

*The Sermon on the Mount
and the Civil State*

—SECTION ONE—

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

-SECTION TWO-

THE CIVIL STATE

-APPENDIX-

THE CONSCIENTIOUS PATRIOT

(FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

THE LAW OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(BY M. C. KURFEES)

COPYRIGHT 1967
BY FOY E. WALLACE JR. PUBLICATIONS
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
(All rights reserved)



Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT		<i>Pages</i>
The Introduction		v
The Frontispiece.....		viii
The Foreword.....		ix
The text of Matthew (chapters 5, 6, 7).....		1-8
Introduction to the Sermon.....		9-10
Evaluation of the Discourse.....		10-11
The Beatitudes (5: 1-2).....		12-22
The Similitudes (5: 13-16)		23-26
The Precepts (5: 17-48)		27-58
The Exhibitions of Hypocrisy (6: 1-34).....		59-77
The Premonitory Instructions (7-29)		78-97
The Leaven of the Pharisees (Luke 12: 1-3)		98-105
The Christian's Manual (Romans 12, 13).....		105-130
The Function of Conscience.....		131-141
SECTION TWO: THE CIVIL STATE		
The Character Of Civil Government		145-146
The Nature of the Civil State.....		148-158
The Precepts Applied To Civil Procedures		158-214
(Matt. 4: 8-10; Luke 3: 10-14; Matt. 5: 38-42; Luke 6: 27-28; Matt. 20: 51-52; Luke 22: 35-38; Jno. 18: 36; Mark 12: 13-17; Mark 12: 28-31; Matt. 10: 23; Jno. 8: 3-11; Rom. 13: 1-7; 2 Cor. 10: 3-4; Jas. 2: 8-12; Jas. 4: 1-2; Isa. 2: 2-5)		
The Fallacy of Pacifism.....		215-2
The Inconsistency of Non-Resistance.....		224-23
APPENDIX:		
God's Law On Capital Punishment—M. C. Kurfees		248-201
The Conscientious Patriot—Go Tell That Fox— from the Congressional Record.....		235-247

INTRODUCTION

This book, *The Sermon On The Mount And The Civil State*, is a timely declaration of fundamental principles. To say that confusion reigns in the areas covered in these pages is to understate the conditions that exist, not only among religious people generally, but in the legislative, judiciary and executive branches of our national government as well. I do not exaggerate my own deep convictions when I say that the study of this most thorough and comprehensive book by all preachers and church-members, lawyers and judges, lawmakers and politicians in America could be the means of preserving the freedoms or life and of worship, and *freedom itself* in the social and political conditions of our time.

For a number of years I lived just across the Potomac from our nation's capital, and daily commented on the news and events of our age to a nation-wide radio and television audience. The millions of listeners to my daily commentary, on the program *Life Line* from 1958 to 1963, know that I espoused the fundamental principles of human relations, both personal and international, which are laid down in the Bible and which form the basis of our national government and of our union as a nation under God. To state that America is in fast departure from those principles is simply to put in words the self-evident.

There was a day in which the criminal, whether an individual or a nation, was subject to punishment according to the principles of eternal justice as enunciated by the Bible. But that day has passed, and instead of the outlaw being the subject of punishment and the object of scorn, he is coddled and courted and aided. The concept that some forms of behaviour are eternally *right* and some forms eternally *wrong* has been replaced by the philosophy that "everything is relative." Thus, fornication is no longer condemned, but its wrongness or rightness is determined by whether or not "a meaningful relation existed." Murder is considered no longer subject to capital punishment, and government officials who are sworn to uphold the constitution are making public statements that they are opposed to capital punishment. It is only a short step to the

application of this theory of "relativity" to international relations, and today as a nation we are giving aid and trade to Communist nations who are guilty of murdering more people than have been killed in all of the declared wars of human history. Thus from the concept of living by eternal principles of justice, of right and wrong, we have evolved into a society governed by expedience rather than principle, from the personal level up to the national policy.

It is no wonder that the youth of our nation and of the world are confused. Today many Christians find themselves in company with beatniks, draft card burners, protest marchers and draft dodgers. They know that they do not belong in such company, but somehow cannot figure out why. The reasons they give are all confused with "feelings," and with a mixture of absorbed propaganda daily fed to the American public through mass communications media and the thousands of books pouring from the nation's presses. Finally, there has come from the press a clarion voice of reasoned study of God's revelation. This book, *The Sermon On The Mount And The Civil State*, could change the tide if studied with the Bible in hand. It will become the object of attack, but I will make one prediction in this introduction—the objectors to the truths delineated herein will not attempt to disprove these truths, but will follow the usual course of the modern-day extremist propaganda by attacking the author.

The author, Foy E. Wallace, Jr., does not propose to speak for any group, religious or otherwise, in the following pages. This is not the first book he has written, but is only one of many which have flowed from his erudite pen during the many years that he has been a gospel preacher. He writes from the wisdom of more than a half-century of Bible preaching and study. Through a half-century he has fearlessly proclaimed the truth of God's word without regard to whether it was considered controversial or otherwise. In the writing of this book he is not engaging in an excursion into the political realm, but is simply shedding light in areas where Christians have been in darkness. Brother Wallace has walked the lonely road of God's truth too long to solicit endorsement or praise.

He simply asks that each reader diligently study to "prove all things" and to see if these matters are true.

If I may be permitted a more personal word about the author and the book, it is my hope that beyond the need of every New Testament Christian to study this work, every legislator and public official in every level of government in our land may also read it. Unless the error of the mass psychology propaganda of our age is exposed and replaced with truth, the advocates of slavery will continue to overwhelm and subjugate the peoples of the world. These propagandists tell us that there is no God, and that man is the supreme being in our world. The Word of God tells us that the freedoms which have produced the abundance we know in America are the gifts of our Creator. There is no fellowship between light and darkness. There can be no equivocation between right and wrong. There are eternal truths and there is eternal justice. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" are words which were spoken by our Lord with specific reference to freedom from sin, but I have never encountered any realm in which this great principle is not equally valid.

I am honored to have the privilege of writing this introduction and to take my stand with what I devoutly believe to be the truth. I earnestly suggest that the readers supply Congressmen, Senators and other public officials with copies of it.

WAYNE POUCHER

142 Kenilworth Ave.,
Ormond Beach, Florida.

FOREWORD

The dual title of this book conveys the scope of its contents—the doctrine of the Lord's sermon on the mount; and the relation of his disciples to the organized community into which our lives are cast, a society known as civil government. The object is therefore twofold: first, to unfold the meaning of the Beatitudes as kingdom principles, gospel previews and Pentecost pointers; second, to develop the teaching of the entire discourse in the light of the announced kingdom of heaven.

The people of the Roman world understood the meaning of the word *kingdom*. They had not known any other form of government from the Babylonians to the Romans—Babylonia under Nebuchadnezzar and Artaxerxes; Media and Persia under Darius and Cyrus; Grecia or Macedonia under Philip II and Alexander III; and Rome under the Caesars. But when John and Jesus announced the *kingdom of heaven*, that was something else—it meant a kingdom not from here; it *is* here but not *from* here; it is from heaven, *the kingdom of heaven on earth*. It meant the *reign* of heaven in the *hearts* of men.

The mission of Christ into the world was to establish this heavenly kingdom as the means of seeking and saving the lost humanity—and from the banks of the Jordan where he was baptized to the hill of Calvary where he was crucified, his teaching pointed to the culmination of this kingdom. The *Sermon On The Mount* is, therefore, the gospel of the kingdom.

But the disciples of Christ—Christians—are not only citizens of a spiritual kingdom, we are all members of a civil community, and the principles of the *Sermon On The Mount* do not cancel our relationship to the organized society of which we are a part, nor exempt us from the civic obligations to it, therefore, the contingent title of this book: *The Civil State*.

The aim of this part of the present work is to allay hostilities and relieve animosities, and all that the author has spoken or written, past or present, has been for the vindication of the Cause.

Whenever a world calamity occurs a national emergency exists which precipitates a social crisis. The resultant effects of these combined causes create conflicting sentiments among pious people. The youth of our land, the cream of the young generation, are periodically mustered into the nation's armed forces to provide for its necessary military might. Foreseeing these exigent circumstances in the months preceding the crucial period which requires critical national decisions, many morally honorable and religiously faithful men and boys within and on the border of the draft age enlist for assignment to whatever branch of service the government needs them. The inevitable result has been a declaration war against war by political pacifist organizations and certain religious groups adhering to the Conscientious Objectors viewpoint, who claim the right of exemption from all related military services on the ground of conscientious scruples against all war of any kind, either offensive or defensive, under any and all circumstances, declaiming with much vociferation that neither a Christian nor a moralist can be a soldier.

Encircled by these sentimental complexities and conflicts our young men face a dilemma, a serious and embarrassing alternative, in a choice between the course of the Conscientious Objector—the consistent consequences of which is commitment to the Concentration Camp—or of honorable enlistment in the armed services for the defense of the nation. It is for the information of this legion of heroic youth and their patriotic parents, and because of personal interest and sympathy, that this treatise is tendered as an obligation to meet an imperative need for encouragement to our soldiers and their families.

The portions of this book that bear upon the Christian's relation to civil and military government are the result of the author's own mental and spiritual struggles, having been himself in earlier years a sentimental adherent of the non-combatant viewpoint, on a largely taken-for-granted basis derived from various religious environments. But in the depths of heart-searching reflection that conviction yielded to the logic of consistency—for if civil government is God-ordained and right, by the same token the military is both religiously and morally right, for the civil cannot endure without the military to sustain it. In the logical

analysis there is no such thing as *non-combatant* service in principle, military or civil, in government. On the principle of *particeps criminus*, one who is a party to anything, who helps or assists, aids or abets an evil, is an *accomplice in crime*—the one is as guilty as the other. Seeing the inconsistencies involved led the author to review the whole ground of civil and military government, with an examination of every scripture text which has been employed to condemn participation in civil and military government, and the relation of the principles of the *Sermon On The Mount* to the government issue, and to both morality and Christianity. The conclusions of this study covering the period of the war years are fully developed in *Section Two* of this work, and its only purpose has been to lead others out of mental confusion and uncertainty, and to render a service toward delivering churches of Christ and Christians from the odium of any affiliation with subversive *Conscientious Objectors* organizations, a malodorous influence in an organized civil society, indeed, and a classification which the members of the church in our good land do not deserve, it is the author's heart felt desire that this presentation may accomplish these ends without renewing the oppositions and animosities of the former years.

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
MARCH 1, 1967.

SECTION ONE

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

(MATTHEW FIVE THROUGH SEVEN)

MATTHEW—CHAPTERS FIVE
THROUGH SEVEN

CHAPTER 5

AND seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain:
and when he was set, his disciples came unto him:

2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,

3 Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

4 Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

5 Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

6 Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

7 Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

8 Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

9 Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

10 Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

11 Blessed are ye, when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

12 Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great *is* your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

13 Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.

14 Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid.

15 Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

16 Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

21 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Ra'ca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

23 Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee;

24 Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

25 Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

26 Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28 But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29 And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

30 And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast

it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

81 It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

82 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

33 Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

84 But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:

35 Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Je-ru'sa-lem; for it is the city of the great King.

36 Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black.

87 But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

89 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away *thy* coat, let him have thy cloke also.

41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

45 That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

46 For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

47 And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so?

48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

CHAPTER 6

TAKE heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven.

2 Therefore when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

3 But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:

4 That *thine* alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly.

5 And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

6 But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

7 But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.

8 Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.

9. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

10 Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

11 Give us this day our daily bread.

12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For *thine* is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. A-men'.

14 For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:

15 But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

16 Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they

may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

17 But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face;

18 That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

19 Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal:

20 But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal:

21 For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

22 The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!

24 No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

25 Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

26 Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

27 Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature ?

28 And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

29 And yet I say unto you, That even Sol'o-mon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

30 Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith?

31 Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we

eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?

32 (For after all these things do the Gen'tiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things,

33 But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

34 Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof.

CHAPTER 7

JUDGE not, that ye be not judged.

2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

3 And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye ?

4 Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye ?

5 Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

6. Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

7. Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened into you:

8 For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

9 Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?

10 Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?

11 If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him ?

12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

13 Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate,

and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:

14 Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.

15 Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

16 Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

17 Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

18 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

19 Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

20 Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

22. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?

23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

24 Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.

25 And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

26 And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:

27 And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.

28 And it came to pass, when Je'sus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine:

29 For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes.

—SECTION ONE—

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

I. INTRODUCTION

The misconceptions and mistaken attitudes concerning the *Sermon On The Mount* prevail among both believers and non-believers. The missed meaning of its precepts by the former class cause the impression that as a moral code it is far too superior for practical application to personal conduct or general observance in the present order of society and therefore must be reserved for other times than ours. The latter class looks lightly upon its ideals as being on the level with the sayings of Buddha, Confucius and Lao-tse. The demands of the group, classed as believers but complacent toward complying with its principles, would require the *Sermon On The Mount* as a moral code to smooth all disorders and irregularities, confusions and conflicts, in modern social and civil life. Considered morally, it is viewed as a panacea of social reform; legally, as a civil code to cure all political evils; religiously, as a creed broad enough to include anything bearing the label of Christianity. Such views reflect neither the intent nor the content of the *Sermon On The Mount*.

Subsequent to the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan and immediately after his descent from the mount of temptation it is stated, in Matthew 4: 23, that "he went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, " followed by great multitudes. The next thing in context was the *Sermon On The Mount* at the conclusion of which, in Matthew 7: 28-29, it is recorded that "the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. " The first passage refers to his preaching as the *gospel* of the kingdom, which already he had announced as at hand. The second passage refers to his teaching as his *doctrine*. The *Sermon On The Mount* is therefore the gospel of the kingdom and the doctrine of Christ.

It is declared that "he taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes. " He was Himself the new lawgiver, while the scribes taught only as interpreters of law. They were the professional teachers whose function was to multiply copies of the law and expound it, as set forth in Nehemiah 8: 1-12 in the appointment of Ezra the scribe, to be the expounder of the long lost and forgotten law. The scribes later became an organized body, membership in which required examination, and they were therefore referred to as lawyers, a distinction that was not always maintained, one being a popular and the other an official designation. But Jesus did not teach as the scribes, a mere interpreter and expounder of the existing Mosaic law. He was himself lawgiver, possessed legislative power and taught with that authority. The text states that he taught as one *having authority*—it was divinely inherent in Himself from the Father, derived from no predecessor. The staff of Moses had not been handed over to him, nor had the mantle of the prophets descended upon him—he taught not as an expounder with secondary or delegated authority but as one who had authority by the divine right of his own person, the Son of God, who was "full of the Holy Spirit" from his baptism in the Jordan—Luke 4: 1—and "full of grace and truth"—John 1: 14—in that he was "the only begotten" Son.

II. THE DISCOURSE

From the foregoing preliminaries it can be at once observed that fundamentally essential to a comprehensive evaluation of the *Sermon On The Mount* are the following considerations:

(1) The announcement of the harbinger of Christ in John 1: 29: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. " The word "sin" here has no *s* at its end—it is *sin*, not *sins*. The barrier between God and man was sin. The purpose of the incarnation of Christ was to remove the distance between God and man, take away the barrier, remove the separation. The veil suspended in the arch of Solomon's Old Testament temple, and of Herod's temple in the time of the Lord's ministry was a symbol of the separation between God and man that sin had caused, and the rending of the veil when Christ was suspended on the cross was the symbol of the removing

of that separation. That is the meaning of John's announcement of the mission of Jesus Christ, and it has significant emphasis in the introduction to the Sermon—the beatitudes:

(2) The announcement of both John and Jesus in Matthew 3: 1-2 and Mark 1: 14-15 concerning the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, the forecast of its spiritual character, the reign of heaven in the hearts of men in the world, the peculiar tenets of which are set forth in the discourse on the mountain.

(3) The announcement of a new dispensation and inauguration of a new covenant as recorded in Luke 16: 16: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. " The expression "until John" means until John's order ended, not until John appeared. The regime of John ended at the cross and that also ended the law and the prophets, thereafter a new dispensation, and the kingdom. When Moses and Elijah appeared on the mount of the transfiguration in Luke 9: 30-31 talking with Jesus "of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, " the conversation was in reference to the transition of administrations from the law and the prophets to the new dispensation and the new covenant of Jesus Christ. The *Sermon On The Mount* with its beatitudes comprehend all of these preparatory principles—they are previews of the gospel and Pentecost pointers, discursive not of the then past or present but words looming with the immediate future, prospective and contemplative of the new covenant and kingdom of Christ.

(4) The pronouncement of the permanent precepts of the gospel, not a mere interlude, not temporary and provisional, but corollary to the Great Commission to which they pointed, in which they were fulfilled, and of the permanence of which the Lord said, "even unto the end of the world. "

The whole of the *Sermon On The Mount* was therefore prospective and contemplative of the new covenant, the new dispensation and the new kingdom, from Pentecost to the end of time, and we now proceed to the examination of its principles.

III. THE BEATITUDES—MATTHEW 5: 1-12.

"And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him: 2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying 3 Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 4 Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. 5 Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. 6 Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. 7 Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. 8 Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God. 9 Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. 10 Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 11 Blessed are ye, when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. 12 Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great *is* your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you. "

The word *beatify* means to make happy, and *beatitude* means consummate bliss or blessedness. The eight codified declarations which introduce the discourse of Christ, which have been named the beatitudes, describe realm of the kingdom of heaven as a state of spiritual blessedness which produces the highest happiness of the soul. Each beatitude states a gospel principle, a preview of the kingdom, and it is impossible to ignore Pentecost as the time foretold in these precepts, the immediate prospect of which accentuated the teaching.

(1) "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. " (Verse 3)

The word *poor* is usually descriptive of what a man has, or does not have, but the expression *poor in spirit* refers to what a man *is*. It carries the idea of dependence on something other than one's self. Jeremiah declared, "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps. "—Jeremiah 10: 23. The one who is poor in spirit depends upon God for direction, and that will lead him into the kingdom. It is opposite of the command of the world's resources which breeds the independence of self-sufficiency and human wisdom. Isaiah declared, "For thus saith the high and lofty

One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones"—Isaiah 57: 15. The kingdom of heaven which had been announced was a sphere of divine grace which only the obedient spirit could enter, and the phrase "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" are words which pointed to Pentecost when the kingdom that was drawing nigh was established.

A prophetic description of the character of its constituents is set forth in the metaphors of Isaiah 35: 8-10: "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed of the Lord shall walk there: and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. " The wayfaring men are men who fare by the way and are not acquainted with the territory through which they are passing, and they must be guided. The fools of the passage are not simpletons but are descriptive of men who realize the need of guidance, who know that they cannot guide themselves.

To the Corinthians Paul said, "Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise"—1 Corinthians 3: 18. In the first chapter of the epistle the apostle contrasted the human wisdom of their Grecian philosophy with divine revelation. In the second chapter he declared that he did not bring "the excellency of speech" which they ascribed to their Grecian philosophers, the literature of which they regarded as the paragon of all excellence—instead, he came to them not in human wisdom but with divine revelation. So in the third chapter the apostle exhorted any man in the Corinthian church who had come out of the Grecian society into the church, and was still doting on the wisdom of the philosophers, to "become a fool that he may be wise"—that is, to lay down the human wisdom of Grecian philosophy and accept the guidance of divine revelation. Now that describes the fool of Isaiah

35, of 1 Corinthians 3 and of the *poor in spirit* of, the beatitudes. It refers to the humble-hearted who depend upon God for direction, and in accepting the conditions of the gospel they will be guided into the kingdom. It is impossible to ignore Pentecost as the time when these words were fulfilled, for not until the events of that day of Acts 2 did any of these disciples enter the kingdom, and the kingdom thus became theirs.

(2) "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. " (Verse 4)

The gospel truth contained in this beatitude lies in the meaning of *mourning* and of the *comfort* in the passage. It is not a consolatory text. To apply it to the material losses sustained in the adversities of life is too materialistic for this context; and to refer it to grief and bereavement over the loss of loved ones in death is too trite—the comfort in the former application would of necessity be a sort of *status QUO ante*, restoring the same state as before; and in the latter it would consist in the comfort which time as the healer of the wounded heart may bring.

The theme of the passage does not admit of these applications. The mourning and comfort of the passage undoubtedly has connection with the announcement of John concerning the mission of Christ in reference to sin. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. " It has no reference to personal bereavement, disappointments and losses. It refers to the mourning of the spirit over the sinful condition of the world when the Lord appeared and is sympathetic with his mission to take away sin as announced by his harbinger, an attitude of grief and concern in the depth of feeling for the state of the lost world.

These words were especially applicable to the environment of the believing Jews in the surroundings of the Roman and pagan society, and all who were thus mourning over "the sin of the world" would soon be comforted by the good, glad news of the gospel about to be announced to all the world. It is the comfort of Isaiah's prophecy in reference to the coming of Christ into the world, in Isaiah 61: 1-2: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the

captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn. "

To show the application of this prophecy and its fulfillment in his ministry, Jesus quoted it in Luke 4: 18 when he addressed the synagogue, in the following words: "And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives. . . to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. " The relation of Isaiah's prophecy and of the Lord's quotation is plain. The reference to preaching the gospel to the *poor* does not mean to poor people, but to the poor spirit of the first beatitude, and it is evident that "to comfort all that mourn" refers to the good news of the gospel mentioned by both Isaiah and Jesus, which is also the comfort of the second beatitude.

Parallel to this beatitude is the invitation of Matthew 11: 28: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. " There is no difference between the "mourning" of the beatitude and the "heavy laden" of the invitation; and there is no difference between the "comfort" and the "rest. " Both passages refer to remission of sins by the gospel of Christ. And that is the meaning of the second beatitude which anticipated the good news of the gospel, as the means of comfort for the sin-laden world by removing the cause of mourning—"the sin of the world. " Nothing could alleviate that kind of mourning, or weaken the potency of sorrowing for sin, than the comfort of the gospel upon which rests the hope of all mankind. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God... The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God... and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it"—Isaiah 40: 1-5; Matthew 3: 3. The second beatitude is related in meaning to these gospel prophecies and their fulfillment and was preparatory to Pentecost.

(3) "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. " (Verse 5)

Who are the meek? and what is the meaning of "inherit the earth"? Meekness is often mistaken for passivity, timid reticence and a sort of an inferiority complex. But the basic element of meekness, derived from its root meaning, is equilibrium—the full and complete possession of all the faculties of one's being, an inner mastery. It has been illustrated in some lexical definitions as the captain at the helm of his ship in the midst of the storm, who, in full control of the vessel, guides the ship steadily through the storm. It is said of Moses in Numbers 12: 3, "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all men which were upon the face of the earth, " yet he was among all men the most courageous, and with Joshua his colleague and commander-in-chief, the greatest fighter in Israel.

The hearers of Jesus were all under the Roman yoke, but his own disciples were soon to become citizens in a new kingdom in which they would be surrounded by the hostilities of all opposing elements, the oppositions of paganism, the oppressions of the Roman empire and the persecutions of their own flesh and blood Jews. But in the meekness of their souls, the supremacy of will that gives victory over all surroundings, they would overcome all of these hostilities, rather than be subdued by them, and thus fill the earth with the teaching of Christ. The literal application of inheriting the earth belittles the Sermon, beggars its nobility and nullifies its nature; and it contradicts the character of the hope planted in the hearts of disciples then and of Christians now; it is incompatible with the gospel which the beatitudes forecast.

The promise of the third beatitude to inherit the earth has no reference to material possession of the earth nor to the rulership of the world. It rather means that the disciples of Christ would possess an imperious equilibrium of soul and supremacy of will that would give them spiritual victory over the mundane surroundings and so enable them to fill the whole world with the principles of the kingdom being then announced.

In the prophecy on the gospel dispensation of Isaiah 11, the prophet said in verse 9, "for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea";

and in chapter 2, verse 14, the prophet Habakkuk said, "for the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Both of these passages were prophetic of the new dispensation just as the beatitudes were a preview of its principles, and the promise of inheriting the earth in the beatitude was the forecast of the same thing Isaiah and Habakkuk prophesied—the expansion of the gospel over all the world and thus to fill the earth "with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord" in the gospel dispensation.

In the Lord's predictions on the siege and destruction of Jerusalem in Matthew 24, he said that he would afterward send his angels to "gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other"—referring to the expansion of the church through emissaries of the gospel over the whole Roman world. In the commission to Jeremiah, chapter 1: 10, God said, "See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms"—not as the ruler over nations and kingdoms, but through the teaching of the prophet. Paul said in 1 Corinthians 6: 2 that "the saints shall judge the world," not as rulers, but through teaching and exemplifying the principles of the kingdom of Christ. It is in this same sense that "the meek shall inherit the earth"—the disciples of Christ as subjects of the spiritual kingdom would, through the supremacy of will that gives victory over all surroundings, spread the kingdom over the earth "as the waters cover the sea"—and that was done. It is a forecast of the universal character of the gospel of Christ and the expansion of the church over the known world from Pentecost and from Jerusalem unto the uttermost part of the earth.

(4) "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." (Verse 6)

Righteousness is the state of justification due to forgiveness of sin. Paul declared in Romans 1: 16-17 that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation because it reveals the righteousness of God. This righteousness does not refer to the character of God and is not an attribute of God. In chapter 10: 3 the apostle said that the Jews were ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, had not submitted to the righteousness of God. But the Jews were not ignorant of God's character,

they knew that God is a righteous being; therefore the righteousness of God did not refer to an attribute of God but rather to the righteousness imparted to man by the forgiveness of God necessary to justification of sinners. The Jews had set up their system of justification, and were ignorant of the gospel plan or how God forgives sinners. So Romans 1: 16-17 simply states that the gospel reveals how God forgives sinners and thus makes sinners righteous.

The statement of the fourth beatitude means that Jesus Christ was bringing to mankind a system of righteousness, a divine plan for the justification of sinners, which depended on forgiveness of sin, and which for that reason the sinner must desire—"hunger and thirst for righteousness"—and in accepting its condition, receive its full measure.

In verse 20, of the same chapter 5, Jesus said to the disciples, "except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. " This passage has been almost universally misapplied to such things as *tithing*, after this manner: the Jews tithed, and to exceed their righteousness a Christian must not only tithe, but tithe *plus*. If that be the meaning of Matthew 5: 20 then the tithing plus is a condition of entering the kingdom, for the passage reads *except* this righteousness exceeds *that* righteousness they could in no case *enter into* the kingdom. The righteousness of this passage is the passport into the kingdom, a necessary condition to entering it, and obviously has no reference to the subject of giving or tithing even by allusion.

The scribes and Pharisees, the Jews, had their own system for justification, but it was not the righteousness of the gospel. Jesus Christ came to bring to mankind the righteousness which the law could not provide. "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law"—Galatians 3: 21. The system of forgiveness which Jesus Christ brings to sinners through the gospel is the righteousness that *exceeds* in kind the righteousness of the Jews. The Lord's use of the word *exceed* refers to character and kind, not degree, and refers to the gospel system of forgiveness or pardon.

The fourth beatitude therefore refers to the desire for

the justification that the gospel of Christ offers to unpardoned sinners. In order to receive it one must possess the inward qualification of desiring it—hungering and thirsting for it. It means that the gospel is persuasive, not coercive, in character. We cannot shoot the gospel into a man nor machine-gun Christianity into him—he must know what the gospel offers, and realize his own condition without it, and desiring what the gospel will do for him, he will obey its conditions and come into the full measure of its forgiveness and pardon. It simply defines who will enter the kingdom—the one who so deeply desires justification that he will meet the conditions necessary to obtain it. This blessing is attached to conditions that we have the power to fulfill, submission to which on the knowledge of what the gospel reveals and obedience to its commands. The genuineness of desire will bring it to us, and us into it, and we "shall be filled"—receive the full measure of the promise.

Again, it can be seen that the beatitudes point to the Great Commission and the Day of Pentecost—they are previews of the gospel and Pentecost pointers.

(5) "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." (Verse 7)

The fifth beatitude is but the extension of the fourth, it has to do with obtaining the mercy of forgiveness or pardon which the fourth beatitude calls righteousness. We are all the objects and recipients of divine mercy in the pardon of sin, but forgiveness is not only a thing received—it is extended into a relation. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin"—1 John 1: 7. The gospel of Christ is a system of mercy, and as recipients of it we shall not withhold from or deny to others that which we claim for ourselves. This is a "missionary" beatitude, in that we are merciful when we show to others the divine mercy by which we have been saved.

This beatitude balances with the gospel. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit"—Titus 3: 5. The principal sentence in this passage is: *He saved us*. The conditions of this salvation are stated in a negative and an affirmative: *Not by—but by*. Not by what? Not by works of righteous-

ness which we have done, our own works of merit. But by what? But by the washing of regeneration—baptism. There is no denominational scholar who has denied that the washing of regeneration means baptism. It follows then that baptism is not a work of human righteousness or merit, but has something to do with what God does when he saves a sinner by his mercy. So the passage reads in transposition: He saved us not by works but by baptism according to his mercy. It is further in harmony with Ephesians 2: 8-9: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. " Every person addressed in this passage had been baptized, and salvation is here represented as a system of grace, as it is a system of mercy in Titus 3; and is the gift of God because its recipients are the objects of grace and mercy and do not obtain it through any work of human merit. The fifth beatitude is therefore a preview of the gospel plan of salvation.

(6) "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. " (Verse 8)

The pure heart of this beatitude does not have reference to freedom from impurity, lust or vice. The word *pure* is not used in the moral sense. It means an enlightened heart, as in Ephesians 1: 18, "having the eyes of your heart (understanding) enlightened. " The pure heart means the same as the eye single to the truth. In the same connection Jesus said, "the light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" The single eye is the eye that sees straight; pure vision, is straight vision. And the pure heart is a heart with single vision, a heart that sees straight. It is an enlightened, understanding heart, a knowing heart—a heart that knows, understands and comprehends the truth. We all know that the eye is the organ of light; and if the eye is single it has pure vision and the body has physical light; but if the vision is blurred the body is in darkness. Applying this physical sense to a spiritual condition Jesus said, "how great is that darkness!" Spiritual darkness in the soul is infinitely greater in the comparison with physical darkness in the body. It is only through

pure vision of the eyes of the heart that the soul can receive the spiritual light, and therefore see God.

The expression "see God" means to enter into the relation with God in the kingdom. Jesus said to Nicodemus, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God"—John 3: 3. To see the kingdom meant to enter the kingdom, and to see God means to enter that same state. The sixth beatitude therefore refers to the heart that is single to the truth, unmixed with alien elements; an unclouded vision of the truth which vouchsafes obedience and brings one into the kingdom of Christ. So again it is impossible to separate this beatitude from the gospel of the kingdom, pointing to its establishment on Pentecost.

(7) "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." (Verse 9)

The immediate question is, what is this peace, and who is the peacemaker? A look at the beatitude in the light of its setting reveals at once that it does not refer to the role of an arbiter, nor to arbitration, nor to composing differences between people. The peacemaker here is not the compromiser of disagreements and the settlers of disputes. It is a passage on reconciliation to God and involves the doctrine of peace with God, and the peacemaker is the peace preacher, the disciple who would show the people of the world how to find peace with God. It is the peace of Romans 10: 15, "how beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things." It is the peace that Christ came to preach, as expressed by Paul in Ephesians 2: 14-17, "for he is our peace ... and came and preached peace to you who were afar off, and to them that were nigh." It is the peace that Peter preached to the children of Israel and to Cornelius, as recorded in Acts 10: 36, "the word that God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: he is Lord of all." It is the peace that comes through justification by faith, as stated in Romans 5: 1, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." It is the peace of reconciliation by the blood of the cross, as declared in Colossians 1: 20, "And having made peace through the blood of the cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself." It is the peace of reconciliation to God.

The *peacemaker* is therefore the *peace preacher*. He is the disciple of Jesus Christ who tells any one how to be reconciled to God. In so doing he performs the function of the children of God, or of those designated "the sons of God." So once more, the seventh beatitude balances with the gospel, and occupies a place of sequence in the order of the beatitudes as a preview of the gospel dispensation.

(8) "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Verse 10)

This last beatitude reverts to the first. The first beatitude states the condition of becoming a citizen of the kingdom, and the last describes the character of one who has become a citizen, and being in it is exposed to all of the opposition, persecution and scorn for the cause of righteousness. It has its place also in the sequence of the beatitudes pointing to Pentecost, for the disciples were not persecuted before Pentecost. It is therefore a forecast of the church after its establishment on Pentecost. The apostle, in Hebrews 10: 32-33, said: "But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly, whilst ye were made a gazingstock by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used."

The last beatitude sees the disciple of Christ at his highest, triumphing by the sheer spiritual power of the new kingdom over forces of opposition. He is not necessarily the martyr in the arena under the gaze of the spectators, but the disciple of Christ anywhere who overcomes the buffetings of hostility, who finds himself the subject of malignity, due to his loyalty to Christ and the principles of his kingdom. Here is the test of truly possessing the kingdom—the one who can bear it, and maintain his integrity and fidelity as the disciple of Christ, surely has his inheritance in the kingdom. And he is related in spirit to "the prophets which were persecuted before you" of verse 12, This comparison joins the old and the new dispensations. Thus the eighth and last beatitude is the climax of gospel previews and Pentecost pointers.

The eight beatitudes are but the introduction to the *Sermon On The Mount*, as a whole. They are a synopsis of the gospel of the kingdom, an epitome of the doctrine of

Christ, and as such they find expansion in the precepts that follow in the order of the *Sermon* and of this discussion of them.

IV. THE SIMILITUDES—MATTHEW 5: 13-16

"13 Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. 14 Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. 15 Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. 16 Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. "

Following the previews of the kingdom in the beatitudes next in order is the description of the members of the kingdom in parabolic similes or similitudes, in images, illustrations and object lessons.

(1) The salt of the earth. (5: 13)

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and trodden under foot of men. "

The figure of salt defines the effect and action of the disciples of Christ on society in the new kingdom, soon to be established. The salt "of the earth" denotes an element in the earth for good proceeding from them. The inherent property of salt is here designated "its savour, " which is its intrinsic quality, its flavor, its taste. Here the text says if the salt has lost "his flavor"—not *its* flavor here, but *his* flavor—"wherewith shall it be salted?" The flavor attributed to the disciples would come from Him as its source, and separated from him the disciples could have no source of supply—"wherewith shall it be salted?" Jesus said to the disciples in John 15: 1-3 that without him they could do nothing.

Salt does not lose savour if it is not mixed with clay or otherwise adulterated. This loss of savour is not deterioration from within, but from without, and otherwise it remains pure and potent. It meant that the disciples of Christ in the new church would compose an unadulterated element in the society of the Jewish and pagan world and maintain

purity without amalgamation with one or contamination from the other. Oppositely, salt being the symbol of preservation, it is the antidote to corruption, and as an emblem of influence and a metaphor for flavor, the members of this new spiritual society, the church, being endowed with all of these qualities, would act on all of their surroundings as a check of evil tendencies ceaselessly. Thus in the midst of the world and in perpetual touch with all of its environment they would possess not only a power to resist but to impart.

But if those disciples, here called the salt of world, should lose *his savour*—that inner quality proceeding from one source only—it would then be "good for nothing," for he said, "apart from me, ye can do nothing." The new church would be a divinely founded society as an appointed means of rescuing the world from corruption. It is a collective idea, a function of the body which must remain pure in order to be potent. This purity must be in doctrine, not a vain worship and human doctrine, which the Lord condemned among the Jews in Matthew 15: 9, saying: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." This purity must also be in life, not a mere religious battalogy or set of forms condemned in 2 Timothy 3: 5. "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." If the disciples become contaminated, the influence is gone, the action is lost, and spiritually they would become as useless as salt without savour, having no property, no function, and being *good for nothing* it is cast *away*, and having an element or quality of soil and fertility, it is *trodden under foot of men*. That is the dismal description of the professed followers of Christ who singly or collectively become adulterated, contaminated and mixed up with all of the worldliness of society.

(2) The light of the world. (5: 14)

"Ye are the light of the world." The disciples were shortly to become members of a body illumined with light, compared to a world shrouded with darkness. In Ephesians 5: 8 the members of the church are called "children of light" and are said to be "light in the Lord." In Philippians 2: 15 they are said to "shine as lights in the world." The disciples would soon be organized into a body, formed into a church—hence, the plural "ye are the light of the world." The Jews were aloof from the world, their highest conception

of duty was to dwell apart. Now for the first time a mission to the outside world, the whole world of mankind, was uttered and announced: "Ye"—the disciples collectively; "of the world"—all the world; "among whom"—a mission of good, to function as light in the midst of darkness. It is a beneficent figure—light is *good*. God is light; Christ is light; his disciples are light; the gospel is light; all truth is light. Light is both physical and spiritual in kind and character. Physical light can be analyzed and measured, with the speed of 186, 000 miles per second. The speed of a bullet is nothing in comparison, and it penetrates substances as hard as rock. The energy of light with its photo-electric cells makes Aladdin obsolete. It has the power to land a plane by the vibrations of the motor turning on the landing lights. It can guide a yacht in the harbors of Maine and New York without a soul on board, electrically controlled. Light is the servant of man beyond a layman's conception. Science agrees with the first biblical declaration concerning it, that *light is good*.

First, light is good because it makes visibility. Consider the tragedies of the seas without the lighthouse of the harbor, and in the spiritual application the apostle declares in 2 Corinthians 4: 6: "For God, who commanded light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. "

Second, light is good because it is pure. There is no such thing as dirty light. It is the one element which cannot be contaminated. Air pollution is a problem and water reservoirs are treated for impurity, but not light.

Third, light is good because of its healing propensities. There is healing in the rays of the sun, in the X-ray, the ultra-violet and infra-red, all of which are light.

Fourth, light is good because it protects from evil. Sin and crime and tragedy prevail under the cover of the night. Said Jesus in John 3: 19: "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. "

Fifth, light is good because it makes life possible. Without life plants cannot grow and develop, botany could not exist, and the vegetable kingdom of life would disappear.

The function of the Lord's disciples, subsequently to become his church, was to shine as light, and in his own letters to his churches, through one of his beloved disciples, he designated them his golden candlesticks, a metaphor full of meaning.

(3) A city set on a hill. (5: 14-16)

"A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. "

Here the disciples are not viewed individually, but as a community—as a city on a hill, an aggregation, a corporation, and it is placed where it is visible, on a hill. Furthermore it is "set" and it *is* set, it does not set itself, it is an implanted quality of the truth.

The light is not self-kindling, but it is self-diffusing, it shines of itself. "Let your light so shine"—one has the light—let it act. This is not an arrogant self-assertion of being the light, but a divine agency at work, radiating in a kingdom of light and of peace and blessing among men.

As the city situated on the hill, this light "cannot be hid. " This is a reference to the inevitable diffusion of Christianity as a result of the entrance of the gospel into the world. The lamp is lighted, equipped with an inherent divine illumination of the gospel. The members of the church are called the light—"ye are the light of the world"—but only representatively, as reflectors. The mistake is often made of applying the passage to an effort to make the members shine—it is the light that shines, not the reflector; but the reflector may need cleaning; nevertheless the light is what shines. The influence of the truth is its inherent quality, it needs not to be glamorized, and an effort to do so belittles and debases the nature of the gospel, and is a reflection on the character of the church. The disciple of the Lord does not shine himself, a Christian's best work is often found in that which he least knows or realizes.

These similitudes forcefully forecast the inherent power of the truth and its all-pervading power in the diffusion of Christianity through his disciples who were commanded to "go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every

creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—and "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded. "

V. THE PRECEPTS—MATTHEW 6: 17-48.

"17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. 18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. 19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. 20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. 21 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: 22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. 23 Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; 24 Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. 25 Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. 26 Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou has paid the uttermost farthing. 27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: 28 But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. 29 And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. 30 And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish,

and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell. 31 It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: 32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. 33 Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: 34 But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: 35 Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. 36 Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. 37 But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. 38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: 39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. 40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloak also. 41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. 42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. 43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. 44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; 45 That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. 46 For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? 47 And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? 48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. "

The wide scope of the precepts in the discourse includes the full range of injunctions—prohibitive, inhibitive, exhibitiv and monitory.

(1) The law and the prophets. (5: 17-19)

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily

I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoso shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. "

In the epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 2, verse 14, Paul the apostle specifically states that Christ *abolished* "the law of commandments contained in ordinances, " and in the epistle to the Colossians, chapter 2, verse 14, the same apostle just as emphatically affirmed that the "handwriting of ordinances" was "blotted out" and that God "took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. " The very language of these verses show unquestionably that the apostle refers to the decalogue itself and the whole Mosaic law which it represented as being abrogated.

Both of the reputed "new Bibles"—the so-called Revised Standard Version of the United States and the New English Bible of England arbitrarily substitute the word *abolish* for the word *destroy* in this statement of Jesus, changing the verse to make it read: I came not to *abolish* the law. But he did abolish the law, as declared in Eph. 2: 15, 2 Cor. 3: 11, 13, 14, 16, in which passages the apostle not only used the word *abolished* twice, but the phrases *done away* and *taken away* four times; and in Col. 2: 14 the phrases *took it out of the way* and *nailed to the cross*, and thus *blotted out*. The new versions array Paul against Jesus by making their statements contradictory. If Jesus had *destroyed* the law he could not have *fulfilled* it, but having fulfilled it, he did abolish it. Here the so-called new versions by changing the text have destroyed the truth, as they have done in hundreds of other places. They are not *versions* at all—they are *perversions*.

The statement of Jesus, therefore, that he had not come to "destroy" but to "fulfill" the law, cannot mean that he did not abolish the law, which would establish a contradiction between his personal declarations and the epistolary statements of the apostle. The words *destroy* and *abolish* do not carry the same meaning. The law was not destroyed, but it was abolished. Jesus Christ fulfilled the law, but its destruction would have prevented its fulfillment—it was fulfilled, not destroyed. The statement of verse 18 reads:

"Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. " The qualifying statement *till all be fulfilled* means that not one iota of the law would be annulled until all of it reached fulfillment, till the whole purpose of the law had been accomplished. And this was done at the cross. In Luke 24: 44, after the resurrection, Jesus said to the disciples: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. " And in Acts 13: 29, in the apostle Paul's sermon at Antioch, he said: "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree. " It is indeed a warped theological interpretation that makes the teaching of Christ in Matthew 5: 17 contradictory to the teaching of Paul in the references cited. In further reference to the same thing in Romans 10: 4, the apostle says: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. " The word *end* in this place means *purpose*, and the preposition *for* in the English text is *eis* in the original, and the term *righteousness* means justification, or forgiveness. The simple meaning of the passage therefore is this: *For Christ accomplished the purpose of the law in order to justification*, and thus fulfilled the law, as stated in Romans 8: 4: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh"—the fleshly law of Moses—"but after the Spirit"—the spiritual law of Christ.

Thus the evident meaning of Matthew 5: 17 that the law and the prophets were not destroyed but accomplished, by the coming of Christ into the world for their fulfillment and consummation. It is the Lord's acknowledgement of the divine character of the Old Testament in which is unfolded the unchangeable purpose of God in the divine plan of redemption which the New Testament reveals and brings to completion and perfection.

The statement of verse 18 that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law" cannot be disjoined from the phrase with which it is connected, "till all be fulfilled, " and the necessary inference is that when the law was fulfilled every jot and every tittle did pass—the whole law ended. The words *jot* and *tittle* are references to the small strokes of the Hebrew alphabet which distinguish

letters that are similar, and mean that no part or portion of the law, however small, should pass away until the whole was accomplished and consummated. Verse 20 follows with this conclusion: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. "

The word "break" here does not refer to an act of transgressing a lesser commandment in the law in contrast with one that is greater, It is a reference to the teaching that certain parts or portions of the law, even while it was in force, were not to be regarded or their validity acknowledged. It has the same meaning as James 2: 10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. " It is not that the breaking of only one commandment is as sinful as breaking all of them, for the law itself recognized degrees in guilt by the discrimination in the penalties. Rather it means that in the breaking of one commandment the law as a whole has been breached.

The principle of obedience to all commandments is one, in that it keeps not one or another but every command alike; so if one chooses nine commands to keep and selects one to break, he is not doing God's will at all, but his own. All the commandments are *as one* in the expression of one divine will, resting on one authority, as further extended in verse 20: "For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law"—that is, there is one Lawgiver whose authority is equally involved in all of the commandments and obedience or disobedience to his will is the same in respect thereto, whether one or all. The law is whole, and forms one code and it is breached on "one point" when one commandment is broken.

In a similar vein in Romans 13: 10-11, after naming several commands, the apostle added: "And if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. " All of the precepts and commandments of God are manifestations and expressions of his love, and keeping them is the principle of love at work in us, and to "offend in one point"—the failure to keep any one command exhibits the defect emphasized by Paul and James; for "love worketh no ill to his neighbor"—*no* ill at all; and

love is therefore the spirit of the whole of God's law of which the several precepts are partial expressions—the separate ingredients compounded into "the royal law," the sum of which is in the word *love*. The various Mosaic laws forbidding injury to one's neighbor are all summed up in the saying which contains them all in principle—"therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."

But the argument of the passage is not limited to the law of Moses with its special prohibitions. It rather points to the much larger sense of the essence of love in the full revelation of God's will in the plan of salvation, the required fulfillment of which is in "the law of faith" of Romans 3: 27, and the "faith which worketh by love" of Galatians 5: 6. All of the laws of God flow from this fountainhead and are gathered up in a word which in 1 John 4: 8 the apostle of love used to define God—"for God is love." This declaration means more than the view of benevolence—that God is benevolent. It comprehends both creation and redemption, for love is both creative and redeeming. It answers the question as to why God created the world "and all things therein," and why he "formed man from the dust of the earth," and then "in the image of God created he him." Why did God create at all? There was no necessity to compel him other than the compulsion of love, as expressed in verse 16 of 1 John 4, "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." Herein is expressed immanence from God. This was creative love.

A magnificent description of divine love in redemption is declared in verses eight to ten: "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The propitiation or satisfaction for sin which was effected in the one great act of love—the sending of the only begotten Son of God—signifies an already existing inherent love. It is set forth in verse 19 as being evocative: "We love him, because he first loved us." God's love preceded and evoked the love of man, it calls or summons forth as from seclusion in the hidden recesses of man's being, even while alien in heart, the response of love in consequence of the sending of his Son. All of this was in fulfillment, not destruction, of the law and

the prophets—and in this light the declaration of Christ in the discourse on the mountain has its full meaning: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. "

(2) The new righteousness. (5: 20)

"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. "

The new righteousness would consist in the system of justification that differed from the self-justification of the Pharisees. Righteousness means justification—and that means the system of divine forgiveness, without which no man can become just, or justified. In Romans 1: 16-17, the apostle declares himself unashamed of "the gospel of Christ ... for therein is revealed the righteousness of God. " It is evident that this "righteousness of God" does not refer to the character of God, or an attribute of God, for in Romans 10: 3, the same apostle further declares that the Jews were "ignorant of God's righteousness, " and "going about to establish their own righteousness" they had not "submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. " Now the Jews were not ignorant that God is righteous, a righteous being—but they were ignorant of "God's righteousness, " therefore *God's righteousness* is not an attribute of God, and is not used as a descriptive characteristic of God—it refers the righteousness that God imparts to man in forgiveness, it is *justification*. And the gospel reveals it—"for therein is revealed the righteousness of God"—because the gospel reveals how God forgives sinners, how God makes man righteous, how God justifies sinful man.

This passage connects with the beatitude: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness"—that is, the justification that the gospel would bring to them in the pardon of sin. The Jews, represented by the scribes and Pharisees in the passage under consideration, had their own system of justification, but the righteousness of the gospel *exceeded* it, not in the sense of *degree*—not *more of the same*—but exceeding it in kind. Jesus Christ was bringing to the world a system of justification which differed from that of the Pharisees and exceeded it in character because it was the righteousness of God, imparted to sinners in obedience to the gospel which reveals it.

The foregoing definition of the word "righteousness" in this passage is further supported by the Lord's own words: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." This righteousness was a necessary condition of entering into the kingdom which was "at hand," and the verb "shall exceed" is future, showing that it referred not to the time present, but to entrance into the kingdom that had been announced. Jesus said to Nicodemus in John 3: 3: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and to the disciples he said, "except your righteousness shall exceed... ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven"—it is the same kingdom, and the same conditions, and the righteousness which should exceed that of the Jews would thus be a passport into the kingdom, already announced as being "at hand."

These considerations show how shallow is the usual interpretation and application of Matthew 5: 20, which almost invariably is put as follows: The Jews tithed, they gave a *tenth*—and our righteousness must exceed the Jews by *giving and doing more of the same thing*—therefore the Christian must *tithe plus*. If that is the meaning of the passage, then both the *tithe* and the *plus* are conditions of *entering* the kingdom, and must be performed before admission into the kingdom, or church, for the passage reads that except this righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, *you shall in no case enter* into the kingdom. This makes tithing a part of the gospel, an element of the new birth—and that is a new gospel to us, indeed! The usual application is a complete misfire. Tithing is no more a part of Christianity than any other element of Judaism or legalism of the law. It is not the basis of "giving" nor of any phase of the liberality taught in the New Testament. Some preachers among us who teach this tenet of relegated Judaism are not only reflecting on the church of Christ by classifying it in the public mind with the Seventh Day Adventists and the Mormons, but also render the cause of Christ a distinct disservice in the effort to fasten a false doctrine on his church.

Summarily, the *righteousness* of Matthew 5: 20, and of the fourth beatitude of verse 6, is a reference to the system of justification revealed in the gospel of Romans 1: 16-17. It *exceeds* the system of the Jews in kind and character.

Without this righteousness, or justification through the pardon of sin, no man can *enter* into the kingdom of Christ—it is the passport into his kingdom.

There was no such righteousness in the law, for as stated in Galatians 3: 21, "if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. " Righteousness is justification, and it is the divine system of pardon revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ. So again, as of the beatitudes, the righteousness of Matthew 5: 20 that exceeds the law is a forecast of the gospel and a Pentecost pointer.

(3) The sin of animosity. (5: 21-22)

"Ye have heard that it was said by 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 whosoever is angry with his brother without cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. "

The teaching of these verses proceed from the incipient anger in the heart through its progressive stages until it reaches the end. It deals with the hostile heart, full of scorn and contempt, culminating in the acts of wrath which make the guilty one liable to the verdicts of judgment, which compare with the steps in the offenses of the guilty—that is, from the lower to the higher; first, in the decisions of the elders of a township; second, in the judgment passed by the higher council; and third, the highest degree of punishment assessed by the Sanhedrin, the authority of which could impose the death penalty until the power of life and death was taken from them by the Roman government.

The Lord's statement, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, " is evidently a reference to the glossary—the interlinear translations, explanations and commentaries which the scribes and elders added from time to time to the text of the law, and which accounts for the addition to the sixth commandment of the phrase, "and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. " To the original command, "thou shalt not kill, " this rabbinical gloss had been attached—hence, the Lord's statement: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time. " The judgment mentioned in connection with extension of the original

command refers to the consideration of the charge of murder by the elders of the city, which was a local tribunal among the Jews, the councils and the Sanhedrin being courts of higher jurisprudence.

Jesus then advances to the extended sense of the old command, to a new application: from the outward act to the inward force or state of mind leading to it, to the sins of thoughts, words and intents, and not merely the deed. To be angry with a brother "without a cause, " without ground, would put the offender in the danger of an adverse judgment, represented by a lower sentence of the local tribunal; to apply the term of extreme abuse and utmost contempt in calling another, *Raca*, would subject the offender to trial before an appointed jury, designated the council; and to attach to another the appellation *fool*, which at that time was a term of extreme vulgarity and moral reproach, would subject the offender to the sternest penalty of the supreme court, the Sanhedrin, which had the power of the death sentence.

Thus Jesus recognized both the degrees in sins originating in the heart antecedent to their subsequent acts and the degrees or extent of judgments and penalties in punishment of them. The word "hell" in the passage is from *gehenna*, derived from *hinnom*, in which valley the refuse was an ever-burning heap and, therefore, signified the last and final sentence in punishment.

The next thing in order of mention, of verses 23-24—the bringing of gifts to the altar—is in close connection with the preceding, and has reference to offending another in the profanities that had been mentioned. And the admonition of verses 25 and 26, to "agree with thine adversary quickly, " is in the same context, and infers that the adversary has a case at law against the offender who would more wisely make settlement before the imposition of sterner penalties of the court; for after the sentence, the offender in prison would "by no means come out thence"—be released from the debt; "till thou has paid the uttermost farthing"—not only of the debt but of the additional assessments of the judgment against him. So it is the course of wisdom to settle his offense against his adversary at law before the sentence of the court is pronounced, and thus avoid the inevitable alternative. The spiritual application emphasizes the imperative need of rectifying all wrongs be-

fore they come to the judgment day when God "will render to every man according to his deeds, " and where "every transgression and disobedience" shall receive "a just recompense of reward. "

Applied to certain conditions, a duty toward a fellow brother or a fellow man becomes a duty toward God claiming priority because it involves service to God. But it is all connected with the sin of animosity, in relation to which the command "thou shalt not kill" refers to murder, not to the prerogatives a government in the infliction of punishment on criminals. The law which said "thou shalt not kill" in Deuteronomy 6: 17, meaning murder, also said "thou shalt surely kill him" in Deuteronomy 13: 9, meaning capital punishment, a principle which extends from the Noachian code of Genesis to the apostolic conclusions in Romans 13. The common practice of applying these sayings of Christ, without qualification, to theories of non-resistance and pacificism, would make the teaching of Jesus Christ the Bill Of Rights for lawbreakers and gangsters and an aid to all trespassers and evildoers. The Sermon On The Mount is not a sanctuary for criminals.

(4) The look of lust. (5: 27-28)

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her in his heart. "

This part of the Lord's teaching is not dealing with a breach of the matrimonial law, but with the desire for criminal gratification. There is a distinction between the thought and the act. Some inquirers are always asking if the thought is as bad as the act. The answer depends on the *motive*. And some have asked if it is a sin to look. That answer is determined by the *intent*. The phrase "lust after" expresses the will and purpose, decision and intention, to act—lacking only the opportunity if the actions are not materialized or the deeds not performed. The interaction of the eye and the hand in verses 28 and 29—"if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, " and "if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off"—as instruments of the acts intended, is condemned. The emphasis is on the importance of thoughts and feelings as distinguished from their manifestation in outward acts. This was preparatory to the new covenant in

which, according to Romans 1: 9, one must serve God "with the spirit"—with the inner man—"in the gospel of his Son."

The seventh commandment, which is given in verse 27 without gloss, is the law against adultery, prohibiting union between any married man or woman other than husband or wife. Human affection is complex and the physical element cannot be excluded from the lawful desire of a man for a maid. But the word for *woman* in the phrase "looketh on a woman to lust after her" is *wife*, and in that light the sense is distinct and logical—it refers to a man lusting after the wife of another man, and it is thus related to the prohibition on the coveting of a neighbor's wife. Ethical principles are here joined with moral conduct. The reference to *looking* on the woman does not condemn appreciation or admiration for feminine beauty; the look that is condemned is when sensually employed, and the desires press with an imperious force for gratification, hence a crave for unlawful satisfaction. The intentional excitement by the use of the eye which leads to the motive of creating opportunity for the act is the reason for singling out the *looking*, but while the one thing is specified it represents all desire of sinful category common to man—that the motive and the intent, the will and the purpose, the decision and the determination to commit any act of sin, is in principle though not in effect the same. So Jesus used the rhetorical and sensitive images of "the right eye" and "the right hand" offending, or causing one to stumble and sin, exhorting one so tempted to *pluck it out* and *cut it off*, for the purpose of expressing forcibly the demand to cast away anything, however cherished, that becomes the occasion for sin. This teaching of the Lord forbids the beginning of sin with the same condemnation of its completion.

(5) The law of divorce. (5: 31-32)

"It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. "

Divorce is the legal dissolution of the marriage bond, a separation that renders null and void the marriage relation.

It was allowed in the Mosaic law because it was already existent, but the law required certain restrictions and regulations for the protection of an innocent wife and to prevent mistreatment, injustice and cruelty. Knowing what Jesus had said concerning divorce in the *Sermon On The Mount*, the Pharisees attempted to ensnare him, in Matthew 19: 1-9, by asking if it was lawful for a man to divorce his wife "for every cause, " which was an indication of their interpretation of the law. Jesus adroitly avoided the snare by pointing them to the primitive institution of marriage which decreed that "they are no more twain, but one flesh, " reminding them that "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. " The Mosaic permission of divorce for every cause was due to their hardness and must be considered as a relaxation of the primitive institution of marriage prior to the law. These words of Christ are a virtual condemnation of the gloss in respect to the marriage institution and a revocation of the permission of the law as a provisional measure, serving a temporary purpose.

The Lord's language is plain on the point that divorce-ment and remarriage, without the cause of post-nuptial infidelity, creates the state of adultery. The peculiar view of some that the exceptions of Matthew 5: 32 and 19: 9, "saving for the cause of fornication" and "except it be for fornication, " refer to incontinence before marriage as the cause for divorce and not infidelity after marriage, is an interpretation that makes this sin a greater breach of the marriage bond before it is formed than the sin of adultery itself in violation of the marriage relation, and is wholly untenable. The effort to make a distinction between fornication and adultery as it applies to *pre* and *post* marriage relation is a complete failure. The words are used interchangeably in reference to married people, and in the general sense in numerous passages, such as 1 Corinthians 5: 1 where the husband was evidently alive according to Paul's second reference to the case in 2 Corinthians 7: 12. Again, in 1 Thessalonians 4: 3-4 the apostle exhorted the members of the Thessalonian church "that ye should abstain from fornication, " and addressed the exhortation to the whole church in the words "every one of you, " thus using the term *fornication* in the general sense of adultery. The only escape from this conclusion would be to attempt to prove that there were no married people in the Thessalonian church!

In Acts 15: 19-20, the apostle James addressing the Gentiles of the church at Antioch, gave a general decree to "abstain from fornication." Other passages where the word has general application are 2 Corinthians 12: 21; Ephesians 5: 1-3; Colossians 3: 1-5; Revelation 2: 20. The language of Matthew 5: 32 and 19: 9 is obviously applicable to the married, to husbands and wives.

The civil statutes do not make a distinction between fornication and adultery on the part of married people, and the Bible uses these terms interchangeably—hence, both law and scripture recognize nuptial-fornication. The fact that in Mark 10: 10 and Luke 16: 18 the exception for divorce and remarriage is omitted only indicates that these two records deal only with the rule as the chief point in the discussion of the Lord's discourse, which is true also in the reference of Romans 7: 2, where the rule is postulated without mention of the exception. Once the exception was guaranteed by Matthew, it was sufficient, and its repeated mention was unnecessary.

The language of the Lord teaches that when a man had put away his wife without reference to post-nuptial fornication, he was guilty of ignoring the marriage bond, and made an adulteress of an innocent wife in appearance when she was not an adulteress in fact. Where the King James text reads, "causeth her to commit adultery," the American Standard text puts it, "maketh her an adulteress." She is made an adulteress, when she was not, in the sense of 2 Corinthians 5: 21 where it is said of Christ that "him who knew no sin was made to be sin." The text does not say that she *becomes* an adulteress, but that she is *made* an adulteress. In the eye of the law she is placed in a position from what she is in fact. In the view of man she differs from what she is in the sight of God. According to one she is a freed woman, but according to the other she is still a wife. The sin of adultery in this case consists in treating the original contract as null and void when it is not. No man has the right to so stigmatize an innocent partner. This behaviour is adultery in principle, and if he marries again he translates this false view of his position into action. It is on this ground that the common practice of divorce for any cause or claim, post-nuptial infidelity excepted, is condemned by the Lord.

This law of divorce declares that remarriage by either

party after unjustifiable divorce establishes a state of adultery for the one who does so. But Christ omitted legislating a disciplinary procedure, indicating that such a legalized relation becomes a principle of moral conduct between the parties involved and God, and is left to his own judicial decision, not ours. With no course of action legislated, revealed or prescribed, we cannot make one without human legislation. The course of some preachers in demanding separations and the breaking up of family relations, and the refusal to even baptize certain ones whose marriage status does not measure up to his standard of approval, is a presumptuous procedure. It reveals the tendency to displace God as the Judge of us all, and a preacher ascends to the bench. More than teaching the moral principles involved, the preacher has no course of action revealed, and to establish one would result in human legislation, more far reaching in evil consequences than the moral effects of divorce limited to the persons involved. There are some things that are not subject to the law of restitution, things done in certain circumstances which cannot in later circumstances be undone, which remain as matters between God and the individual, and therefore reserved for the judgment. It is certain, however, that if the Lord Jesus Christ had intended a course of action in these cases, he would not have left it for preachers to prescribe, but would have himself legislated it.

There are some other observations to be made on the perplexities of the marriage, divorce and remarriage questions, before leaving all of these considerations to the conclusions of those who read them, such as (1) the difference in sense and meaning of the word *moikia* as used in the New Testament, and the word *adultery* in our English language; (2) how far religious legislation in various creeds reflect the actual teaching of Christ; and, (3) considering the strictures of the *Sermon On The Mount* in the light of the parallel versions of the same subjects, occasions and circumstances by the other gospel records—the versions of Mark and Luke. These records are classified in four passages: Matthew 5: 31-32; Matthew 19: 3-9; Mark 10: 2-12; Luke 16: 18, and a parallel study of them yields some questions for thought.

First: The absence of certain aspects of marriage indi-

cates that Jesus was not dealing with the single subject of marriage, but with the general principles of moral conduct.

Second: The treatment of the permissibility of divorce, not a mere separation, but a separation so complete that the *vinculum matrimonii*, the marriage tie, or bond of union, is null and void, leaving both parties free to marry again.

Third: The strictness of the bond as its genesis—"from the beginning"—whether the bond of union in marriage was a contract so indissoluble that it could not become as though it had never been, nor the parties to it wholly absolved, except in case of conjugal infidelity, or nuptial-fornication, an exception clearly recognized by the Lord in the Sermon On The Mount, as an act automatically dissolving the nuptial bond, and which set the innocent party free.

Fourth: The word adultery in New Testament usage does not necessarily refer to the sinful physical act, it is not restricted to the one way of violating the bond. In the four passages in Matthew, Mark and Luke the term adultery is given the sense of ignoring the bond, of which a man is guilty who formally puts away his wife unjustifiably and regards himself no longer connected with her by contract—he considers himself *unhitched*. The passages in Matthew 19, Mark 10 and Luke 16 discuss hypothetically the man who manifests this view by marrying again. His sin of adultery consisted in treating the original contract as null and void when it was not. The phrase "put away" in the verses means to formally divorce, not merely to "send away, " or separate, and he thereby assumed the bond to be wholly dissolved. The guilt consisted in the formal assertion of freedom which God declared "from the beginning" to be nonexistent, a guilt that remained unaffected by any sequel, other than the exception which the Lord specified. Accordingly, by adultery Jesus meant the attempt to dissolve the indissoluble; but its current meaning is rather the act that dissolves it, and in this way the common usage falls short of the teaching of Christ.

Fifth: The scriptural permanence of wedlock, reaffirmed by Jesus, stands on the premise that the one sinful act alone can sever the bond sealed by divine sanction and hallowed by divine decree. God joins and God sunders—and "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. " If an-

other party chooses to marry one who has broken the bond, he or she takes the responsibility of union with one who is guilty of what the Lord sets forth as the one great sin, a case of guiltiness in the realm of moral conduct that stands between the individual and God.

Sixth: In the seventh chapter of first Corinthians the apostle Paul deals with some other phases of marriages and separations in extension of and in addition to the teaching of Christ in the four passages that have been considered. In verses 10 and 11 in connection with his command that the wife should not "depart from her husband" and that the husband should not "put away (divorce) his wife, " the apostle added, "yet not I, but the Lord, " which clearly means that he was restating the words of Christ on the subject, and passing on his orders, from the record of Matthew in chapters 5 and 19. He then adds, in verse 12, "to the rest speak I, not the Lord, " which just as clearly means that to others involved in different situations and phases of marriage than the ones already addressed, the apostle was speaking from his own inspiration on certain points and aspects of the conjugal relation in actual cases in the Corinthian church which were not included in the Lord's own strictures in the *Sermon On The Mount* and in the later citations. In verse 25, concerning virgins, he stated that he had "no commandment of the Lord" but gave his judgment "as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful"—which can mean nothing else and no less than the mercy of inspiration.

Here again the perversions of the so-called *New Versions* appear in changing Paul's words from *This say I* to *This is my opinion*. There is a vast difference in the two statements. Jesus declared that the Holy Spirit would reveal to the apostles certain later truths which he had not at that time taught them on the ground of prematurity. Thus when Paul said "This say I, not the Lord, " he also plainly declared that he had the Spirit of God—and his statement could mean only that the Spirit had revealed to him on this point that which the Lord himself had not personally declared, a thing not included in the teaching of Christ to the apostles while he was with them. This is precisely what Jesus himself said would be the case—so why not? To change the sentence "This say I" to "This is my opinion" is worse

than *mistranslation*, it is not akin to translation at all—it is the *interpolation* of false teaching into the text and is rank *perversion*.

What the apostle refers to as "my judgment" in this Corinthian verse compares with his reference to "my knowledge" in Ephesians 3: 4. The "knowledge" of the Ephesian reference meant inspired knowledge, and the "judgment" of the Corinthian reference also meant inspired judgment. Further proof of this fact is seen in verse 40 of the Corinthian chapter, where the apostle again used the same phrase "my judgment" and added that in the giving of this judgment he had the Spirit of God. Therefore, his teaching on all of these points were not his own human opinions, but rather inspired revelation. This comports with what Jesus himself said would be done, as recorded in John 16: 12-13: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth"—that is, the Holy Spirit would later reveal to the apostles truths that the Lord had not included in his own teaching while he was in the world. The twofold function of the Holy Spirit in the apostles was to "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you, " as mentioned in John 14: 26; and to "guide you into all truth, " as stated in John 16: 13; thus declaring in advance the *reminding* and the *revealing* offices of the Holy Spirit with the apostles. Both offices were affirmed by Paul in the Corinthian chapter, when in verse 10 he referred to what the Lord himself had commanded, and in verses 12, 25, and 40, he referred to what the Holy Spirit had further revealed to him. This is what Jesus said would be true of his apostles, and there is no reason why it should not have been true of Paul in these Corinthian instructions. Predicated on this are the several phases of his apostolic directives.

1. Verses 10 and 11, in the cases of separations where the parties were not content to remain without the marriage relation, they should not marry another, but be reconciled to each other, in the existing marriage bond.

2. Verses 12 to 14, in the case of an unbelieving husband or wife, the believer is not to depart, for the unbeliever was "sanctified" in the relation with the believer—that is, not spiritual but matrimonial sanctification, *set apart* lawfully

and in the sight of God for the conjugal state in which they dwelt, and thus their children were not "unclean" but "holy"—meaning that they were born in approved wedlock and therefore not of illegitimate birth, which would not have been true if the marriage status of the believer with the unbeliever had not received divine sanction. It is in this connection that the apostle added in verse 20, "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called, " and it should serve as a check to some marriage-counselling preachers who are so readily disposed to break up marriage relationships that are not in conformity with their own immature human opinions.

3. Verses 15-16, in the case of the abandonment of the believer by the unbeliever, whereby the believer is "not under bondage" and is therefore set free. If the bondage here does not refer to the marriage bond, then the believer would still be in the bondage of it. To advocate, as some do, that the passage means the believer is not bound to live or remain with the departing unbeliever would be a truism, for it is set forth as a case of abandonment and the abandoned one obviously *could not* abide with the one who had departed. It appears evident that when the unbeliever so departs it presupposes a state of adultery which exists in the principle previously discussed, and here the apostle's inspired teaching is again projected beyond the Lord's own strictures and declares the abandoned believer "not under bondage. " If that does not mean that the believer in these circumstances is free to marry, then it cannot mean anything, for if the one involved is not altogether free the bondage would still exist.

4. Verses 39-40, in the case of the widows exhorted to marry "only in the Lord. " In the same connection and for the same reason the apostle exhorted the virgins not to marry at all. The reason for it is elaborated in verses 26 to 31 inclusive. The destruction of Jerusalem was at hand, and they would have "trouble in the flesh, " and the apostle would "spare" them. He declared that "the time is short" and "they that have wives" would in those dire conditions "be as though they had none. " Because of "the present distress"—the impending Neroan persecutions—that virgins were exhorted not to marry. The widow not content without marriage should for her welfare marry "only in the Lord, "

for to do otherwise would involve her in hazards of the time of distress with an unbelieving husband that would jeopardize her own loyalty and faithfulness. The law of marriage was not the subject, and a violation of it was not involved. There is only one law of marriage for all society; it is not a church ordinance or sacrament, and there is not one law to govern people in general, another for virgins and another for widows. The fact that Paul states in verse 40 that "she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment" is further and final proof that his inspired advice was not based on the law of marriage itself, nor any violation of it, but for the welfare and interests of the persons involved.

The other Corinthian passage, which has so long been misapplied to the marriage of members of the church with non-members is in 2 Corinthians 6: 14-18: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. " A separation of believers from unbelievers is here directed, but where to draw the line is another question. The passage has been erroneously applied to marriage and to partnerships of any kind with unbelievers then, and therefore with non-Christians now. If this injunction has any reference at all to the marriage relation it poses a direct contradiction in the apostolic teaching to the Corinthians, for in the seventh chapter of the first epistle he instructs the believers to remain in that partnership and maintain its bond of relation. So the second epistle would contradict the first. In the first the apostle urged them not to separate, and in substance said, *be yoked*; but in the second he said, *be not yoked*.

The unbelievers in these passages comprehend the Gentile world with its heathenism, and it was a question of how far Christians could associate and mingle with them. It is true that taking the heathen world as a whole they practiced immorality as a natural and normal character of life, and it was a part of the warp and woof of idolatry. But there were many Gentiles who as persons were not involved in such corruptions, as there were also Jews that practiced these corruptions, and on the moral grounds a Christian should be yoked with neither.

So if it refers to marriage there are some members of the church that another member of the church should not marry. To say that the passage prohibits partnerships and bonds of every kind between believers and unbelievers would indeed be far-reaching in its effects and consequen-

ces. It would require a wall of separation around the church sufficient to fence the members in seclusion. But if exceptions shall be allowed, then the elimination must begin and end somewhere—so how far may believers associate with unbelievers in the affairs of life?

That the passage refers to the affiliation of Christianity with heathenism, and not to social and matrimonial partnership, is evident from a contextual study of the verses and their environment.

1. Verse 14: "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." The word unequal here means incongruous, and carries the idea of that which is heterogeneous. There are different yokes for different species of animals in the physical world, and the same is true in the spiritual realm. Heathenism is here regarded by the apostle as a yoke, and it is not of the same species as Christianity. Nothing could be more *heterogeneous* to Christianity than heathenism. The two could not be mingled. The members of the Corinthians church had come out of heathenism in obedience to the gospel which Paul had preached, but many of them entertained the notion that they could continue their participations with the idolatrous feasts of the heathen temple. To do so threatened Christianity with an amalgamation with heathenism, and would associate the church as the temple of God with the temple of idols. In thus mixing Christianity with heathenism the church would lose its unadulterated qualities. To prevent this the apostle enforced his prohibition against it by successive questions showing the essential incongruities and oppositions of the two yokes.

2. Verse 16: "What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" In these questions the heads of two kingdoms were represented—Christ and Belial. He had pointed out in verse 14 that the element of heathenism—the kingdom of Belial—was darkness; but the element of the kingdom of Christ—was light—hence, "what communion hath light with darkness?" These elements exclude each other in the spiritual realm as well as in the natural world, and for that reason there could be no communion between the church and the heathen temple in Corinth. Between Christ and Belial there could be no *concord*, no fellowship, no harmony, but absolute *discord*.

3. Verse 16: "And what agreement hath the temple of

God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. " Any concord between the church of God in Corinth and the temple of Belial would be a contradiction between the worship of God and the adoration of idols. In the history of the temple of God it had been profaned more than once by the introduction into it of the idols of Baal; and now the church in Corinth, which was the spiritual temple of God was threatened with the profanation of being brought into a collective fellowship with idol worship. Referring to the church as a body he said: "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" And in justification of his question, he added, "for ye are the temple of the living God. " The use of the word temple here denotes a *sanctuary*, and it means that the church is the sanctuary of the *living* God in contrast with the temple of *dead* idols.

4. Verse 17: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you. " The quotation is from Isaiah 42: 11, where the prophet said, "depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, " and by the double "depart" the prophet urged promptitude of Israel in separating from idolatrous practices, an appropriate parallel to the apostle's call to this Grecian church for a complete separation from heathenism.

5. Verse 18: "And I will receive you; and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. " The apostle's premise for these upbraidings and pleadings was the prohibition against idols, and he now draws the conclusion that compliance with the prohibition is a positive condition of remaining sons and daughters, and of maintaining the privileges of this status received by adoption from the Gentile world into the family, or church of God.

It should be apparent to all, who regard textual analysis as anything, that there is neither reference nor inference to the law of marriage in this whole passage. Granting that it may be altogether inexpedient in some circumstances for a member of the church to marry a non-member, the misapplication of the scriptures cannot be countenanced. It is also inexpedient in some circumstances for a member of the

church to marry another member of it, sometimes a sad mistake, but there is no law against it; and there is no law against the marriage of a member to a non-member. It is therefore a question of judgment and expediency, and where the circumstances alter the cases.

(6) Prohibited adjurations. (5: 33-37)

"Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. "

This prohibition has reference to avoiding the use of the name of Jehovah by substituting other names and things of sacred import, such as *heaven*, *earth* and *altar*. There is no reference to formal civil oaths. The legal and civil oaths that belong to courts, affidavits and warranties are not the objects of these restrictions, examples of which are found in trials of Jesus and Paul in the Roman courts. The purpose of attestation in the civil oaths must be distinguished from the invoking of sacred names in religious oaths, as a declension from the inherent character of truthfulness.

As it applies to profanity, the use of sacred words to relieve the pressures of intense feelings, are not only evidence of irreverence and disrespect for God and therefore insults to divine dignity, but also the marked characteristic of bad breeding, a self-indulgence at the expense and embarrassment of others, hence can only be classed as intolerably bad manners, aside from the religious seriousness of this type of profanity. It involves both irreverence for the holiness of God and disrespect for the sensibilities of other people. It is crude, coarse, unholy, and contemptible conduct which only a boor practices.

The command "thou shalt not forswear thyself" has a twofold significance. To forswear oneself is to swear falsely, which is to commit perjury. The scribes and Pharisees considered an oath binding or not binding, according to the sanctity of the object by which the oath was sworn. This is

indicated in the Lord's condemnation of Matthew 23: 16: "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple it is nothing: but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor!" The Lord then added in verse 17, "Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" The import of these verses is that a false oath is always false, and a profane oath is profane, whether they are made in the name of deities and sacred things or not. Hence, the command, "let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. " The Lord's teaching on this point was in refutation of the casuistry of these "blind guides" that profane swearing and perjury were excusable provided these false oaths were not made in the name of God or of anything sacred.

The condemnation of religious oaths in the Old Testament quotations refers both to the third commandment of the decalogue, "thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, " and to the Mosaic command in Leviticus 19: 12, "Ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God. " The gloss is added here, "but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths, " which was interpreted to mean that the performance of an oath was not obligatory if it was not a vow to the Lord, and if it was not taken or made in the name of God.

It is certain that the prohibited adjurations refer only to such categories and not to the legal and civil oaths, as further evidenced by the examples of Jesus before Pilate and Paul before the Roman courts. In like manner, the words of Jesus when he answered the adjurations of the high priest in Matthew 26: 63-64, and the language of Paul in Romans 1: 9, 2 Corinthians 1: 23, Galatians 1: 20, and Hebrews 6: 16-17, may all be adduced as evidence that the Lord's teaching was not intended to prohibit an appeal to God on solemn occasions.

From the legal viewpoint, in the government's consideration of citizens who hold religious scruples against sworn testimony in courts, on the use of the word "swear" as signatories of legal instruments, the law patronizingly permits the use of the term "affirm" as a substitute. This may serve to satisfy scrupulosity but it is meaningless, for to affirm under oath is swearing. A false affirmation is perjury in the same degree as if the word "swear" had been

used. There is no difference in the principle of swearing and affirming under oath. These procedures were not the objects of the Lord's prohibitions on oaths. After emphasizing that there is no difference between swearing by sacred things and swearing by God's name, the Lord adds this conclusion: Our religious nomenclature should simply be *yea* and *nay*, "for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." A simple affirmation or negation should be a sufficient guarantee of truthfulness, and one's word should be no less sacred than an oath. Anything more than that "cometh of evil"—that is, comes from the *evil one*, the devil, in whom "there is no truth," according to John 8: 44, "for he is a liar, and the father of it." By lying a man reveals his parentage and acts conformably with it.

The parallelism between these sayings of Jesus in Matthew 5: 37, and the words of James in James 5: 12 is striking, as the apostle virtually quotes the language of the Lord. "But let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation." It seems to have the meaning of: Say no more than you mean, and mean all that you say. Jesus said more than this "cometh of evil," and James said "lest ye fall into condemnation"—that is, under punishment for perjury. The fact that the Jews generally believed that oaths were not obligatory unless made as a vow to God, or in God's name, there is the strong indication that both Jesus and James were forbidding all such oaths as a false morality. It is said that some Jewish Christians believed they could exempt themselves from persecution by swearing falsely concerning the faith. Prohibiting it, James exhorted them to *yea* and *nay* truthfulness in all things, thus forbidding false swearing before the tribunals "by heaven, by earth, or by any other oath." The light and frivolous attitude toward truth and integrity is evidently condemned.

(7) Inhibitive acquiescence. (5: 38-42)

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: for whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away."

Following the summary of the set of Mosaic codes, as discussed in the previous verses, the Lord now introduces to his hearers some advance principles of individual action. This teaching does not prescribe a set of regulations for conduct; they represent principles, not rules. If one is looking for labeled directions as to fixed and definite action in every situation, he will have a vain search, for there is no specific mechanical course of action comprehended. The *Sermon On The Mount* is not a Tourist Guide—it is something better than rules, it is a point of view, a spirit to be exercised toward man and God.

The admonition to *resist not* indicates a non-resistance indeed, but what kind? And the exhortation to *turn the other cheek* is suggestive of an acquiescence—but in what? And going the *second mile* carries the idea of forbearance—but to what extent and why? What would going two miles instead of one, presumably in some sort of a transport emergency, have in common with respect to this teaching. Obviously, these are not a set of mechanical rules, but personal and ethical principles. As soon as the attempt is made to translate these ideals into prohibitions rather than inhibitions, and thus make of them all a statutory code of positive commands, the entire teaching is jettisoned. The literal application would reduce it to an absurdity and subject the prescribed conduct to ridicule. Jesus Christ himself did not literally turn the other cheek in the case recorded in John 18: 23—he replied with *words* of resistance. The apostle Paul did not literally turn the other cheek in the incidents of Acts 23: 1-5, and his *verbal* resistance was scathing. It is evident that the Lord's teaching was meant as a guide in the application of principles to avoid retaliation when under provocation, but his sayings do not teach mental inertia, and are not intended to lend aid to an aggressor, or to give protection to an offender. To so apply "the law of love" to such a concept of non-resistance would affect not only the welfare and safety of the second party or victim in the case, but the interests of a third person often involved as well. It would help the guilty and harm the innocent, and in so doing would actually violate the law of love. Forbearance is not meant to play into the hands of an evildoer.

It is an egregious error to assume that the inhibition to *resist not evil* means never to resist and never to oppose violence. Such a concept places the teaching of Jesus on the

same level with the religion of Buddhism, the founder of which, Gautama Buddha, claimed the incarnation of absolute self-abnegation; and of Confucius and Lao-tse, who with Buddha were deified in a teaching of unlimited non-resistance. These deities found a representative of their teaching in our day in a certain character named Mahatma Ghandi, but they had no representative of their system of so-called ethics in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The teaching of Christ was not consistent with their ethical theories and philosophies, nor of the modern pacifist notions of non-resistance. Jesus even approved the shepherd's fighting in protection of his sheep, even by giving his life in so doing. Shall it be said that resistance to a gang of sheep rustlers in protecting a flock of sheep is right, but the same resistance in the more or less protection of innocent people is wrong? This would find a parallel in the Lord's question to the Pharisees, in Matthew 12: 10-12, in reference to the relative importance of the fourth commandment and the life of a sheep, and the life of a sheep and the life of a man: "How much then is a man better than a sheep?" The same principle may with certainty be applied to the erroneous theory of unqualified and unlimited non-resistance.

The hypothetical inhibition on expedient agreement with an adversary required that the adversary was right, and the case was against the accused, and that he should therefore make immediate adjustment, without a continued delay which would add further cause to his legal recourse. The reference to the adversary delivering the accused to the judge, and then to the council, and finally to prison, shows clearly that the wrong-doer was the one here admonished to agree with the adversary, who was in the right, and the resistance here was a case of the one that was in the wrong resisting the one that was in the right. It cannot be used as a proof-text for the non-resistance theory, for it proves too much.

Furthermore, the non-resistance advocates do not apply the same reasoning to verse 42 of the same context: "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." The literalists do not follow this demand, and here their whole theory breaks down—they must take it all or none, and the literal insistence on verses 39 to 41 in reference to resistance of evil, the coat and the cloak, turning the other cheek and the second mile, makes

necessary also the literal application of the behest to lend to every one that asks and turn no borrower away. Thus the ends required to uphold the conscientious objector's non-resistance viewpoint not only is a *reductio ad absurdum*—reducing the contention to an absurdity—but it makes compliance with it impossible also.

There has been a fanatical clamor on the part of extremists for the exact word-for-word rule of action on personal conduct in regard to bodily appetites, recreation, comfort and luxury, pleasure and sportsmanship, matrimony and celibacy, law enforcement and war, civil and military government, stocks and bonds, insurance and banking, competition and gambling, and all kinds of getting and holding—a category of things for which there can be no mechanical rules, no exact statements, and no precise directions. These are questions that belong to a realm of things in which the disciple, or Christian, must be trusted to guide himself by the inhibitive principles set forth in the *Sermon On The Mount*. These sayings are educative in character and represent problems that are in the highest sense of that classification, which must be decided individually and not as a church regulation, nor subjected to the personal regimentation of other people's conduct by over-pious and imperious preachers.

Passing from the idealism of the passages a sort of brief analytical commentary on a few pronouncements in the paragraph of inhibitions, which are somewhat representative of them all, will complement this division of the study.

1. "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," in verse 38, is a reference to the legal retaliation which was to be administered by a court of justice under the law, which had no personal application with reference to its administration. There was no spirit of animosity, or motive for revenge, in the official of the court or of the judge carrying out the procedures of the law. Since this saying belonged to the legal procedures, it would involve the question of how far an injured party may seek justice, and to what extent would one be required by the principles in this teaching to bear injury and injustice. The Lord did not set up a board of arbitration to decide, nor bring it within the jurisprudence of the elders of the church to settle, so again it is a matter trusted to the

heart of each Christian for his own self-government. The teaching of the Lord on this point is not directed against the eye and tooth law itself, but against the extension of it into the realm of personal revenge and retaliation. The law itself could become an instrument for revenge in some matters in which they should rather submit to wrong. The teaching of Paul in Romans 12 compares in its principles with this part of the Lord's teaching.

2. "And if a man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also, " in verse 40, is considered to be a reference to an outer garment which could not be retained in a pledge, or a lien as mortgaged property, and which therefore could not be legally taken from the owner. It is in accord with the principle afterward stated by Paul in Romans 12, "if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. " These precepts call for a magnanimity on occasions and circumstances to give up that which even by the law itself cannot be taken. This cannot be construed as a mandate, but as a course of conduct based on principles.

3. "Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain, " in verse 41, implies a legal requisition, based on compulsory services in carrying dispatches or rendering services of transportation. It refers, of course, to some character of a forced service, an unjust demand or unlawful commandeering of one's service. This may have been applied to the compulsory governmental services which were so repugnant to the Jews who considered themselves vassals in a foreign government, a government alien to their own. The teaching therefore applies to their conduct as disciples of Christ, not to resent such requisitions of services but to even go farther than the demand on any occasion which required the exemplification of their discipleship. It is in extension of this teaching that the apostle Peter exhorts in chapter 2, verse 13, of his first epistle: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. "

This exhortation has twofold significance; first, as a

requirement of submission to civil government and the due observance of all the duties of good citizens; second, the application of the principle of conduct that would affect the Gentile observers in their judgment of Christianity and appraisal of the character of Christians. The expression "for the Lord's sake" indicates that going more than the mile, or a second mile, in submission to any legitimate authority was an effectual means of advancing his cause and kingdom in a hostile world. And the following expression, "for so is the will of God," accentuates the ameliorating effect of this spirit of submission on the part of Christians, to do even more than was actually required, and its effect in counteracting the many false reports which were disseminated against Christians by their calumniators. They were free from the legalisms of the law, but should not allow such freedom to be perverted by the Judaizers into exemption from all human law, nor turn their freedom into the libertinism of the Gentiles. In the true meaning of freedom to prohibit or restrain the attitude of active resistance by the disciples of the Lord toward an enemy of God—one who defies God—would ignore all of the dictates of duty. The too general application also to any and all enemies of the state, of the nation, of the church and of the truth, is wrong. There could be no rightful opposition to fighting against and seeking the defeat and destruction of any foe of the church—an arch-enemy of the truth—and to leave such unopposed is contrary to the love of God. Any doctrine of unlimited non-resistance destroys fidelity to the truth, faithfulness to the church, and loyalty to God.

The Lord Jesus Christ himself announced the immediate defeat and downfall of Satan in Luke 10: 18-20: "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven"—the prediction of Satan's complete downfall from his own exalted place of power and dominion, referred to as heaven in the sense of Satan's own abode, not God's heaven, but Satan's own dominion. Jesus Christ opposed him, defeated him, and dethroned him. Verse 19 says, "Behold, I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy." These vipers were a figurative representation of evil men; and "over all the power of the enemy," meant the victory of the apostles over all the evil forces of men in opposition to the church. There could be no better symbol of evil men as enemies of Christ and his apostles

than the scorpion with a bladder and tail full of dangerous poison. In the scriptures scorpions are used in a figurative sense for wicked and malicious men who, scorpion-like, wound, torment and kill good men, as indicated in Ezekiel 2: 6, Revelation 9: 3 and in Luke 10: 19.

The command to "love your enemies" cannot be construed to teach a non-resistance that will leave all enemies of truth and right unopposed. The statement of verse 46, "if you love them which love you, what reward have ye?" indicates that there is a scale or degree of love, and a certain kind of love, designated for an enemy which is not the same emotion felt for friends and kindred, or conjugal, paternal and filial affections.

Then what does "love thine enemy" mean? Love for enemies may well take the form of compassion and pity that acts kindly toward them, an example of which is seen in the feeling of Jesus toward Pilate and Judas and for the ones who crucified him. When we know that men are in utter alienation and drifting toward the grave, regard could follow the spirit of the injunction, "whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." There is a close correspondence between these precepts of Christ and in the later apostolic teaching on these same points, as of Paul in Romans 12 and 13, and of Peter in the second chapter of his first epistle. In these all, the obligations of Christians in social and civil society have indeed a strong emphasis.

(8) The paradoxical love for enemies. (5: 43-48).

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

There are three precepts in the context of these six verses. First, love for enemies; second, prayer for enemies;

third, to be perfect as the Father is perfect. The word *love* describes an emotion of our being under the control of the will. It directs a course of conduct above all the natural faculties of speech, actions and feelings. As used here it has no reference to feeling less emotion of love or affection for an enemy than for a friend, but rather with all existing hostilities and malignities, they have a claim on our pity.

Added to the instruction to "love your enemies" is the further charge to "pray for them" and "do good to them." The praying and the doing are joined, the latter as a help to the former, or *vice versa*—it requires both, the one to complement the other. The promise attached is, "that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven"—that is, that in so doing a moral and spiritual likeness of God is assimilated in this attitude toward sinners.

The consummate command, the ultimate in all of these sayings, from the first beatitude to the last precept, is verse 48: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." This saying of Christ does not teach the Pelagian doctrine of the perfectibility of man in this life. It rather counsels the children of God to maturity in conduct, to act as full grown sons of God, the Father. It is not an unconditional requirement for unimpeachable rectitude in a life without flaw or failure, but an encouragement to maturity through stages of growth.

The old dispensation had been the tutor to bring the world to Christ, the Great Teacher, as illustrated by Paul in Galatians 3: 24, and in the first verses of chapter 4, the illustration is extended in referring to those in that dispensation, under the law, as minors in comparison with the new dispensation and those who live under the blessings of the gospel as heirs. The law was thus compared to elementary lessons in the expression of verse 8, "the elements of the world." In Hebrews 6: 1, referring to the same thing, the apostle called these elements "the principles," or *first principles*, of the doctrine of Christ, which he proceeded there to describe as the ordinances of the Jewish system, and exhorted the Hebrews to "go on unto perfection"—that is, the perfection of the new covenant. They were admonished not to return to the elementary or first principles in the old Mosaic covenant, such as, "repentance from dead works"—the sacrifices of the law; and "of faith toward

God"—because Christ had not come; and "of the doctrine of baptisms"—the divers washings of the ceremonial law; and "of laying on of hands"—pertaining to the priestly and prophetic functions of the old system; and "of resurrection of the dead"—that is, reviving the dead ordinances of the Mosaic law; and "of eternal judgment"—because there was no remission of sins under the law, the judgment never being lifted remained to the end of the dispensation, pending the opening of the new dispensation and the perfection of the new covenant.

Under Moses they had been in the state of childhood, but had now reached maturity in Christ, and the apostle is counselling them not to return to "the weak and beggarly elements" of Judaism—leaving these elementary principles, says the apostle, "let us go unto perfection" in the new covenant. In chapter 11: 39 the apostle declares that under the old dispensation that "these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect"—the meaning of which is that the old covenant apart from the new covenant could not bring those who lived under it into perfection. But in the new covenant "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," according to the sublime declaration of chapter 10: 14, and which reaches the ultimate in inspired description in chapter 12: 22-23, with the imagery of "the spirits of just men made perfect," in the new testament church composed of his firstborn ones. It was in the maturity of this new covenant that the disciples were to assimilate the perfection of the Father—and once more the sayings of Christ have presaged Pentecost.

VI. EXHIBITIONS OF SYMPTOMATIC HYPOCRISY- MATTHEW 6: 1-34

"Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. 2 Therefore when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. 3 But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: 4 That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall

reward thee openly. 5 And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. 6 But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. 7 But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. 8 Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. 9 After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. 10 Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven. 11 Give us this day our daily bread. 12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. 13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. 14 For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: 15 But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses. 16 Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. 17 But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; 18 That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. 19 Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: 20 But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: 21 For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. 22 The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. 23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness! 24 No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. 25 Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life,

what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? 26 Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? 27 Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? 28 And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: 29 And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. 30 Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? 31 Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? 32 (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. 33 But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. 34 Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof. "

The continuation of the Lord's discourse in the sixth chapter deals with the apparent symptoms of hypocrisy.

(1) The outward performance of piety. (6: 1-8)

"Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore when thou doest *thine* alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly. And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall re-

ward thee openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen *do*: for they think *that they shall be* heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. "

The Pharisees were exhibitionists, and in this chapter Jesus rebukes the panegyrics of ostensible virtues, their practices in putting prayer and piety on parade.

1. "Do not your alms before men, to be seen of them. " The doing of alms, or of anything else, with the motive for applause destroys its character. It is the ostentatious philanthropy "to be seen of men" that is condemned. There is an extent to which good deeds must be performed with a degree of publicity, for non-publicity is not always possible or even expedient. There are examples of this fact in both the old and the new testaments in connection with charity and liberality. The text does not prohibit the doing of alms before men, but "to be seen of them"—it deals with the *motive*. The examples of this ostentation were focused on three practices of the Pharisees: almsgiving, praying and fasting. The hypocrisy of performing outward acts of piety for the publicity and applause differs in principle from receiving praise as a stimuli, mentioned by the apostle in Romans 13: 3: "Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. " There is a place in mature life for an approval and commendation for deeds well done, and the praise of God is the end, or purpose, of actions, if they are performed in conformity to his will, without bargaining for applause. It is not the rendering of public service or the performance of public duties that are here proscribed. The point of criticism is ostentation, and the picture of the Pharisees at prayer on the street corners and their almsgiving in all public places exposes the depth of deceit into which human beings can fall.

But the entire concealment of philanthropy is not the application. The teaching must be blended into the value of good example, which in other passages is made an obligation. The admonition "let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth" has its application to a self-consciousness of deeds, and a self-congratulation, which may exist anonymously, but the Father who "seeth in secret" also recompenses accordingly. The parallel apostolic injunction

of Romans 12 says, "he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity"—with pure content, purpose and aim.

It was this "righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees" to which Jesus referred in chapter 5: 20, their system of self-justification through their own appointed performances and ceremonies. The righteousness which exceeds it is not doing more of the same thing, but the justification that comes through the acceptance of the gospel and compliance with its commands in the simplicity of obedience—and it is this righteousness which is the passport into "the kingdom of Christ and God. "

2. "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites. " These hypocrites were actors in crowded places, putting piety on parade and praying for publicity. When one prays "not as the hypocrites" he is conscious of relation to God, Author and Creator, and the unseen Father. The praying of the hypocrites was performed under conditions which made prayer impossible, yet they persuaded themselves into believing that they gained reward from God. The Lord said: "Verily I say unto you, They have their reward"—but it came not from God; it was the reward of public applause and vanity.

Another mark of their hypocrisy was in "vain repetitions. " The prayer of true believers is not a mere set of words. All of the ceremonial forms and stereo-formalities of ritualism and liturgy are travesties on prayer and the worship of God. This is in principle what the apostle Paul condemned in 2 Timothy 3: 5, "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. " It is a mere sound of words, consisting in mechanical verbosity, giving no mind to signification, expressed in the Anglicized Greek word *battalogy*, which carries the idea of liturgical forms, meters of poetry, and mere rhetorical oratory. This misuse of prayer is the extremity in full depravity of the hypocritical spirit.

This malpractice of hypocrisy does not discountenance public worship. There are some demands of worship which cannot be fulfilled in secrecy or solitude, certain emotions to be exercised jointly and in cooperation, such as praise and song. The element of spiritual solidarity in union, and the oneness of unity, are fostered by the gathering of worshippers in a well-ordered public service. This is why

the assembly is commanded for the first day of the week, and why the words "gathered," and "together," and "one another," and "come together," and "congregation," and "assembly," and "church," are all so often used in reference to the worship and service of God in the New Testament. Unison in song and in prayer genders unity in the soul, and praise in concert is conducive to oneness in conduct.

The Lord's formula for prayer, "after this manner pray ye," was not intended to become a *paternoster*. All of the liturgical formalities have an effect of fettering the spirit. Genuine prayer has to do with words and principles of its own, with definite requests and direct petitions, differing altogether from the vague inarticulate communings and mutterings of set forms. The principles of prayer consist in the recognition of God's inherent glory and man's fundamental needs; the kingdom of God and subservience to his will on the earth; the necessity of temporal providence and divine forgiveness; and all of it to the ultimate realization of his eternal kingdom, power and glory. These were the principles of the pattern prayer in the heart of the *Sermon On The Mount*.

The ostentations of the Pharisees were a prostitution of these principles of prayer. Both prayer and alms are acts of service to God in a relation with God not to be exposed to the gaze of a profane public further than necessity. The general idea of publicity in these acts on the part of the Pharisees was: "Take notice of my spiritual status—See how exact I am in these duties—Watch my contributions to the poor." The circumference of all of their vain worship was in being and doing good for the sake of men's approval. In these things many professed religionists are guilty of sinful traits from which even the criminal characters of society are free. The approval of men is a wrong motive in anyone who is trying to do right, and the wrong practices of certain generally recognized virtues are a symbol of character that is rotten at the core.

(2) The pattern for prayer. (6: 9-13)

"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but

deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and glory, for ever. " Amen.

There is a parallelism between the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer which has apparently been overlooked. It has been previously pointed out that the previews of the gospel in the Beatitudes are imbedded in its eight doctrinal statements, all of which pointed to Pentecost. The same is true of this pattern for prayer, known to Protestants as the *Lord's Prayer*, and to the Roman Catholics as the *Pater-noster*. As the Beatitudes form the axis of the fifth chapter, the Petition is the pivot upon which the sixth chapter turns. In the anticipation of the establishment of the kingdom, it is as much a preview of the gospel as the Beatitudes, and presages the approaching events of Pentecost to the same extent. Its elements yield to analysis easily and in the following order:

One: Our Father—the disciples in the new kingdom would be the *children* of God by spiritual relation instead of mere natural offspring as of the Gentiles, and of fleshly descent, as of the Jews.

Two: Hallowed be thy name—the disciples in the new relation would be *worshippers* of God in a sense never before existing, "in spirit and in truth, " instead of in tabernacles, temples and altars.

Three: Thy kingdom come— the disciples in the new dispensation would be *subjects* of a kingdom not of the world, not from hence; a kingdom in the world, but not of the world, a kingdom that *is here*, but not *from here*, a reign of heaven in the hearts of men.

Four: Thy will be done—the disciples as citizens of the new kingdom would also be *servants*. So the great apostle declared himself to be in Romans 1: 1, "a servant of Jesus Christ. "

Five: Give us our daily bread—the disciples in the new world would be *beggars*, dependent upon supplication to God for all providence, natural or spiritual, general or special.

Six: Forgive us our debts—the disciples in the new covenant would be *sinner*s, with a debt of sin which cannot be paid, and must therefore be forgiven, a continuous re-

mission of sins necessary to the human imperfections of us all.

Seven: Lead us not into temptation—the disciples in the new age would be his *followers*, and in following him they would be led away from the exposures of temptation, not brought into its snares by their own wrong steps and mistakes.

Eight: Deliver us from evil—the disciples in the new generation would be *saints*, set apart and sanctified by a regeneration, distinguished by a new birth, a sanctification that comes by obedience to the gospel.

The parallel reaches even to the conclusions of both the beatitudes and the prayer, in that the reason for all the statements of both was the establishment of this kingdom of heaven. "For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory"—the disciples in the new order would be *servants*, vassals of the King, ascribing to him all homage and fealty, and ever in awe before his power and glory.

The glory of God holds the priority and precedence over all things else, and the ultimate good of man, his creature is the ultimate object of his gracious providence. Divine glory and power are enhanced in the phrases "hallowed be thy name"—"thy kingdom come"—and "thy will be done. " Human reliance on divine power is phrased in the words of dependence, "give, " "forgive" and "lead. " And the prayer ends in the recognition and acknowledgement of the supreme power of God in the announcement and subsequent establishment of the kingdom appointed to his Son, in which his will is done on earth as in heaven.

(3) The observance of external traditions. (6: 16-18)

"Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly. "

This third division of the "righteousness, " or self-justification of the Pharisees by their own works, is the traditional institution of fasting. It was not here enjoined at all

as a duty, rather, the Lord simply takes illustrative instances from Jewish life and custom to exemplify his warnings against their hypocritical display of piety in public places. The custom of fasting was not actually a part of the Mosaic code. It had comparatively scarce mention in the ceremonial observances of the Old Testament and had no doctrinal indorsement in the New. As a custom it had been gradually fastened on Jewish society by the traditions of the elders and has more frequent mention and far more emphasis in the Talmud than anywhere else. In loosening the yoke of tradition, Jesus did not renew these requirements. When asked by the disciples of John, in Luke 5: 33-39, why he and his disciples did not fast, after suggesting the appropriate times and places for the observance of the custom, Jesus then replied that he had not come to put a new patch on the old garment of Judaism, nor new wine in the old Mosaic container. The gospel would be whole new cloth, and the new covenant would be all new. But in the matter of mere customs, he continued by saying, "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better." Thus in the observances of customs that did not contradict or prevent any command or duty of the gospel, there was a gradualism in leaving the Jewish customs until they were finally abandoned.

The duty of observing the custom of fasting was not the object of these verses, as is also true of the mention of other establish Jewish customs; but the teaching of Christ was not iconoclastic, and it left all such customs and practices to the dissolving influences of time, loosing these bonds and freeing the people from their observance of them either by his own laxity toward them or silence with reference to the practice of them.

The custom of fasting in the history of some people in past ages was exercised in times of mourning and sorrow and calamity, but these exhibitions are no more in vogue. Its religious significance among the Catholics and the Protestants who feign to observe it is meaningless by reason of the sheer mockery attending it. Jesus taught plainly that the custom should not be forced or fastened on any one. It belongs to neither moral nor positive law, and has no place in the gospel of Christ, nor portion in the system of Christianity.

The Lord's attitude toward fasting was the same as it

was toward all other *externalisms* of the Pharisees and all the Jews, and his very attitude is the evidence that he did not enjoin it. The stress of his teaching was put on the fatal effect of ostentation and the wrong way of performing their own common practices. On the particular matter of customs, this party of strict religionists, the Pharisees, had from time to time added to the Mosaic requirements, and this was true of their embellishments in regard to fasting. The teaching of Jesus applied not to the practice of the custom, but to the wrongness of the Pharisees in the effort to enforce a habit of their own more odious to others actually than the publicity of their prayers and alms.

After all is said, the fact remains that the Lord did not appoint fasting as an ordinance of the new religion that he inaugurated, and with his disciples he abstained from its observance under the old religion. This precept and example is a declaration of independence from ritualism, a proclamation of freedom from formalism, deliverance from traditionalism, and emancipation from sacerdotalism.

(4) The allurements of temporary treasures. (6: 19-21)

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. "

This precept is not a prohibition against provision for temporal security. Such an injunction would contradict the apostolic reference to the parental obligation of 2 Cor. 12: 14: "For the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. " The oriental form of speech that denied the lesser in order to emphasize the greater is often employed in the New Testament. An example of it is evident in a similar statement by the Lord in John 6: 27: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life. " The Lord did not forbid working for a living, for his apostle said in 2 Thessalonians 3: 10, "This we command you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. " In a negative form of speech the lesser was denied that the greater might be more emphatically affirmed.

The whole tenor of the teaching of Jesus on the earth, and of his apostles after his ascension, was to lure the heart away from the worldly wealth and treasure, to center it on the heavenly possession of the eternal residence. He said to his disciples in John 14: "In my Father's house are many mansions... I go to prepare a place for you. " Forty years later, in his first epistle, the apostle Peter wrote it down, in chapter 1: 4, that such a place is "reserved" in heaven for us—and as Peter was present when the Lord made the statement, and heard it, this would seem to be an inspired comment on its meaning. Paul exhorted the Colossians, in chapter 3: 2, to "set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth"; and to the Philippians, chapter 3: 20, he proudly said that "our conversation (citizenship) is in heaven. "

It is thus that the Lord's teaching in the *Sermon On The Mount* against the allurements of temporary treasures was in purpose to minimize the earthbound ambitions and to magnify the heavenly inheritance. Notwithstanding there is a millennial theology which teaches, despite all these monitions, that when the redeemed saints have departed this life and left this world, after entering the other world they will be turned around and sent back to this mundane sphere to dwell on the earth again for a thousand years! Such a theology is rank materialism, inconsistent with and contradictory to the Lord's teaching in the *Sermon On The Mount* and of the apostolic teaching in the inspired epistles.

(5) The lamp of the body. (6: 22-24)

"The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness! No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. "

The eye is the organ of light, and without it the physical body would dwell in darkness. When the eye is single, the vision is pure and the eye sees straight. Single vision is the opposite of double vision, which blurs the eye and

darkens the body. Figuratively, it is the organ of the mind that apprehends God, and understands the truth. Reference is made to it by the apostle Paul in Ephesians 1: 18, "Having the eyes of your heart enlightened," and the opposite application is made by the apostle James in James 1: 8, "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." The mind that understands gives light to the soul through spiritual perception, and the eye of the heart is single. But the "evil eye" is the imperfect vision, the mind lacking in knowledge, and the application depicts a darkening within which brought forth the Lord's exclamation, "how great is that darkness!"

The illustration of the single eye belongs to verse 24 on serving two masters—"no man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." A singleness of service is required, and the servant of God must have an "eye single" to his service. It corrects the attitude toward the world. The word *mammon* is a Chaldaic-Syrian word denoting *wealth*, and it stands for *worldliness*. The eye single to the service of God as the Master, is to possess aims, motives and ideas of life independent of the ordinary conduct of men in the world, the purposes of which are drawn from another sphere than the world. The evil eye is employed on wrong things, it is the wrong use of the faculty, and is descriptive of the "double minded man, unstable in all his ways"—his vision is blurred, and darkness envelops his way. He is the *worldly* man. But when this spiritual organ turns away from mammon to God, the result is spiritual light for the soul, and he is the *unworldly* man. The organ of the evil eye may be in full vigor, but employed on the wrong things—it is an attitude toward the world. The single eye views the world in the right perspective and is employed on right things. Here are two views—what is designated the scientific view and what is denominated the religious view, and they are both illusory. The former considers knowledge as the single object of man's pursuit, the latter minimizes that as being little in comparison with relationship to God which should be singly pursued. The divergence of views is due to the difference in application. They are not incompatible. All service, no matter in what realm, is due to One—the objective is One—to divide it and attempt to make it

serve two masters, results in bringing: the servant into the slavery of the *wrong one*.

In the saying, "no man can serve two masters" there is an illustration of an application which does not at once catch the eye. An old age of the world was ending, and a new age was beginning; an old dispensation was closing, a new dispensation was opening; an old covenant was being abrogated, a new covenant was being inaugurated; an old law was being annulled, a new law was being enacted. The world could not be under both; the disciples could not be the servants of both. The old law itself had served as a schoolmaster to bring the world to the new—and in this Pentecost was again looming brightly before them, an old service to be broken and terminated, a new service to be originated and initiated.

(6) Pecuniary anxiety and doubtful forebodings. (6: 25-32)

"Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Sol'o-mon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gen'tiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. "

These exhortations on material anxiety refer back to verses 19 to 21 concerning the laying up of treasure upon earth.

1. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures"—but wherein is the evil of so doing? Parents are admonished to lay up

possessions for their children, and from every direction comes the clarion call to look ahead and make provisions for the future. The reason is here given: the forces of dissolution make the laying up of treasures upon earth useless. But this could be true only in extent, whatever may be more than needed in life before the time of dissolution comes. So we look to another phrase in the text for the qualification—"lay not up for yourselves"—*for yourselves*, that is, do not hoard. The language "where moth and rust doth corrupt" indicates non-use, a miserly or selfish storing, with no worthy or useful object other than personal satisfaction—the acquisition of property and wealth for its own sake. The passage carries no condemnation of ownership, and has in it no encouragement for indigence. Construed as a prohibition against provision would place the command of Christ in direct contradiction of the teaching of Paul, who said in 1 Timothy 5: 8 that "if any provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." To interpret these words of the Lord as strictures against provision would not only run counter to the teaching of Paul, but it would in effect reverse the Lord's warnings on anxiety, for the depressing prospects of poverty form a greater danger to the attitudes the Lord encourages than any intrinsic evil of earthly treasures. The subject of his pecuniary warning—*anxiety*—does not grow in the sphere of affluence, but in the surroundings of impecunious conditions.

The application of this passage to imprudence in business management is a gross misinterpretation. It runs counter to the parable of the talents of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, and arrays the Lord against himself. And applied to business adventures such as investments in stocks and bonds and insurance on the usual objection of these enterprises being forms of gambling is another miss in logic and interpretation. The benefits of the things named actually allay the very anxiety that gambling genders and that the gambler causes.

On the face of it, the statement, "lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," is the most Platonic of all the sayings of Christ. The Greek philosopher (Plato) emphasized

the contemplation of things permanent rather than transient. An oriental form of expression was customarily used to deny the lesser in order to affirm with more emphasis the greater. In John 6: 29 Jesus said, "labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life. " No one with any ability to understand would interpret this language as a command not to work for food and sustenance, yet the structure of the sentences are identical—"lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth... but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven. " In both passages the customary oriental form of speech is employed which denied the lesser in order to affirm with more emphasis the greater. The words of Christ are an appeal for unworldliness as an end, teaching that even the possession and employments of wealth should have an eternal aim—treasures in heaven.

2. "Take no thought for your life"—but does the doing of this prohibit forethought? The prudence of previous thinking is not a cause of anxiety, but rather the prevention of it. The statement is not prohibitive of *forethought* but of *foreboding*. The phrase "take no thought" denotes more than "be not anxious"—it is in the Greek, *melancholy*, and refers to a state of despondence, which reflects on the providence of God. It describes a temper of mind which does not involve the idea of either prudence or imprudence but an attitude toward the providence of God in the world. The reference is to a temper of mind and not to a policy in business. It exhorts the disciples to that which would pacify their minds in the midst of a world of uncertainties, and any forebodings that would divert this singleness of mind is the forbidden anxiety. The question, Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? is viewed in proportion to values and relative importance, and is resolved in the answer that God, who by creation is the Author of the greater gifts of the life and the body, will not fail through the laws of nature to provide for the lesser also, the food and the raiment.

3. "Behold the fowls of the air" and "the lilies of the field"—the birds neither sow nor reap, but *gather*; and the lilies neither toil nor spin, but *grow*. These are not examples of heedless indigence, but rather an illustration of an end that is served and a purpose that is fulfilled

in the natural providence of God. The birds of the air are in ceaseless quest for food, and the nesting season provides an example of strenuous but happy activity, as in fulfillment of their mission they fill the air with song, a fitting illustration and type of happiness in the sphere of life. The lovely lilies of the field, notwithstanding their ephemeral existence, are possessed of pleasing beauty and have an aesthetic mission to fulfill. The end calls for the means, and God does not allow the purpose of their existence to fail for the lack of sustenance. "Are ye not much better (of more value) than they?"

If God makes it possible for all living things to fulfill natural functions, then what about mankind? The Creator provides the means to the end, and he will not leave the ends of our mundane existence to spoliation and failure by the lack of necessary provision. The birds of the heaven and the lilies of the field exemplify this fact of providence. "Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" God *so* clothes the grass with provender and nourishment for the birds and the lilies, and they are sustained by it. The birds, which exhibit wonder of motion and happy activity in sweet sounds, must be fed—God provides the means. The lilies, which are arrayed in aesthetic loveliness for flowers of fragrance, must be ornamented—God provides the adornment. If God *so clothes the grass* by making it the means of fulfilling these natural designs in these spheres of existence, shall he withhold from us the means necessary to fulfill the purposes of a higher existence? By the interrogatory reproof of verse 30, "O ye of little faith, " the Lord reproves his disciples not for absence of faith or belief in God, nor was he chiding them for not trusting in a bestowal of a special divine providence upon them apart from the world in general. He has previously declared that God "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust, " without discrimination in the dispensation of natural providence. It is not by special providence that God feeds the fowls of the air and arrays the lilies of the field, but by the general providence of natural law, for all of the laws of nature are the laws of God. The upbraiding was for the lack of faith in the

divine means for accomplishing the purposes of God in every sphere of life and existence.

4. "Therefore take no thought, saying... Wherewithal shall we be clothed?" The term "wherewithal" means that with which anything can be purchased, obtained or done. The question of this verse reverts to the answers given to the preceding questions i. e. that God provides the means to the end in every sphere of life—then why all of these forebodings for the future. The derivation of anxiety has been defined as something that detracts or divides. This definition finds application in these verses to the anxiety that divides the doubter in providence as the means to the end from God, its Author. Such doubt would destroy singleness of mind and aim, as the lamp of the body, and would cause the disciple of the Lord to grope in the darkness of the Gentile world, as stated parenthetically in verse 32, "(for after all these things do the Gentiles seek)"—that is, the Gentiles were seeking the answers to all of these things without the knowledge of God or the revelation of his will in both the natural and spiritual worlds. The Gentiles were engrossed in mundane matters, seeking solutions without the aid of revelation, and without revealed religion to guide them, the apostle said in Romans 1: 21-22, they were vain in their reasonings, their understanding was darkened, and in their professions of wisdom they became steeped in the follies of heathenism, which the apostle declared was not man's primeval religion, but the consequence of his self-conceit in a gradual departure from divine revelation. This "wherewithal" of the disciples amounted to doubting God, the first step toward a plunge into all of the uncertainties of heathen scepticism. For the disciples to manifest that kind of misgiving concerning the overall providence of God would be a reflection of Gentile influence in disregard for the teaching of their Master in the examples which he had cited, a lack of faith which would disqualify them for their mission as members of the new kingdom, upon the threshold of which they stood.

(7) The quest of superlative importance. (6: 33-34)

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall

take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. "

The teaching of Christ in the *Sermon On The Mount* now comes to a focus in these verses. By his own announcement the kingdom which he came into the world to establish was at hand. The evangelist Mark records this saying of Christ in chapter 1, verses 14 and 15: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand. " All of his sayings—from the banks of the Jordan where he was baptized, to the hill of Calvary where he died—pointed to the kingdom and to Pentecost. His sayings were previews of the kingdom, and all of his teaching had bearing on its establishment and was related to its principles. In these verses of the *Sermon On The Mount* the Master's sayings reach the focal point.

1. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness. " The conjunction "but" in this place joins coordinate phrases in the context and connects with the parenthetical statement in the preceding verse, "for after all these things do the Gentiles seek. " The heathen Gentiles were seeking things of the mundane sphere in the natural world. It was concerning these things that Jesus had ordered his disciples to banish their forebodings. Now, in contrast with the things of the natural world he bids them give the place of prime importance to the principles of the kingdom he had announced and was ready to establish. Here is Pentecost again, "the kingdom of God and his righteousness. "

2. "His righteousness"—the gospel plan for justification of sinners through pardon, which exceeds in kind the asserted righteousness of Pharisaical self-justification—that system of gospel righteousness of which all of the Jews were ignorant, and to which they refused submission, according to the statements of Paul in Romans 10: 3. There were no mundane questions of the Gentiles nor objects of forebodings among the disciples which could counter-balance this superlative quest. This kingdom was nigh and they must prepare to make it their prime cause, never subordinating it to secondary place or pursuit.

3. "And all these things shall be added"—the an-

nounced kingdom was looming before them, and as God provides the means in the natural world necessary to accomplish his purposes; so in the kingdom every secondary thing would be added as the means to the end in the fulfillment of his purpose and plan, and for service in his kingdom.

4. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." The "morrow" held within it many things. There were times of trouble, but its anxieties were postponed. The "evil" of the day does not refer to moral evil, but to a day of vexation **and** distress. The whole phrase, "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" evidently has connection with the eighth beatitude of chapter 5, "blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"—"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." The evil of the day in chapter 6: 34 is that day of distress in the persecution of the church, but they should "take no thought for the morrow" in that forebodings of these future experiences should not be harbored: "for the morrow shall take thought of itself" in the course of events.

It is possible, and not at all improbable, that in the statement "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" there is a veiled reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the Jewish state, and the tribulation that came upon the whole Jewish world; and these predictions would be accompanied by awful anxieties and fearful forebodings, as depicted by the Lord in other sections of his teaching, such as Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21—but in other mention of these distresses the Lord said to his disciples, "in your patience possess ye your souls," and "look up, and lift up your heads," so here he admonishes "be not anxious." It is the continued assurance that the providence of God will operate in all events for the fulfillment of the divine purpose in all things.

The disciples were thus instructed not to project themselves beyond each day's duties and problems, in an anxiety of thought which would become the soil for seeds of doubt to grow, but to keep in proper focus the emergence of the new kingdom, the principles of which he was imbedding in their beings.

VII. PREMONITORY INSTRUCTIONS-
MATTHEW 7: 1-29

"Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. 3 And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? 4 Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye? 5 Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. 6 Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you. 7 Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: 8 For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. 9 Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? 10 Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? 11 If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him? 12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets. 13 Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: 14 Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. 15 Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. 16 Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? 17 Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. 18 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. 19 Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. 20 Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. 21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. 22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord,

Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? 23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. 24 Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: 25 And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. 26 And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: 27 And the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. 28 And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: 29 For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes. "

The seemingly abrupt break in the train of thought, or disconnection in the substance of the text, with the beginning of the seventh chapter, has been the basis for some critics to conclude that this part of the Lord's teaching does not belong to the body of the *Sermon On The Mount*, but to another discourse on some other occasion. But to the contrary, there is a remarkable connection with the fifth and sixth chapters by a continuation of their precepts in the monitory form of the seventh chapter, as a proper ending for the discourse.

Through the preceding chapters the hypocrisy of the Pharisees had been the object of censure. The present chapter is not a break in continuity of teaching at all, but is rather the continuation of it in judicial censures. The admonitions of the fifth and sixth chapters relate to the ostentation of the Pharisees in the performance of their good works, whereas the strictures of the seventh chapter deal with the judgments that these same Pharisees passed on others in comparison with their own self-righteous estimation of themselves. The connection is logical, and is all the reason needed for retaining chapter seven as a part of the *Sermon On The Mount*, and is furthermore all the argument necessary to refute the assertions of those critics who are ever so bent on the destruction of the integrity of text and context in the Scriptures.

(1) The law of requital. (7: 1-5)

"Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considered not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. "

The context of these five verses on judging and being judged shows the reference is to the right and wrong standards of judgment respecting the characters and actions of men, not the judgment of the hereafter.

1. "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged" What is the connection here between judging and being judged? This judicial declaration refers to a Pharisaical attitude that judgment for sin with some would be remitted while remaining with others—the immunity from being judged depending not on the merits of judgment but on a basis of discrimination. But against this respect of persons, this monitory precept teaches that all are sinners before God and that none can pass judicial sentence upon another, all alike being guilty. Therefore, to assume the prerogative of such judgment as a judicial sentence on others, the Pharisees were ignoring the fact that they were themselves the subjects of judgment by the same yardstick: "For with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. " But the standard by which this measure would be meted was not their own, for the Lord is teaching that man cannot assess judgment which in the nature of it inheres in the law that has been violated. In whatever realm, the standard of appraisal is not of man, but proceeds from the laws of God. It is not within the province of man to establish rules by which to justify themselves or to condemn others. The law of God carries its own judgment, man cannot set it up, and he does not have the inherent power to condemn and pass judicial sentence. It denotes the wrong attitude toward God, and adds up to one principle: Man does not have the authority to make the sentence nor to pass it.

These monitions of Jesus have no reference to judging in the sense of discerning wrong teaching and wrong actions, or to detecting error in any form, whether it exists in doctrines taught and practiced or in false and evil intents. In John 7: 24 Jesus exhorted the Jews to "judge righteous judgment. " In the effort to convict Jesus of a violation of the law in reference to the sabbath, the Jews had misjudged him according to the law by which they attempted to judge him. Jesus answered them, saying: "Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment"—that is render the judgment which the law itself dictates, not a judgment of one's own decisions based on appearances, or what *seems* to be right to oneself. In Proverbs 12: 14 the inspired passage declared that "there is a way that seemeth right unto men, but the end thereof are the ways of death. " And, in James 1: 26, the inspired apostle said, "if any man among you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue"—that is, if his tongue is not bridled or guided by the word of God in his teaching—"this man's religion is vain. " Human judging is based on what *seems* to be the proper standard, but "righteous judgment" is no more nor less than what the word of God decrees and dictates. It is by this standard, according to 1 John 4: 6, that "we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. " And it is only by so judging that the command in Titus 1: 9 to *convict the gainsayers* "by sound doctrine" can be obeyed. The "gainsayer" is an abbreviation of *against-sayer*, one who *says*, or speaks, against the truth. To convict such an one is judging by the truth itself.

2. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you. " This coordinate of verse one and the first part of verse two, has application in the law of requital—that which is given in return—and the connotation here is the condemnation of that Pharisaical spirit which judges another by a self-righteous standard without the warrant of any positive offence against the law of God.

3. "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" This expression was an old proverb which applied to a general tendency to descry—to espy, discover by the eye—small faults in others, while ignoring the failing to discern the larger faults in oneself.

4. "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. " Figuratively, the *eye* is mental perception; the *mote* is a small floating particle; and the *beam* is a splinter. The metaphors are applied to the inconsistencies and injustices of men who seek to pass sentence upon others, when their own moral and spiritual perception is so debased and depraved that they cannot "see clearly" to judge another by the standard that is right. It was this kind of judgment by the Jews against the practices of the Gentiles that Paul condemned in Romans 2: 1-2 and in so doing postulated the only true standard of judging men: "But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth. "

It is evident that the command to "judge not" does not prohibit all judgment. The apostle declares in 1 Corinthians 6: 2 that saints judge the world—by teaching truth and practicing what is right. The nature of judgment is both corporate and individual. Jesus said in Luke 6: 35-37: "But love ye your enemies... for he (God) is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. "

The general thought expressed in these verses is that discernment and discrimination of evil is based upon knowledge, but the verdict belongs to God. Man cannot assess judgment—he has no power either to condemn or to suspend condemnation, and the power of clemency on the same principle belongs only to God. The nature of judgment is inherently twofold: first, the power to condemn and pass sentence; second, the power to extend clemency and suspend the judgment. For man to attempt to do either denotes a wrongness in his relation to God. We are all alike sinners before God, and one sinner cannot judge another sinner. So for any man to assume the prerogative of passing sentence ignores the fact that we are all subject to judgment by the same measure—"with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again"—being in some sense and in some degree guilty of the same things, the same rule and measure applies to all. So the monitory command, "judge not" does not apply to discernment of wrong motives, nor to con-

donement of wrongdoing—it has reference to condemning, exercising the power to pass sentence.

In the case of the woman taken in adultery in John 8: 11, Jesus said, "neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." These words of Jesus did not either condone or forgive the woman's deeds—they simply meant that Jesus had not permitted the Pharisees to make him the judge of their law, to pass a judicial sentence on the woman. The condemnation of the verse—"neither do I condemn thee"—has no reference to moral guilt, but to a verdict, a sentence, and the assessment of punishment—and in this position of judge under their law Jesus refused to be put by these Jews who were trying him. It is in this same sense that "judge not" is used by Jesus in Matthew 7—without regard to moral guilt, or of motives or of deeds, all of which one may discern and recognize in another, it nevertheless remains true that no man has the prerogative to condemn another—to pass a sentence of condemnation upon him. It was the Lord's proscription of the Pharisaical practice of rendering judgments and passing sentences upon others, thus asserting and assuming a divine prerogative to be exercised according to human rules and measures. It was his condemnation of human authority to either justify or condemn, the contrast between the right and the wrong exercise of judgment.

The one thing in view in all of these sayings of Christ is the opening of the gospel dispensation, and his words are the previews of its benefits and blessings. In the gospel age the Jews and the Gentiles would be judged by the one divine law, not one by the law of Moses and the other by a law of conscience, but both by the gospel, the same gospel to all men for all time. This is the import of Peter's words to Cornelius the Gentile, in Acts 10: 42-43: "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it was he which was ordained to be the Judge of the quick and the dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." The "whosoever" of this verse means that the Gentiles, on the same level with the Jews, were included in this judgment of the gospel, and were the recipients of its remission. Whether before, after, forward or backward—it all points to Pentecost.

(2) The dispensation of providence. (7: 6-11)

"Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you. Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened into you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"

There is in these verses an abrupt transition in the persons addressed from the hypocrites to the disciples, and in the subjects of the address from false standards of judgment to the blessings of providence, but there is no actual disconnection in the general course of thought. Verse 6 is connected in the general sense with verse 1. The first verse inveighs against the injustice of false judgment, and in the same tenor the sixth verse protests the forcing- of holy things on profane persons.

1. "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs. " The analogy applies to the characters of men who have no respect for God, As dogs have no sense of discernment in source and supply, whether from the garbage can or the dining table, impious men have no reverence for holy truths, and all ill-timed attempts to coerce irreverent men into a reception of sacred things only aggravates their hostilities toward the truth.

2. "Cast not your pearls before the swine" is an extension of the same analogy. As the swine "turn and rend" the feeder who would attempt to force them to consume feed not adapted to swinish appetite, unwilling men will rail against the things that are holy when forced upon their attention. Christianity penetrates but does not impose; the gospel is persuasive, not coercive. It is the continuation of the fourth beatitude on "hungering" and "thirsting" for gospel justification. God does not coerce, the gospel persuades, and the inward qualification of desire for it must exist in order to obtain it. Nobody can shoot the gospel into a man nor machine-gun Christianity into him, "for with

the heart man believeth unto righteousness, " saith Paul, in Romans 10: 10.

S. "Ask, and it shall be given unto you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. " Again, these verses are connected with the references to giving that which is holy to the dogs, and casting the pearls before the swine—there is no forcing of gospel principles on the unwilling. The gospel is for those who want it, and if it is inopportunately urged hostility will be stirred, resulting in the swinely act of turning and rending.

In the grammar of the text the verb "ask" is the *present imperative*, which indicates continuing desire—not a reference to prayer or praying, but desiring. Only such as desire, not a spontaneous and intermittent impulse, but a desire that becomes a part of the inner being, a continuous yearning for the righteousness which God imparts to man through justification and pardon. It is the desire expressed by Isaiah the prophet, 55: 1-3: "Lo, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live. " The blessings of the gospel, pardon and righteousness, are free gifts of God, but as plainly indicated by the prophet and by Christ these gifts are not unconditional. The Lord commands *asking*, "ask, and it shall be given"; and *seeking*, "seek and ye shall find"; and *knocking*, "knock, and it shall be opened unto you. " In the same vein the prophet said *come* and *hear*.

The apostle, in Romans 10: 13, defines what it means to ask and knock, seek and come: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard ? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and

hearing by the word of God. " The comparisons are here made out: Asking is calling, and calling is hearing, believing and obeying. It is that simple. So the one who asks and receives, seeks and finds, knocks and has the door opened to him, is the one who hears and obeys the gospel of Christ. The opening of the door of these blessings depends on the bid for entrance. The reference is to obedience and is an advance promulgation of gospel conditions. It does not refer to praying and pleading, and knocking at the door does not mean knocking the door down! The one who complies with the gospel is the seeker; the one who obeys, is the knocker; and the seekers and knockers are the finders and the receivers. It refers to obedience. The entrance is granted to one who complies with the conditions—it is the reception of the gospel. So again, the teaching is pointing toward Pentecost and aiming at Acts 2.

4. "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"

The parallel passage in Luke 11: 13 reads, "How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him, " which reveals an important point, that the giving of the Holy Spirit consists in the good things of the Holy Spirit and not the Holy Spirit itself, or himself. The *good things* in Matthew 7: 11 are equivalent to the *Holy Spirit* in Luke 11: 13. Comparing the two gospel records Jesus *equates* the "good things" in Matthew with the Holy Spirit in Luke, and the Holy Spirit is put for what he provides or for that which proceeds from him.

The bread and the stone illustration means, in comparison, the bread of the gospel versus the stone of Judaism. The promises of the gospel are as superior to the traditions of Judaism as a loaf of bread is superior to a stone.

The connection with the gospel is in the equivalence of the asking to the question of what to do to be saved—"Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" and "Sirs, what must I do to be saved"—in the examples of conversion in chapters 2: 37; 9: 6; 16: 30 of the Acts Of The Apostles. Receiving the promise is contingent upon complying with the answer to the question.

The asking and receiving, as to merit, is related to a promise of grace; as to conditionality, it involves obedience to instruction; as to confidence, it is manifested in reliance on the Giver.

First, the *asker* will receive on the conditions implied—obedience: "He became the author of salvation unto all them that obey him"—Hebrews 5: 9.

Second, the *seeker* will find—honesty of heart presupposed: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God"—John 7: 17.

Third, the *knocker* shall be admitted—on grounds of being a qualified claimant: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven"—Matthew 7: 21.

All of these portions of the Lord's discourse are his kingdom sayings—and they presaged the Day of Pentecost, the opening of the new dispensation and the inauguration of the new covenant.

(3) The fulfillment of the law and the prophets. (7: 12)

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets. "

This "golden text" verse is usually separated from the entire text of the seventh chapter and made to stand apart from the Discourse as a whole; but properly considered it stands in correlation to the preceding verses, and in being the definition of "the law and the prophets" it becomes a summary of the whole Sermon. In verses one to five of the chapter, Jesus informed them on the subject of judging—that God will judge men by the same measuring rule which they would apply to others, but from which they would exempt themselves; that "the judgment of God is according to truth, " the divine standard of righteousness, not the human standard of self-righteousness.

In verses 6 to 11 the Lord announced that the gifts of the gospel were to be contingent upon the qualifications of claimants who ask in faith with all of the implied conditions of obedience. And in verse 12 the connection with the foregoing sayings is established by the statement that the

righteous judgment one desires for himself should not be withheld by him from another. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you"—that is, the judgment one would want administered to himself; "do ye even so to them"—that is, by the same standard let others be judged; "for this is the law and the prophets"—that is, the perfecting and the fulfilling of the law and the prophets by accomplishing their purpose in bringing all who had been under the law to Christ.

In Romans 10: 4 the apostle said that Christ accomplished the "end" or purpose of the law *in order to* righteousness, which the law itself could not impart. Again, in Romans 8: 4 he said that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us—that is, the righteousness which the law desired but could not accomplish finds fulfillment in the gospel which makes men righteous. This is what Jesus meant by the saying in the Discourse, in Matthew 5: 17, "think not that I am come to destroy, but to fulfill. "

In Galatians 3: 21, the apostle declared that "if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness would have been by the law, " and in verse 24 he adds, "wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. " To be righteous and to be justified are identical. The law could not make man righteous, or just, because the law could not provide pardon and remission of sins. But the law was elementary and fundamental to the gospel, and brought the world to Christ. The law was therefore fulfilled and perfected in the gospel. That is why Jesus said in Luke 16: 16, "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it"—that is, the law prevailed until John's order or regime came to end, at the cross; since that time, after the cross, all men, both Jews and Gentiles, have pressed into the new kingdom under the preaching of the gospel.

The so-called "golden rule" verse of Matthew 7: 12 has been universally misapplied to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you, " in personal favors and accommodations, when in fact it is connected with the subject of the human and divine standards of judgment: By the same divine standard of God's righteous judgment that one would claim for himself, let him accord to others also: for the law and the prophets reach completion and fulfillment

in the gospel of Christ by which all men shall be judged both here and hereafter. This paraphrase fits the context, and takes away the application of the text to every whimsical notion which it has been twisted to serve. And once more, in this verse as in all of the others, the words of it loom with the future as previews of the kingdom, pointing to Pentecost.

(4) The broad and the narrow ways. (7: 13-23)

"Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. "

Having given a summation of the law and the prophets in the principles of the foregoing verses, the Lord in this section of the Sermon turns to exhortations designed to prevent interferences with the keeping of these sayings from difficulties in walking the narrow way, and impediments to obedience stemming from the seductions of false teachers.

1. "Enter ye in at the strait gate. " The word *strait* here does not mean *straight*, but restricted, separated from the general course, and easy to miss. Few find it because of

in it. It is another version of asking and receiving, seeking and finding. It is illustrative of the solemn fact that there are many ways to be wrong, but only one way to be right.

2. "For wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction. " This broad way is the way of the world in which it is easy to follow the crowd. "Many there be which go in thereat, " because they are drifters. The gate is wide, the way is broad, and instead of being easy to miss it is easy to enter, requiring no determination of will—and in this broad way are all forms of error, which lead to destruction. The narrow way is the gospel way. The *seekers* enter this way; the *drifters* enter the other—the "many" loosely follow the crowd, the "few" carefully follow the teaching. The broad course leads to destruction and perdition; the narrow path leads to life and salvation.

The two ways are representative of two lives. Conformity with the world is the way of the large majority; compliance with the will of God is the way of the small minority.

There are also two gates which are representative of two destinations. The parallel reference in Luke 13: 24 reads: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. " The imagery is that of an entrance that requires attention to find, and an effort to enter. The contrast between "strive" and "seek" in Luke's reference is significant, for to *seek* may mean only to desire or wish, but to *strive* means determination and struggle. Thus it is possible to seek without striving. The saying that "many will seek to enter in, and shall not be able" does not mean that it is impossible but rather that they do not seek in the appointed way—they are not able to enter by the way they wish to enter—hence, strive to enter the narrow way through the strait gate, for many will try to enter through other doors, and fail. Keeping in the narrow way is a continuous course requiring the same effort as entering it—it is a way of living. Walking the broad way is ignoring divine conditions, it is a false independence.

The expression "many will seek" forecasts something not yet begun at the time of the Lord's sayings. It is a preview of the church which the Lord said he would build. Many will desire the salvation it offers, but will go the wrong way to get it.

3. "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. " This saying is connected in sequence with the admonitions for the guidance necessary to enter the strait gate and travel the narrow way. It means to choose right and walk right. But there would be impostors on every hand to mislead. Here again is the forecast of the church, for impostors were not effective while Jesus was with them—only after the establishment of the church did the false prophets appear, as described in Matthew 24. The warnings against the sham leaders, self-constituted prophets and false teachers swarmed all over Palestine after the church began. These sayings depict after Pentecost scenes, not before.

4. "Ye shall know them by their fruits"—These fake prophets and false teachers could not be discerned by appearance for they "come to you in sheep's clothing. " It is well known that sheep follow a leader even "over the fence. " In this imagery the false prophet is a leader disguised as a shepherd. It denotes one without warrant laying claim to inspiration and acting in the role of a mouthpiece for God. It forecasts the danger of false teachers in the church for all time.

5. "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. " The fruit of the new dispensation was not to be corrupted with Judaism. It applies to all error in doctrine and practice, any teaching or any claim contrary to the authority of Christ. The teacher is convicted by his *fruits* when the thing produced is not according to the divine rule by which it is judged. Man does not have the authority to make the rule, but he has the permission to discern the fruits by the rule that is made. The promise of Jesus to the apostles in John 16: 13 that "the Spirit of truth" would come to guide them "into all truth" points to an event of the greatest magnitude: the complete and perfect revelation of the Holy Spirit through the apostles who were to be forever the teachers of the world. It is worthy to observe again that in these sayings are the forecasts of the kingdom soon afterward established and the sketching of the qualifications for membership in it.

The Lord's warning against false teachers is a solemn one which should not be minimized. The duty of the shepherd was to protect the sheep. Jesus said in John 10: 11 that

"the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. " There is no warning more terrible in either Testaments, old or new, than those that are directed against sham guides, false teachers of self-constituted authority. They are wolves preying on souls, ravening for gain. The church of Christ is repeatedly presented as a flock, and Christ as the chief Shepherd, but under Christ, the elders of the church are its shepherds and charged with the command to "tend the flock of God"—and that means to keep the false teacher and his false doctrines out.

6. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. " The word "enter" indicates the continuity of the subject matter between verses 13 and 21—"enter ye in at the strait gate, " and "shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. " Entrance into the narrow way and entrance into the kingdom of heaven are one and the same thing in these two sayings. The kingdom is the way—the strait and narrow way is the kingdom. Of the strait gate and narrow way it is said, "few there be that find it, " and of the kingdom it is said, "not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter, " Because of the words of verse 14, "many will say to me in that day, " some have concluded that the entrance into the kingdom here refers to the second coming of Christ, or to the judgment day and the end of time. The conclusion does not follow. It is a forecast of the establishment of the kingdom which the Lord had announced. The condition of entering it was not praying the formal prayers of the Pharisees on the corners, making a *paternoster* of prayer, with incantations of Lord, Lord, but rather by doing the will of God which determines entrance into the kingdom. One enters the kingdom not by *praying* but by *doing*; one cannot *pray* himself into the kingdom, he must *do* himself into it, by obedience to the will of God that governs it. Furthermore this doing of the will of God continues after entering the kingdom, for entrance into the eternal state is conditioned upon the continued obedience to the will of God, not upon the performance of grandiose works of men, according to verse 22. Again, the entrance into the kingdom then at the time of its establishment of verse 21, and the subsequent judgment of verses 22 and 23, are connected with the entrance into the narrow way "which leadeth unto life. " In the same sense

that walking in the narrow way now *leads* to life hereafter, so *doing the will of God* in the kingdom now, will justify the doer hereafter, thus enabling him to escape the final sentence "depart from me. "

These sayings clearly anticipate the establishment of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. Not every one who recognized the claims of Christ and acknowledged his Sonship, supposedly acting in his name and praying would gain entrance into it. The essential thing is to do the will of God, to meet the requirements of the gospel, as stipulated in "the Lord's prayer" of chapter 6: 10, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. " This obedience "in earth" obviously referred to the kingdom then to be established. The doing of the will of God, obedience to the gospel, was essential to entrance. Admission into it was barred and membership in it denied to all others. But there will be some who shall have gained entrance by having complied with the initial terms who will forfeit his acknowledgment "in that day. " The verdict "I never knew you" and "depart from me" will be pronounced on many claimants for his recognition who will have cited the doing of other things than *his will* as the ground of their justification. The Christ who was the Teacher, will then be the Judge, and disobedience to or disregard for his teaching means final banishment. One is known by Christ and acknowledged by him only through the will of God.

The language of verse 21 "not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, " does not within itself indicate insincerity. Rather it may describe a high type of denominational church members, by human measures, paying homage to Christ in true ardor and fervor. But that is not all that is needed for membership in the kingdom of Christ. The one indispensable thing for membership to be gained and to be sustained, which takes precedence over all religious devotion, prayers and deeds is *doing the will of God*. Only that type of subject gains entrance into the kingdom here and secures entrance into its final state hereafter.

Throughout the Lord's teaching in the Discourse on the mount and his entire ministry the emphasis is invariably placed on doing the will of God. It was equivalent to conversion and the new birth. Compare a few passages: John 3: 3-5: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see... enter... the kingdom of God. " Matthew 18: 3: "Except ye

be converted... ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God. " Matthew 7: 21: "Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. "

The first rule of higher mathematics is that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. " By this rule the new birth, conversion and doing the will of God are made equal to each other, for they are all equal to the same thing i. e. entering the kingdom of God. The arrangement in syllogism would be too tedious here, but would follow this line: The new birth equals to enter the kingdom; conversion equals to enter the kingdom; obeying the gospel (doing the will of God) equals to enter the kingdom: Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other—the new birth, conversion and obedience to the gospel are equal to the same thing, therefore they are equal to each other. The new birth is doing *the will of God* in obedience to the gospel.

The change that takes place in conversion is effected by obeying *the will of God*, the gospel. The apostle says, in James 1: 18, "of his own will begat he us with the word of truth. " The hearing and the doing of the will of God is the basis of the just and unerring judgment of Christ, as expressed by himself in John 5: 30: "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. " In John 4: 34, Jesus said: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. " The knowledge of the will of God unaccompanied by the doing of it would have fallen short of the acceptance of God even in the divine person of his Son. What type of subject, then, would secure entrance into the kingdom about to be established by him, as he was ready "to finish his work" on the earth? "He that doeth *the will* of my Father which is in heaven. " In recording with his indorsement the words of the blind man the apostle John said, in chapter 9: 31, that the doer of *the will of God* is the only acceptable worshipper of God.

7. "And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. " The meaning of this declaration is that God does not *know* what is alien to himself. The rendering of this same passage in Luke 13: 27 reads: "I know not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. " Speaking especially to the Jews,

the Lord here warns them against the disregard for the principles of his kingdom, an iniquity or lawlessness that would bar their entrance into it.

As it is true that God does not know, or recognize, that which is alien to himself, it is further true in reference to one's relation to Jesus Christ. In Galatians 4: 9 the apostle Paul inquires of the Jews in the church, "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, wherunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" The knowledge of the will of God by the believer is the ground of being known of God and is the basis of all judgment. In John 15: 5, Jesus said to the disciples, "for without me (apart from me) ye can do nothing." Without relation to Christ in the kingdom, his church, none of them could be known or recognized by him. "I know not whence ye are"—he has no consciousness of, no recognition for, no relationship with the boaster of good works, but who are workers of lawlessness—*working* without *doing* His will.

Every saying of Christ in the Sermon from the beatitudes to the benediction makes it more and more evident that his teaching contained the previews of the gospel and consisted of Pentecost pointers.

(5) The parable of the builders. (7: 24-28)

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. And it came to pass, when Je'sus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes. "

1. "He that heareth and doeth. " This comparison is not a comparison between the hearer and the sand *house*, but between the hearer and the *man* who builds on the sand: "He that heareth and doeth"—the *doing* is the building on

the rock. The sand hearer is according to the general run, not hostile to the teaching, but otherwise occupied, like a careless builder engaged in rush construction, quickly erected. He is like the drifter in the broad way, walking loosely and carelessly without the sense of direction or discrimination. The sand builder knew that the storms would come, but he gambled. It is a vivid picture of decisions that determine one's course and dominate the future. The foolish builder subordinated the future to the present—"and great was the fall thereof, " in the complete collapse of the *do not* hearers.

2. "That built his house upon rock. " This parable was spoken in continuity of the sayings of verses 21-23 in reference to the doing of the will of God. There is such a thing as listening to the exposition of principles with approval, without allowing the heart to be influenced—a knowledge of the will of God unaccompanied by action. That course is fatal to a hearer of the word—"he that heareth and doeth not" is a remarkable characterization of the general run of mankind.

The comparisons should be kept clear. The two hearers are not compared to a house well built and a house wrongly built, but to the *builders*. The foolish builder worked above the ground, with no foundation that could stand a test. Much of the wise builder's work was out of sight, no show of notice, but it was *fundamental*, he builded on the rock, the doing of the will of God, without pretence or show. Such is the final test and the eternal result will be the answer to the question as to who does what—his own will or the will of God. This is the emphasis which Jesus placed on the will of God in all of his sayings. It was the warp and the woof of his teaching and pointed to the obedience of his disciples in the kingdom that was coming. "Not every one that saith Lord, Lord... but he that doeth the will of my Father. "

3. "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. " The Lord Jesus Christ taught in his own name with the authority of a lawgiver: "I say unto you" and "these sayings of mine. " The scribes taught only as interpreters of the Mosaic law, without any authority vested in

them. Jesus taught as one *having authority*—it was an authority inherent in himself as the Son of God, not derived from any predecessor. The Mosaic staff had not been handed over to him nor had the prophetic mantle descended upon him—his authority was singular, as announced by the voice of God which vaulted the heavens: "This is my beloved Son ... hear ye him. " Upon this authority his sayings were spoken, with the anticipation of the full exercise of it in his kingdom, as declared in the giving of the Great Commission in Matthew 28, "All power (authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Spirit): Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. "

That is the *amen* of his sayings. The divine Teacher had laid the axe at the root of the tree of Judaism and national Israelism, with all of the branches of its Talmudic traditions. He had expounded the doctrine of the announced kingdom in fulfillment of the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning it, and announced by himself in Mark 1: 15, "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand. " There was no postponement of this kingdom, God sent him to establish it, and in John 4: 34 he said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish the work"; and in John 17: 4 he said, "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. " In verse 11 he added, "I am no more in the world, but these (apostles) are in the world, and I come to thee. "

When Jesus Christ left this world no more to return to it or dwell upon it, the work the Father had sent him to do in it was finished. His kingdom was ready to be established, and in Mark 9: 1 he assured his disciples standing there that they would witness it. His words "I am no more in the world, but these are in the world" means that the work of his kingdom in the world would be executed by his ambassadors, the apostles, with full portfolio as ministers of state in his kingdom. Their ambassadorial office with all of its inspired prerogatives began on Pentecost of Acts 2—and this was the culmination of all of his sayings. It meant the ending of the law and the beginning of the gospel.

VIII. THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES-
LUKE 12: 1-3

"In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. 2 For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. 3 Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house tops. "

The present treatise on the *Sermon On The Mount* would not be complete without a further analysis of the term *hypocrisy*; which has such frequent mention in the Lord's Discourse in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Matthew, that the treatment of it as a subject is made virtually corollary to the discussion of the Sermon. All who would follow the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ should know the meaning of this word, and avoid the guilt attached to it. The light in which Jesus regards it is made plain in his references to it. In Matthew 24: 51, passing sentence on the wicked servant, he said: "And shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. " The severe tone of these words is typical of the manner in which the Lord habitually condemned all hypocrites, and this one verse is enough to show the light in which he placed them and held them. The wicked man would be "cut asunder" and have "his portion" appointed "with the hypocrites"—in other words there could be nothing worse than dwelling in eternity with hypocrites!

The novel sense which Jesus imparted to the word broadens its meaning and enlarges its application. The word has ordinarily been used to signify pretension—pretending to be something which one is not in order to gain some end. But Jesus uses the words "hypocrite" and "hypocrisy" with connotations not easy to connect with the usual definition, and which certainly cannot be restricted to pretension, but inclusive of a state of ignorance of oneself—of moral blindness and spiritual deception. As a positive indication that the word *hypocrisy* signifies such a state the passage in Luke 12 is introduced, with numerous other texts.

In words of warning to his disciples, Jesus said: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. " The word *leaven* is used in the figurative sense of *influence*, which may be good or bad. In Matthew 13: 33 Jesus likened the teaching of the kingdom, the doctrine of the gospel, to leaven in its influence upon society in the expansion of the kingdom. On the other hand Paul warned against the erroneous teaching of the Judaizers in Galatians 5: 9 and said that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. " So the figure of leaven may refer to the influence of either truth or error. In the verses under consideration in Luke 12, leaven of the Pharisees is called *hypocrisy*. Defining hypocrisy, Jesus said, "for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. " This description indicates that the essence of hypocrisy is "a covering up, " or something concealed.

But Jesus said that it will be "revealed" and "be known, " and if "spoken in darkness, shall be heard in the light"—therefore hypocrisy ultimately proves to be a failure.

The broad meaning of hypocrisy is the state of moral blindness, being deceived as to one's own moral and spiritual status or condition. The usual meaning of the word is pretence or insincerity. There are examples of both uses of the word in the applications of it made by Jesus in his references to the scribes and the Pharisees. It is used by him, in Matthew 23: 28, in the common sense of pretence—"Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. " But in Matthew 7: 5, in the reference to mote and the beam in the eye, there is no indication of insincerity, but rather of blindness to one's own faults and failures. "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye. " Here is the description of a person with a wrong-minded view of moral questions, and of moral blindness about himself. He has keen vision toward the moral mistakes and spiritual diseases of others, but incapacity to see clearly himself. Here is the "mote" and the "beam" sequence—the offering to do an operation requiring precision of sight which he does not possess—conscious of the weakness of others, but deceived in his own moral or spiritual condition. It is an utterly wrong view, but it cannot be classified as hypocrisy

in the sense of pretence, for such an one is not pretending, he is sincere in what he thinks, but is deceived in himself; he is not conscious of the beam in his own eye, yet Jesus referred to him as "thou hypocrite. "

For a further study of this broad use of the words *hypocrite* and *hypocrisy* and their various classifications, a look at several passages will serve us well.

(1) Matthew 23: 13. "But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer them that are entering to go in. " Here hypocrisy is *ignorance*. The religious leaders of the Jews were represented as standing outside the portals of the kingdom, beside the palace of the King, but imagined themselves inside; and they were barring those who actually were entering in. It is hardly conceivable that they could knowingly place themselves outside, hence the designation "hypocrite" here implies the ignorance of their real relation. Instead of hindering men from acknowledging the King and entering the kingdom, these scribes and Pharisees should have been the first to recognize the One of whom their scriptures testified. But instead of doing this, they rejected Christ and used their official positions to prevent his acceptance, as charged by the Lord in Luke 11: 52: "Woe unto you lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered. " It is clear that the hypocrisy of this class of the Pharisees was not insincerity, but lack of knowledge, ignorance.

(2) Matthew 23: 14: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. " Here is the hypocrisy of *injustice*—excessive fees on widows' houses as a business transaction, and they received profit thereby at the expense of the unfortunate widows, but they engaged in outward religious activities that blinded them to the inward violation of principles—a covering up of a wrong thing by the doing of something else. This is a moral and religious blindness not uncommon in our day, an effort to cover up wrong deeds by the doing of something else that is right.

These professional fee-takers may have had sincere intentions in praying. The hypocrisy of their conduct lies in

the relation of their religious actions to the habitual injustices to the weak, which apparently was concealed to the man himself. The hypocrite of this classification is totally ignorant of the fact. His external activities have disguised the violation of these inward principles, a concealment of the truth by outward conduct in religious and devotional endeavors. Absorbed in some such activities that blind him to the moral principles violated, he continues in private injustices to the poor and the weak. This is an hypocrisy described in the *Sermon On The Mount* and exhibited in self-deceived actors in public places.

(3) Matthew 23: 29-31: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them that killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. "

This is the hypocrisy of *inconsistency*. They claimed superiority over their fathers who killed the prophets in the Old Testament times, and asserted that they would not have done so; yet they themselves were persecuting the greatest prophet of them all, Jesus Christ, and joined with those who planned to kill him. In this they were called "the children of them which killed the prophets, " because they had inherited this same spirit of blind hostility, and in that sense they were the sons of them that slew the prophets.

These verses are an unsparing indictment against the Pharisees who thought themselves admirable in the deeds of building tombs as monuments to the prophets, and garnishing the sepulchres of the righteous men of old. But while claiming to recognize the wrongs done by their forefathers, and attributing to themselves a higher moral sense in regard to God's messengers, they were plotting, in their malignant misunderstanding of their own scriptures, to deliver the greatest of all messengers of God to death, in the person of Jesus Christ, his Son. They were therefore "witnesses" unto themselves that they had inherited the spirit of the fathers before them, and with divine sarcasm the Lord said to them: "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. " They were sincere in this claim, but blindly inconsistent, and in this their hypocrisy consisted.

(4) Matthew 23: 15: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves. " Here is the hypocrisy of *perverseness*. These scribes and Pharisees had no sense of proportions. They could not see straight; they thought that they were straight in doctrine and practice, but they were crooked. They made a laborious effort with a bad object, a misguided endeavor that had an ill effect upon their fellowmen. They thought these efforts were good, but they were bad, and Jesus exposed them. These particular scribes and Pharisees were not wicked, they were just deceived and blind, as Jesus said in verse 17, "ye fools and blind"—hence, they were hypocrites of the deluded classification. It is in this same connection that Jesus condemned the "blind leaders of the blind" in Matthew 15: 14: "Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. " But these blind leaders did not know they were wrong, or leading others wrong—if they had known it, their eyes would have been open to it, and they would not have been blind. They were deceived, and this *deception* was their state of hypocrisy. Like some today, they thought they were *so right*, but they were *so wrong*.

(5) A cluster of passages sums up the various connotations of hypocrisy. In Matthew 22: 18, Jesus exposed an intentional effort at deception on the part of the Pharisees in reference to the Jews paying tribute to Caesar. "But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?" This is an example of *dissimulation*, a deliberate effort to deceive. On the other hand in Matthew 23: 25-27 the Pharisees were charged with hypocrisy in reference to making clean "the outside of the cup and the platter, " but inside they were "full of extortion and excess. ' Jesus then said: "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and the platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. " While this example has been cited as a case of deliberate deceit, it rather represents that outward activity which conceals the inward disease of wrong, and the victim is blinded to his own state.

Another example of *inconsistency* which the Lord stigmatized as *hypocrisy* is in Luke 12: 54-57: "And he said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west,

straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time? Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" Here the Lord addresses all of the people, not the scribes and Pharisees alone, and charged them all with hypocrisy, not in the sense of the villainy and the depravity of dishonesty, but of *inconsistency*. There are two courses of action mentioned by way of contrast in these verses, revealing the defect which Jesus defined as *hypocrisy*. The people were professing one set of principles in general conduct, but they were acting on another course in something of greater significance.

The analysis of the hypocrisy of the people in this situation, presented in these verses would be in substance this: The rain clouds in Palestine formed from the Mediterranean sea, and blew inland from the west coasts. Seeing the cloud rising in the west, Jesus reminded the people of the common saying, "There cometh a shower," and he added, "and so it is." But when the south wind blew from the desert country, the people said, "There will be heat," and Jesus added again, "and it cometh to pass." But the same people who could "discern the face of the sky and of the earth" for the knowledge of things in the natural world, were unable to discern from the source of their own Scriptures what the Lord called "this time"—that is, the time of the Christ, which the Scriptures foretold, was there; the time had come, the Christ had appeared, and the people had failed to discern it. The same aptitude in the discernment of evidences in the natural world turned into inaptitude with reference to the same principle of spiritual insight concerning the Scriptures bearing on the phrase "this time"—the time for Christ to appear. They were seeing the time but could not discern it. It is here that Jesus called the people at large, as a whole, *hypocrites*; yet not in the sense of intentionally rejecting the Scriptures. They were hypocrites in that they were content with Jewish custom and tradition; and they could decide with accuracy the seasons from natural evidences, but they could not on the same principle of spiritual evidences and insight into the Scriptures judge of themselves—of their own knowledge—"what is right" concerning the special season of the coming of the Christ, their

Messiah, into the world. It was this inconsistency that constituted the hypocrisy of the people at large.

It is evident that all of the people here addressed by the Lord were not hypocrites in the sense of deliberate conduct; and it can be seen by these examples that hypocrisy, as Jesus used the word, defines the spiritual state of inconsistency, of deception, of injustice, of perversity, or any other form of error into which one may fall, even though he may be blind to his own condition.

A further illustration of this truth, which these examples appear to demonstrate, is in Luke 13: 14-16: "And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day. The Lord then answered him, and said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?" Admitting that the owner of an ox or an ass could loose them and lead them to watering places on the sabbath without breaking the law of Moses, yet finding fault with Jesus and charging him with the violation of the law for loosing a Jewish woman from a crippling bond on the sabbath, was perversity in the degree of stupidity on the part of this ruler of the Jews—and Jesus immediately put the label of hypocrisy on him—"Thou hypocrite." Jesus was not merely slinging this word around in order to call people bad names—he was defining this word, he was demonstrating what hypocrisy is. This ruler would feed and water an ox or an ass on the sabbath, admittedly with no broken law, but charged Jesus with a breach of law in the healing of a Jewess, an afflicted daughter of Abraham. In such strict and rigid interpretation of the law, this ruler of the Jews had become bereft of all sense of moral proportions, and was void of the ability to see straight. It was a state of mental perversity, but not of intentional dishonesty. According to his thinking he considered himself as an enforcer of the Mosaic law with unbending penalty and unyielding severity, but his view of the law was inconsistent and his course of action perverse. It was this *state*, or condition, that Jesus called *hypocrisy*.

So, finally, reverting to the original text for these considerations of hypocrisy—"the leaven of the Pharisees"—let the passage in Luke 12: 1-3 be read again in the light of these strictures. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness, shall be heard in light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed from the house tops. "

The thesis has been established that the basic meaning of hypocrisy is a *covering up*, a concealing, and the etymology of the word will expand its meaning to all phases of moral and religious error, or any form of self-deception whatsoever. This self-deception is called *leaven* because it is subtle and works within the person, who has become so deceived. This leaven, with its subtle tendencies to evil, works within the man who has a part to play, a reputation to maintain, or some position to keep, consistent with the profession to which he belongs; and he comes to see himself in the wrong light—in reference to himself he goes blind. This *hypocrisy leaven* worked with especial effectiveness in such a sect as the Pharisees, who boasted of maintaining a scrupulous conformity and a decorous orthodoxy—and that is why Jesus Christ chose to make the Pharisees object lessons on the inward character of this evil, covered up and concealed by all of their outward functions. But the hypocrite of any classification is the victim of his own desperate blindness. The utter futility of all hypocrisy is seen in its ultimate failure—"there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed. "

IX. THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL—ROMANS 12-13

There is a striking parallel between the divine teaching of Christ in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Matthew and the inspired teaching of his apostle in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of Romans. These two chapters contain divers exhortations with reference to the Christian's personal life and character, the dispensation of his duties in the service of God and discharge of responsibilities to the church, the mutual relation of members of the body, the attitude toward personal enemies, and the obligations to society and government, in which as citizens we are all a unit, without exemption in time of peace or in a state of war.

These admonitions constitute applied Christianity and in apostolic teaching are an extension of the principles of the *Sermon On The Mount*. The members of the church are also members of a body politic, and they do not by exemption from the obligations of the civil state become an incubus in society. Becoming a Christian does not automatically cancel the responsibilities of citizenship in a civil society.

The Christian who does not know how to deport himself in time of war, does not know how to deport himself in time of peace—the instructions are the same. The attitude that causes a Christian in time of war to appear as a freak specimen of humanity, and to be placed in a concentration camp, or in a federal prison, when the world is in distress and there is so much work to do, is no more practical in time of peace. A crisis merely brings it to light. The only problems raised by war are in the application of the principles and instructions to what may be to the individual unaccustomed conditions. These principles do not change with map-making.

(1) Romans 12: 17-21.

"Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but *rather* give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance *is* mine; I will repay, saith the Lord, Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. "

The twelfth chapter of Romans is the Christian's manual of personal conduct. It contains the rules for the regulation of the Christian's conduct—instructions for operation of the Christian's life. In the closing five verses Paul gives the rules for keeping peace with one's neighbor. 1 Recompense to no man evil for evil. 2 As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. 3. Avenge not yourselves. 4. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. In personal conduct the Christian must do these things all the time. Whether it will work or not *is not our responsibility*; Paul said, "as much as lieth in you, "

But what of discipline and law enforcement? These are in other realms of God's authority. The New Testament

recognizes these other realms and allows a Christian to operate in these realms of discipline and law enforcement, even though the methods used are not the same as those in the kingdom of Christ. If the offending party is a child, the parent, even though a Christian, must teach his child what is good and evil; and he must control him, although it may require physical force to do so, which cannot be employed under the rules of Christian conduct in Romans 12. The parent, nevertheless, is operating under God's authority *in another realm*.

A case in point: Despite all your efforts under the rules of love and kindness, one of these grown-up undisciplined children of somebody's inflicts upon you a serious bodily injury. It is reported by you, or by someone else. You are called to testify. You tell the truth without coloring it by personal feeling. The guilty party is punished according to the law. Have you recompensed evil for evil? Have you broken the command to "be at peace" in Romans 12? Have you disobeyed what "is written" that "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord?" Have you been overcome of evil? The answer to these questions is, No. No evil has been perpetrated in the enforcement of the law. The employment of physical force in its proper sphere, and in the manner prescribed by God's authority, is *good* and *necessary*. The methods employed in a material realm are not rendered null and void, because they are not to be used in a spiritual realm. Force has no place in Christ's kingdom, because citizenship there is spiritual and voluntary. It would vitiate every act of worship and service. There is no virtue in doing what we are compelled to do. But a Christian can and is even commanded to operate in other realms than the church.

Another case in point: Of the qualifications of elders in the church Paul says, "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?). Now, a man cannot employ *force* as an elder in Christ's kingdom, but the only way he can *prepare* and *qualify* himself for the eldership, according to Paul, is by the experience gained in the wise *use of force and discipline* in the home!

Paul was born a Roman citizen. When he became a Christian he did not repudiate his citizenship in a civil

kingdom; he exercised it. If any Christian has repudiated his citizenship, he should in all honor and fairness register as an alien. The government is entitled to know the exact status of everyone living within its borders during an emergency. Paul's conduct, when revealed with the implication of divine approval, constitutes a very good commentary upon his teaching. The Roman magistrates in Philippi sent word to the jailer to release Paul and Silas: "Let those men go." Paul answered: "They have beaten us openly, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily: but let them come themselves and fetch us out." On other occasions Paul used his citizenship to escape scourging, to avert a plot against his life, to escape an injustice in the lower courts; but on this occasion it was for none of those reasons. The beating was past; his freedom was offered; there was no emergency. His motive, therefore, was tactical—to escape the presumption of guilt in the eyes of the world, not for personal reasons but for the sake of the gospel.

On still another occasion Paul permitted *an armed force to escort him* to his destination to protect him from his enemies who had sworn to kill him. (Acts 23) Had they attempted to carry out their threat, Paul knew that the soldiers would have used the force of arms, and if necessary would have killed the attackers in protecting Paul's life. Was Paul's practice here, as a Roman citizen, inconsistent with and contradictory to his teaching in the Roman letter? The answer again is, *No*. Paul had other realms of God's authority in mind when he penned the rules pertaining to peace in Romans 12, if the context proves anything.

The thirteenth chapter of Romans deals with the Christian's obligation to civil government. It should be remembered that Paul did not divide the Roman letter into chapters. Romans 12 and 13 were not disjoined when he wrote the letter—it was all *one argument*. In the closing verses of the twelfth chapter when he forbids a Christian taking personal vengeance, he declared that "vengeance belongeth" to the Lord. The first verses of Romans 13, which follow immediately, tell *how* the Lord *exercises* this vengeance on the evildoer. Romans 12 and 13 are all one argument. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God,.. For rulers are not a terror to the good

work, but to evil... he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake. "

The sword is an instrument of death. The officer of the law is the officer of God when *he beareth not the sword in vain*. Verse six says: "For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they (the officers) are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. " Administering death, or capital punishment, therefore is divinely sanctioned as a prerogative of government in punishment of evildoers. The idea that some members of the church have in these matters would make every peace officer, sheriff or policeman, a murderer, whether he is ever actually forced to kill or not, for *he beareth not the sword in vain*, and he is sworn to do what his office would in case of necessity require, just as in the case of the soldiers who furnished the armed escort for Paul. The administration of capital punishment in the prosecution of the evildoer by the government does not differ in principle from a defensive war which the government must prosecute to protect the lives and liberties of its citizens. The idea that some of the members of the church have in these matters would also make every soldier in the service of our country a murderer. It is undoubtedly a false idea.

But the Bible says "thou shalt not kill, " we are told. Yes, that is the sixth commandment. The fourth commandment said: "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy"—so the same God that said "thou shalt not kill, " in the sixth commandment provided the death penalty for violation of the fourth commandment to keep the sabbath holy! Did the sixth commandment contradict the penalty of the fourth? Not at all; somebody's reasoning is just lame. If capital punishment is murder, and if peace officers and soldiers are murderers, then one commandment prohibited what the other commandment required! But since both capital punishment and war, under certain conditions, were divinely required *under the same law* that said "thou shalt not kill, " it follows that there is a difference between both of those things and murder. Some people need to look up the definition of murder.

Brother R. L. Whiteside made a clear and scriptural distinction on this point in answer to a question in his query

department of the *Gospel Advocate*, which may be profitably inserted here:

"The command, 'Thou shalt not kill,' was one of the Ten Commandments, and was a prohibition against murder. It applied to individuals, and not to governments. And while the Ten Commandments were in force, the individual was allowed, under certain circumstances, to take human life. 'If the thief be found breaking in, and be smitten so that he dieth, there shall be no blood guiltiness for him.' (Exodus 22: 2.) Such taking of human life is not a violation of the command, 'Thou shalt not kill.' God does not give a law and then license a man to violate it. The command, 'Thou shalt not kill,' has been used as an argument against capital punishment, and yet under that law the authorities were required to punish by death many sorts of criminals. And under that law, the Lord required his people to make war on certain nations. In doing so, they were not violating the command, 'Thou shalt not kill.' The way some preachers and others argue, it would seem that they never read any of the Old Testament excepting the command, 'Thou shalt not kill.' ... But I do not read anywhere that the Lord ever permitted any man to commit adultery for his own protection, or that a nation was required to commit adultery! It is plain that individuals are prohibited from doing the things that governments are required to do. "

The idea that men who are not Christians can be soldiers and officers to protect the Christian by doing that which a Christian himself could not do is about the most conveniently selfish and cowardly convenient doctrine ever pronounced by good men. There is just one thing wrong with it—it is not true.

The Christian's obligations exist in two realms—the civil and the spiritual. The Lord said to his disciples: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's. " According to the theory of some, the same things belong to the devil that belong to Caesar. Then it could just as well read: "Render unto the devil the things that are the devil's. " It certainly would be wrong to render anything to the devil, yet we could not honestly withhold anything from the devil that belonged to him. But Satan never owned a foot of ground on this earth. He never possessed an abstract of title to anything. Obligations are based upon value received, and

if any man ever received anything worthwhile from the devil, he is obligated to the devil. We are told that the devil is ordained of God in the same way that governments are. Satan is wrong, and there is nothing right about him. If that is true of governments, God could not be consistent with his divine attributes and command us to pay taxes to the government.

Some go to the temptation of Christ to show that the devil possessed the kingdoms of this world. It is said that if he did not possess them, his offer would have been no temptation to Christ. Very well, but *did Christ want the kingdoms of this world?* If so, *what* did he want with them? He was building a spiritual kingdom in which force would have no place. He could not salvage one thing from the kingdoms of this world for his spiritual kingdom. If Satan offered him something he did not want and could not use, how could *that* have been a temptation to him? But Christ was *tempted*, therefore, Satan did not offer him the kingdoms of this world as *such*. The kingdoms of this world meant what Jesus meant when he commanded his disciples to go and teach "all nations. " They did not go to the civil governments; they went to the people who composed them. Christ could use the people in his spiritual kingdom. The devil was in possession by *voluntary sufferance*. What the devil offered was a withdrawal of opposition to Christ's work. He could have done the thing that he offered, because he was in control of that opposition. Let us not pervert scripture to support wishful thinking on a Christian's obligations to civil government.

The theory that God uses the devil and wicked men to do some necessary evil work, such as law enforcement and warfare, so that his spiritual children do not have to soil their holy hands makes God *particeps criminus* to evil. To support this theory they go back to the Old Dispensation where it is said that "the Most High God ruleth in the kingdom of men, and that he setteth up over it whomsoever he will. " But under the same dispensation God commanded his own people, under certain conditions, to wage warfare. So it proves too much. If we go back there for an example of one, we get an example of the other.

Take the example of Samuel. Among the Old Testament characters there is none that outshines Samuel for personal piety and saintly faithfulness. His consecration began be-

fore his birth. The last of the judges, and in a sense the first of the prophets, this venerable priest's last days were saddened by the clamor for a king and by the mistakes of Saul, the first king. Saul could not tell Samuel that he had obeyed the Lord when the bleating of the sheep and the lowing of the oxen were sounding in his ears, and when old king Agag stood there before him alive. God had commanded Saul to kill them all. Saul had not done it. Whom did God ordain as a minister to complete the obedience in which Saul had defaulted? An evil, wicked man, some confirmed old sinner that was going to hell anyway? No; he appointed Samuel, the preacher and priest, one of the best men that ever lived, for that task, and he called for Agag to be brought before him. "And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag to pieces *before the Lord* in Gilgal." But that was in the Old Testament! To be sure, but that is where they go to prove that God used evil men to do some of God's evil work that good men could not do—and *this example proves that their argument is wrong*. Here their contention is reversed.

It seems to me that some of the brethren have dipped their pens in ink of speculation and propounded a Calvinistic theory of civil government—namely, that they are all born totally depraved. Had not man rebelled against God, they say, there would have been no civil governments. Neither would there have been any clothes worn. Neither would there have been any *church*—nobody lost, nobody to be saved, no gospel to save them. But man did rebel. As a result God has *two institutions*, operating under his authority. To civil government he has given the responsibility of discipline as it pertains to the physical life. To the church he has committed the spiritual resources, and given the responsibility of order and discipline as it pertains to the spiritual life within the spiritual kingdom. One of these ordained institutions employ physical force because the nature of its work demands it. The other uses love and persuasion, because the nature of its work demands it.

The Christian's relation to the nation is that of individual responsibility. The government deals with the individual. The church cannot speak for its members; and if it did the government would not accept it, but would still examine each individual in the case. The government is

fortunately very reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a "conscientious objector" may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are being made partly on the basis of "denominational pride" for the churches of Christ not to let some other church support our members in these camps. If one's convictions are so impractical as to force him to go to a concentration camp, we may respect them but we are certainly under no obligation to support them. Some are even glorifying these misguided young men, and making heroes out of them. But it is not a thing to be proud of that we have members of the church with such impractical convictions. The New Testament certainly teaches a different conception of the responsibilities of citizenship and service. If the New Testament teaches the course they pursue, then every Christian in the land must follow that course, and the church of Christ will go out of circulation into a concentration camp *for duration*. If the New Testament does not teach that course, then why should the church support those who follow it?

It is said that the president of a Christian school was opposed to Christians participating in civil government, but the school of which he was president employed an officer to carry a gun and guard the property of the school. Another preacher said that if his home and family were attacked, he would just shoot the attacker in the leg. No, not if his argument is right, he could not resist, he could not even push him off the porch. Nor could he consistently call for the sheriff, deputy or policeman to protect them from a killer, for it would make a murderer of them. It is a peculiar quirk of mind that argues that a Christian can work in perfect coordination with the other fellow up to the final and necessary act, but say to the officer or soldier, you are going to hell anyway, so you pull the trigger. God is no such respecter of persons. "If the thief be found breaking in, and be smitten so that he dieth, there shall be no blood guiltiness for him. "

Every passage used to prove that a Christian cannot participate in defensive warfare, under any conditions, applies to the spiritual realm and not the material. The conclusions are therefore based on a misapplication of the scriptures used.

In every congregation there are many parents who have noble sons in the service. Harrowing it must be to their hearts, indeed, to have to sit and listen to a misguided preacher harangue against their participation in the defense of the life and liberty that he and all the rest of us enjoy. It is a serious mistake to make *heroes* of men with a dwarfed conscience in concentration camps and *murderers* out of noble sons in army camps who bravely give their all in the defense of not only the freedom of the nation, but the very virtue of our mothers, wives and sisters—and the sanctity of all our homes.

The idea that if all were Christians there would be no need for civil government has no basis in fact. There would still be the need of the state to be kept separate from the church. Functions of the state are not to be confused with those of the church; both are ordained of God.

When the nation is at war against organized and militarized bandits who propose to conquer the world and enslave all free people; who would destroy our government, our institutions, our liberty, this crisis challenges Christians to think and act with becoming wisdom.

It is needless to assert that loyalty to the word of God must be the watch-word of a Christian at all times. There should be no compromise of the principle that a Christian's loyalty to God comes before, and takes precedence of, his loyalty to his government even in time of war. "We must obey God, rather than men." That is common ground among us.

Jesus taught that Christians should be willing to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, to bear personal intrusions and injuries, to return good for evil, and he strictly forbids revenge and retaliation for personal injuries. But it does violence to the teaching of Jesus in this regard if we conclude that there should be no law to function for the suppression and punishment of lawless men in society who must be controlled by force. The *Sermon On The Mount* was not a discourse against the proper functions and due processes of law and government. It has been said that all war is wrong and sinful, regardless of who wages it or why. If that is true, it is sinful for a police force to function in protecting our homes against robbery and insure us protection in property and life; and an officer of the law who intervenes with physical force to save a pure

woman from a rapist is sinning against God. We do not believe it and Jesus did not teach it. *Jesus Christ never taught anything to aid a criminal.* The government is ordained of God and bears the sword for this very purpose, to enforce law for the common good, suppress and punish crime, and assuredly has the right to defend itself against invasions of an enemy nation. Such function of government is an "ordinance of God. " We should thank God for our Army and Navy. Quoting the *Sermon On The Mount* would not stop a Hitler, a Stalin, a Krushchev or a Mao; and it was not given for that purpose. The arsenals of war are the means to that end and the men who build them and the ones who use them are using physical force directed at the same end. The industrial power of the whole nation is geared for war, and both combatants and non-combatants alike are working for the same thing—to win the war and win the peace. The man in uniform who fires the guns is not the only fighter. Belligerent "conscientious objectors" who stand off at a safe distance and quote irrelevant scriptures are nevertheless wishing that the current threat to our liberties may be crushed by our armed forces. The opposing powers would rejoice if our government would adopt their theory of non-resistance.

The advice to "resist not him that is evil" is against personal vengeance. It is not designed to allow a hoodlum to kidnap a child, or outrage a woman without interference by anybody who can stop it by force, even with a club or a gun. Even most conscientious objectors would act better in an emergency than some of them talk and write.

The Lord's saying, "give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away, " is not to be taken literally and without restriction—it is conditional. As a matter of fact, this part of the teaching of Jesus is not likely to be misunderstood by anybody. Even "conscientious objectors" know how to properly qualify "if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. " Should a non-resister return to his home and find that in his absence an intruder had unlawfully taken possession, would he appeal to the law? or just *bow* out and let the intruder *keep* it, or just kneel in prayer! Jesus did not teach it, and the "non-resisters" are more practical than their doctrine.

Christianity does not antagonize proper law enforce-

ment and law enforcement involves the use of physical resistance to the lawless. Paul asked for military interference to rescue him from a plot of assassination and received it. He appealed to Caesar, an appeal to all the power of the government of which he was a citizen, both civil and military. He did not violate the teaching of Jesus on the question of non-resistance.

It is obvious that some have simply carried that doctrine a lot farther than Jesus did. J. W. McGarvey made some appropriate observations along this line.

"This command which enjoins non-resistance, like most of the other precepts of this sermon, does not demand of us absolute, unqualified passivity at all times and under all circumstances. In fact, we may say generally of the whole sermon on the mount that it is not a code for slaves, but an assertion of principles which are to be interpreted and applied by the children of freedom. We are to submit to evil for principle's sake and to accomplish spiritual victories, and not in the abject, servile spirit as blind followers of a harsh and exacting law. On the contrary, taking the principle, we judge when and how to apply it as best we can. Absolute non-resistance may so far encourage crime as to become a sin... The example given, a slap in the face, has been regarded as a gross insult in all ages, but it is not an assault which imperils life... Self-preservation is a law of God giving right which, under most circumstances, a Christian can claim. He may resist the robber, the assassin and all men of that ilk, and may protect his person and his possessions against the assaults of the violent and lawless ... A man may strive for self-protection when life is threatened without any spirit of revenge. "

The law of Moses said "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. " The new law says, "Resist not him that is evil. " "Vengeance is mine, I will repay. " It is a law against the individual wreaking personal vengeance for the wrongs done him. Even our own government has some laws to that effect.

The command "thou shalt not kill" was given to the newly organized nation of Israel. That nation belonged to God—it did not belong to Satan. The laws of that nation were the laws of God, delivered through Moses. Alongside the prohibition against murder, the law of God provided for law enforcement, capital punishment and the executions

of war. Such civil and national activities therefore *were not murder*. When a criminal commits the act of murder, it is a sentimentally sick philosophy which concludes that the jury which convicts him and the judge who sentences him and the officer who executes him are all murders also. When a nation of free people find it necessary to go to war in the defense of its national life, it is twisted reasoning which assumes that the armed forces, the military personnel, and the nation, from the commander-in-chief President down to the munitions factory worker and tax-paying citizen, at once become murderers. The Bible does not teach by implication or inference such a concept of non-resistance. The people of our nation are not working for Satan when they are supporting and defending the right of government; rather are the officers of the people "ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing," as stated in Romans 13: 1-6, the context of which is connected with the preceding verses of the twelfth chapter.

It is in this connection that the reminder of the duty to "overcome evil with good," in Romans 12: 21, is repeated. And in the same vein of teaching which has been applied to all the other passages, this text deals not with legal resistance of evil, but enjoins the ethics of positive good in our personal dealing with the multiplied forms of evil surrounding us in our lives among men. In verse 17 it is taught that evil should not be recompensed for evil in personal retaliation, and verse 18 exhorts all to pursue peace with all men "if it be possible" and "as much as lieth in you," both of which is a clear indication that peace is not possible under all circumstances, but that its impossibility should not be laid to us. Verse 19 calls upon all to forego personal vengeance, yielding its place to the administration of wrath through the provisions that God himself has established in the processes of law and government—and at this point chapter 12 connects with chapter 13. The twelfth and thirteenth chapters of Romans were written together and should be taken together, and in so doing the reader passes from the exhortation in the twelfth chapter, on living peaceably with men, to the duty of obedience and submission to the civil power in the thirteenth chapter. The Jews at Rome were notorious over the whole empire for turbulence and rebellion. The Christians were regarded as a Jewish sect and were suspected of revolutionary aims.

And they were themselves in danger of being misled by false notions in regard to the nature of the kingdom of Christ and the relation of its citizens to a government of the world.

Paul's emphasis on the sword in chapter 13, in connection with the ordained prerogatives of government, vindicates the right of the civil power to capital punishment.

(2) Romans 13: 1-10:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour. Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. "

These verses in Romans 13 are an extension of the last verses of Romans 12, which include the charge, "avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. " The ten-verse section of chapter 13 explains how the individual gives place to wrath, and how vengeance belongs to God. Reference is made to legal vengeance against evil-doers, chapter 13, verse 4, states that God exerts it through the sword of the officer of civil government: "For he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that

doeth evil. " This is why personal retaliation must give place to law and order, which the sword symbolizes. The sword is not the sign of prison, but of capital punishment. The sword is not made "to kiss somebody with, " but it is the instrument of execution and stands for all the powers of the civil state. The penal prerogative is legal, and is not the direct act of God, nor is it for the individual to administer, but is the function of ordained government. The reasons for this are clear: the passions of men become violent, and need the restraining power of law, without which the individual himself would become the accuser, and the judge and the executioner in one person. So the mandate "give place to wrath" does not mean to yield to the wrath of enemies by not opposing their wickedness, but rather to give place to the wrath of God, whose prerogative it is, and these verses in Romans 13 expound in detail how it is exercised.

Verse 1: "Let every soul"—inclusive of every member of the church, whatever his office in the church—"be subject" to government, because Christianity is not hostile to civil and military power. Christians are also members of society, and are a part of the civil state. The "higher powers" designate ordained human government, inclusive of the civil and the military authorities. Due to the theocracy of the Old Testament, the Jews believed it was wrong to obey any government than their own. The clause "for there is no power but of God" means that God has not only appointed human government to rule society but that he approved it, and the right attitude of the Christian toward it is a duty.

On this point it is argued that Romans 13 applies to all governments, and if it includes Christians, it would be applicable to all Christians in all countries, the consequences of which, in course of armed military action, would eventuate in a Christian fighting another Christian in the opposing forces—resulting in a member of the church taking the life of another member of the church. The sophistry of that attempt at an argument can be discovered at a glance, in the necessary inference drawn from it, that it is *only wrong to fight a member of the church*, but if the one in the opposing force is not a church-member it would not be wrong to kill him!

In the old dispensation all Jews were the people of God—children of God in the old covenant, every Jew a brother of every other Jew in the covenant relation—yet the criminal code commanded the Jew to kill his brother Jew in certain civil circumstances requiring legal executions. The principles are the same.

Verse 2: "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. " The resistance here is the refusal to recognize its rightful sphere of existence which some of the Jews were doing, because of a mistaken allegiance to their own Jewish state. The consequence of disobedience to civil power is stated: "Shall receive to themselves demnation"—that is, the condemnation of the authorities resisted, in a judicial sentence. The purpose of this instruction was aimed to correct the Jewish sentiment that it was an impiety to obey any civil power than their own, as had been true of their nation in the Old Testament. This code in the Mosaic law is found in Deuteronomy 17: 14-15: "When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and thou shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set a king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother. " Based upon this code the Jews believed it to be wrong to recognize any other civil power to be of God. But God has ordained that man shall live in society, and civil government is necessary to its peace and security. It is therefore the government of God in the form of men.

Verse 3: "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil"—this refers to the character of the office, not the official. "Be not afraid of the power"—that is, the true mission of government is not fear, and it is wrong when it is so. "Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same"—the mission of government is good, and in doing that the praise of the government that has been so respected will be received.

Verse 4: "For he is the minister of God to thee for good... for he beareth not the sword in vain., a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. " The purpose of the government through its civil and military

officials is to maintain moral order in all legitimate designs, and in so doing they are ministers of God to the citizens, including the Christians both Jew and Gentile. The phrase "to thee" speaks to Christians as citizens, not as a favored class receiving this protection from other citizens, but exempt from the responsibilities and obligations incumbent upon any other citizen. Being a minister of God who "beareth not the sword in vain," the civil officer has the authority of God, by his approval of government functions, to execute criminals. The sword is an instrument of legal punishment, the symbol of decapitation, and in the capacity of "a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" it has divine sanction.

Verse 5: "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." It is needful to be subject for the reasons stated, the legal and penal wrath of the civil power when it is disobeyed; and "for conscience sake" toward God who appointed and approved it, and in refusal to obey, the one doing so is in disobedience to God as well as to the civil power. True religion is subject to this ordinance. Any religion not compatible with the rights of members of the same society has no right to operate, and should be suppressed, not as a religion, but as an enemy of the liberty and freedom of all the people.

Verse 6: "For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's minister, attending continually upon this very thing." The word *also* denotes an obligation on the part of the Christian who with all other citizens paid tribute, and his further obligations also extended alongside with his fellow-citizens. The passage does not support the sentiment that the Christian's obligation to government ends with payment of tribute in acknowledgment of submission, and custom of goods, and taxation on real and personal property—the additional obligation involves the mutual responsibilities of all other citizens toward the government essential to the common good, even the protection of society with the sword, for they who bear the sword "are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing."

Verse 7: "Render therefore to all their dues." The tribute that on any person is due; the custom that on any goods is due; the fear to magistrates in proper regard for the law and its offices; and honor, the respect for the rank

and position of the official holding the office. All of this is an exposition on the rights and prerogatives of a sovereign state, but the submission is based upon the true mission of government and does not extend to a tyrant who himself opposes the constitution of a government. Subjection "for conscience sake" does not require submission to usurpations of tyrannical governments which have given citizens cause through the centuries for the revolutions which have preserved true government among men of many nations.

Verse 8: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." This is the superior statute. From the duties of government, the apostle turns to the over all spiritual duty to all men, which is couched in one word—love. The exposition passes from the legal to the regal. The civil law does not require love, only submission. But the law of Christ transcends the laws of men. The civil law could not enforce love, it is not enforceable; it is commanded as a principle of true religion along with the principle of true government. The command to "owe no man anything" means to acquit all debts based on moral honesty, including any obligation, debt or duty, and is not restricted to money. The exception—"except to love one another"—refers to the debt that is never discharged, which is the debt of all, a debt which none will ever cease to owe to "one another," as a band in general society, joined by a special relation. And this love "hath fulfilled the law," because love is the source of all good; it is the motive that induces the performance of all duty, and prevents injustice to man and disobedience to God; it therefore fulfills in principle the whole law commanded of God, and which is right by reason in relation to man.

Verse 9: "And if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The reference is to any other commandment than the decalogue; it is comprehended, or summed up, in that the command is all inclusive; in that love for the neighbor adjusts all the relations to society and regulates all duties to men; and love for God governs the attitude toward God and obedience to Him.

Verse 10: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor." The word neighbor projects the human relationship beyond acquaintance into a bond of friendship for all men; and

working no ill to the neighbor is that restraint from the doing of wrong which affects another. It is respect for the neighbor, joined to love for God. This precept of love binds us all to the law of God in society and to the law of God in the church, and in being full and complete, it comprehends all, and fulfills the whole.

The compatibility of corporate coercion, the resistance of an organized community against predatory evildoers within its own borders, with the law of love is fully established in the thirteenth chapter of Romans. The insistence that resistance and coercion in all forms violate the law of love is in character with the classic lines of Emerson, "when love rules and whines—" it makes love a sentimental rule.

(3) Romans 13 and Revelation 20:

A preacher correspondent has ventured to attempt a parallel between Rom. 13: 1-4 and Rev. 20: 4—asserting that *we* are not included in the *he* of Rom. 13 any more than the first person *we* would be a part of the third person *they* in Rev. 20. It is a fact that "we" are not a part of the "they" or of what John was referring to in Revelation 20. But we are a part of the government under which we live and are therefore an integral part of the "he" of Romans 13. For instance, it was Paul who wrote Romans 13; but Paul was a Roman citizen, and said so. Therefore, Paul was himself a part of the "he" of Romans 13. Since it was admitted that "he" refers to the government, and Paul was a part of the "he," and it is agreed that "the government does the sword bearing," it follows that Paul could have been a sword-bearer as "a minister of God for good"—but a Christian today cannot be one! We have been reminded that God has told men "in different ages" to do different things—but Paul did not live in "a different age" from the age in which we are living. Could the Roman citizen, as a Christian who was a part of that "he" (government), do a thing that an American citizen, as a Christian today, cannot do?

The attempted argument that Christians are not a part of the "he" of Romans 13 would force the conclusion that there were no Roman citizens who were Christians, and no Christians who were Roman citizens. That would make it hard on Paul, the Roman citizen. On the other hand, if

there were some Christians who were Roman citizens, and hence a part of the "he" (the government), and some Christians who were not Roman citizens, and hence not a part of the "he, " it follows that some Christians could be "a minister of God for good" in bearing the sword and some could not! According to that "brand of reasoning" some Christians could do a thing that other Christians could not do. The inevitable conclusion from such premises would be that in order to be exempt from the responsibility of sword-bearing one would have to be an alien! In this "age" that would automatically exempt him. It has been very appropriately suggested that those who are arguing on the conscientious objector's side of this question should, in order to be consistent, register as aliens.

The preachers who are conscientious objectors all perform marriage ceremonies, like all other preachers. When he does so, whose agent is he? Who gives him the authority to perform wedding ceremonies? The Bible does not. In that capacity he acts as a minister of the government—an officer of the state. Therefore, when the preacher performs a marriage ceremony, as a civil officer, he makes himself a part of that "he, " of which it is said that no Christian is a part. So that makes it hard on him, as well as Paul. As a civil officer in executing a marriage license he is in the same category with all other civil magistrates, doing the same thing. Since the "he" of Romans 13 is the civil magistrate, what becomes of his contention that the preacher, himself, is not a part of the "he"? But since he is a part of the "he" by his own official acts, then "he" could act in the capacity of "a minister of God" who "beareth not the sword in vain, " when it is "for good. "

The contention that a Christian is no part of the government (and if that line of thought does not mean that, it does not mean anything) will force preachers to surrender their credentials as a civil magistrate in performing wedding ceremonies, or any other government function. Let all parties contracting marriage in the section where such preachers preach the CO. doctrine be so advised. And the government, too, for it is doubtful that the government would pass out such credentials to anyone who admits that he is not a part of the government. If I believed that way, I would not accept the credentials nor would I perform such offices in and for the government

It is becoming more and more evident that there are a lot of "Christians" (mostly among the preachers) who think it is quite all right to claim the *privileges* of a citizen, but altogether wrong to bear the *responsibilities* of one. Not being a part of the "he" of Romans 13 does not bar them from the privileges, it only exempts from responsibilities !

As for trying to parallel our contention on the government issue with the efforts of some who defend Premillennialism, that is absurd. They are in reverse gear in that effort. The very background of Premillennialism is the contention that all human government belongs to the devil and must be overthrown in order that Christ may set up his own government on earth, which will be the millennium. Russell taught it; Rutherford taught it; the Jehovah Witnesses cult still teach it—and some of our brethren appear to teach it. It is on the record that premillennial advocates within our ranks teach that all human government will be overthrown and there will be a period of time when no government will exist on earth except Christ's own government. All Premillennialists have similar ideas of it. So the silly attempt to link our contention with Premillennialism becomes a boomerang. The brethren who are opposing participation in civil and military government are themselves the ones who are yoked with the Premillennialists, for that it Premillennial doctrine in the very essence of it, including all shades and colors, forms and phases.

(4) II Corinthians 10: 2-6.

But I beseech *you*, that I may not be bold when I am present with that confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against some, which think of us as if we walked according to the flesh. For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare *are* not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him

A certain brother has conscientious scruples against bearing arms for the government, but who has no scruples against making armaments in the factories. In stating his objections to combatant military service, he writes: "I am doing all that I can to win this war in a non-combatant way." Another brother writes that he is "opposed to taking up carnal weapons, but will do any work necessary to win the war." What kind of *weapons* will these brethren use *in a non-combatant way* in doing the work necessary "to win this war"? Are the tools they use and the work they do to win the war *spiritual*? If not, they are *carnal*. A little reflection on this point will reveal to any thoughtful person that non-combatants are themselves using *carnal weapons*.

But those who are opposed to active military service in the struggle to preserve the independence of the nation very frequently and fluently quote II Corinthians 10: 3-6. The passage reads: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds;) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

We are told by the authorities that it takes ten men doing non-combatant service to support one man in combat. There are brethren who argue that the one man in combat is violating II Corinthians 10: 4 in the use of carnal weapons in carnal warfare, but the ten men in non-combatant work who support him do not violate that passage. But the tools that are used by the ten men in making the armaments are just as carnal as the guns that are used by the one. Who can make himself believe that the ten men who use carnal tools to make carnal weapons to support one man in carnal warfare are innocent, but the one man who uses them is guilty?

If the passage under consideration applies to members of the church participating in the military service of the government in which they are citizens, one thing is certain—the non-combatant participator is as guilty as the combatant participator in this war. But that is not Paul's point. Such an application misses the meaning of the passage.

What are the carnal weapons and warfare of II Corinthians 10: 4? Compare a few passages in which the same

word is used. In Romans 15: 27 Paul says: "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of these *spiritual* things, their duty is also to minister unto them in *carnal* things. " In this passage "carnal" is the opposite of "spiritual. " Again, in I Corinthians 9: 11, Paul writes, "If we have sown unto you *spiritual* things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your *carnal* things?" The same word in II Corinthians 1: 12 is rendered "fleshly. " So any fleshly thing is carnal in this sense. It is in that sense that reference is made to the carnal ordinances of the law in contrast with the spiritual nature of the new covenant.

Then what is the meaning of Paul's assertion that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal"? He was simply referring to the *nature* of the conflict in which the church at Corinth was engaged against the forces and influences of paganism, idolatry and Judaism—it was a spiritual warfare, not a carnal one. Preserving the play on the words of the preceding verse, in his illustration the members of the Corinthian church were serving as soldiers, but the nature of their campaign was spiritual, hence their weapons were not carnal.

Is non-combatant service *spiritual*? If not, it is *carnal*, and somebody loses a proof-text in the effort to condemn combatant service while justifying non-combatant service. It shows the inconsistency of the contention that the one man in combat service does wrong, while the ten men in non-combat service do right. The plain fact of the matter is that II Corinthians 10: 4 does not apply to participation in the civil and military services of the nation, and any such use of it is a misapplication of the text.

Commenting on the passage, B. W. Johnson says that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal" means that the might of the church is not human strength and human armaments, but spiritual weapons by which souls are rescued from the philosophies of the false teachers. Mac-Knight, the translator and commentator, says that the passage refers to the weapons by which the church made war on heathen religions, that the gospel was not a weak, fleshly, carnal weapon, but the mighty instrument of Paul in overturning the fortresses of religious error and casting down human imaginations by the force of spiritual weapons.

Paul visualized a spiritual conquest, a pulling down of spiritual strongholds. The teachers of error, idolatry

and Judaism were the invaders at Corinth. They had thrown up siege-works against the truth and had threatened the church with destruction. Paul regarded these adversaries of the truth as besiegers. He himself was the commandant of the faithful garrison and he declared his determination to wield his weapons against the besiegers and their strongholds and pull them down. But the nature of the conflict was spiritual, therefore the weapons of the warfare with which he would overthrow Satan's siege were spiritual weapons. He did not propose to machine-gun paganism out of them nor shoot the gospel into them. Nor does anyone propose to do so today. Being a spiritual warfare, his weapons were not carnal, so he would "lead" their "thoughts" into the "captivity of Christ." All who accepted the gospel were led into this happy captivity, but the "revenge of disobedience" would be inflicted upon the rebellious recalcitrants who rejected the gracious terms of the gospel.

If there is an argument to be derived from this passage on "combatant or non-combatant service" on the part of citizens of an earthly government, the forceful figure of military operations against aggressors would be in favor of the combatant service of a citizen rather than the conscientious objector to it.

The proposition of the author's initial editorial of some years ago on this civil and military government issue holds: *Every passage used to prove that a member of the church cannot participate in defensive warfare, under any conditions, applies to the spiritual realm and not the material. The conclusions are therefore based on a misapplication of the scriptures used.* I have not yet seen an argument that furnishes an exception to this proposition.

For an additional thought on carnal and spiritual weapons, the McGarvey-Pendleton Commentary suggests that "carnal weapons" referred to "methods of slander, detraction and misrepresentation" employed by the enemies of the truth that Paul preached, but Paul declared that he used no such carnal weapons in dealing with *his* opponents. In that view of it, there are some now who are certainly using carnal weapons in the form of *carnal words* in their *opposition* to carnal warfare. But they do not believe in *carnal weapons*. Wonder if they think that wicked words are spiritual!

A major trouble with some *combatant* non-combatants appears to be that their conception of a carnal weapon is restricted to gunpowder, bombs and bullets. But in all the premises of the case, one thing stands out: The ten non-combatant men who use carnal tools to make carnal armaments to keep one combatant man fighting are as much participants in carnal warfare as the one man is who fights for the ten who furnish him the arms. The argument is therefore reduced to an issue between the conscientious non-combatants and the conscientious objectors. Let them settle it among themselves. It is their debate. Some are all-out non-resisters, declaring that it would be wrong to even offer physical resistance in the protection of their homes against a murderous invader. Others are not full-fledged non-resisters but are non-combatants. Others aver that it is right to pay *war taxes* but wrong to buy *war bonds*. There are others among them who can conscientiously vote, run for office, hold jobs in the government of the people, but cannot have anything to do with the military end of it—except receive its protection. Then there are those who consign the whole works, both the civil and the military government, to the devil, and will have nothing to do with any of it—except to receive the pensions or whatever the *devil's government* has to give them. All of these sentiments are represented among those who want to debate "the war question"—90 let them debate it, among themselves.

Today there are enough members of the churches of Christ in several states to decide any election if they should vote in a block—a thing they should never as a church do, and knowing their independence it is the author's opinion that they never will do so. Notwithstanding this general practice of the members of the churches to participate in all branches of civil and military services of the government it was nevertheless considered heretical for me to defend the scriptural right to do it. Not at the start, but later, my chief critics were certain school men who, strange as it seems, did not themselves actually disagree with me on the government questions, but who had been antagonized by our opposition to their campaign to put the colleges in the budgets of the churches, and they combined to *put me in my place*. It was generally conceded that our medium had been the most effective instrument in stopping that move-

ment, although G. H. P. Showalter, publisher and editor of the *Firm Foundation*, stood staunchly against the colleges in the budgets of the churches. The fight, however, in deep resentment focused on us, and the combination was formed to obliterate us; and the issues shifted from the *college* contention to the *war* question, with charges of inconsistency and heresy levelled at this editor. It was the spirit of these charges that moved the dispassionate R. L. Whiteside to submit an article for publication containing a direct rebuke to the men in high places who were making these personal attacks. Under its original title of *Consistency* that article is reprinted in this section.

It is a matter of record that the men who were hurling at us the charge of changing on the government question had themselves changed on the issue of the colleges and of civil and military government, and their own opposite statements were printed and made available to all. The statements that military compliance is immoral and that war is never right indicts God himself who commanded war; and no less so of the apostle Paul who declared that the officer that bears the sword for good against the evildoer is a minister of God in so doing. So the statements quoted that the command of the government to take up the sword contravenes the teaching of Him who said "put up thy sword" was resolved into a self-challenge by virtue of their own reversed positions. But Jesus did not command Peter to abandon his sword, or to disarm, he commanded him to put it "into his place"—that is, to sheathe it. Peter was making the wrong use of it. If the sword itself had been wrong Jesus would have ordered Peter to disarm, discard the sword, cast it away, not merely to put it in its place.

Accessible quotations from the pens of able men in the church, including the men who have been my critics, showing the changes in their private views and public statements over a period of years, and after they had reached maturity of mind, reveals how fluid the views of the brethren have been through the years on these questions, and it ill becomes men who have repeatedly changed their own views to bring a railing accusation against another. Such changes are not proof of fickleness but rather an indication that the views of able and honorable men have been pliable and somewhat less than certain on the civil and military government questions. In the period before World

War I the colleges and the churches were being pressured to publish statements in the papers and file statements with the proper Bureau in Washington D. C. as a sort of credo on war; but in World War II, when young men all over the nation, without respect of persons, were being drafted into the armed forces, the same men signed statements to the draft boards that the *church* has no *official* position on military service, that it is a matter of private conviction and individual decision; and that colleges operated by members of the church are not a unit, that some faculty members would be objectors and others were not—but formerly these same men had declared that combatant service is entirely *contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ*, and that this concept had been taught *as a doctrine* since the founding of the school. This was indeed a radical change and it would behoove the men who made it not to lay the charge of *changing* against another.

X. THE FUNCTION OF CONSCIENCE

"For when the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, not having the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in the hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another"—Rom. 2: 14-15.

The definition of *conscience*, according to Cruden, is that inner testimony and judgment which approves or reproaches actions which the mind believes to be good or evil—the particular knowledge in oneself of his own deeds, right or wrong, arising out of the general knowledge of his mind, which show him what is good or bad, conscience bearing witness when he has done the one or the other—and Rom. 2: 15 is cited as the text in which the word is so used.

On this text, in his Commentary on Romans, R. L. Whiteside makes the following comments: "It was the work of the law, and not the law itself, that was written on the hearts of the Gentiles. This, of course, referred to the moral requirements of the law. The moral requirements of the law are just such things that any decent set of people would recognize as proper and right, even if they never had a revelation. Their conscience, like the conscience of those who had a revealed law, would accuse them when they failed

to live up to their standard of right, and approve them when they did right as they saw it. That is the office of conscience. But what is conscience? It is frequently referred to as a guide. But conscience is not a guide at all; that is not its office. Also, it is said that conscience is a creature of education; but I see not how any one would go about educating his conscience. It is also defined as moral judgment, but that definition does not fit. Your moral judgment may tell you that a certain person did very wrong, but his act does not affect your conscience in any way, unless you feel responsible for his action. Lid dell and Scott define the Greek word "conscience" thus: (1) A knowing with one's self, consciousness; (2) conscience. Where we have two words—"consciousness" and "conscience"—the Greeks had one word, and the connection determines its meaning, or, perhaps speaking more accurately, the connection determines its application. "Consciousness" has a broader application than "conscience. " A person is conscious of his own bodily sensations, whether pleasurable or painful; he is also conscious of his own thoughts and emotions. We are getting at conscience when we think of it as that feeling of pleasure when we do what we think is right, and of pain when we do what we think is wrong. It is that which backs up our moral judgment. Saul of Tarsus always did what he thought was right, and therefore always had a good conscience. But his information was wrong, and therefore his moral judgment was wrong. Our judgment may be wrong because the ideas upon which we base our judgment may be wrong. But no matter how we have been taught, we can expect our conscience to urge us to do what we have judged to be right, unless it has been deadened by long indulgence in things we know to be wrong. It seems to me that a live, tender conscience is infallible. But as to moral judgment, no man can safely say that he is right on everything. Gain all the information you can so that you can form correct judgments, and give heed to the urge of conscience. "

Forming a conclusion from semantic premises, the definition of conscience may be put in this one sentence: *the moral sense within one's self that determines whether he considers his own conduct wrong.*

In no area of contemporary life has the question of following the teaching of Jesus Christ seemed more critical

than in that of war and peace. The attitude of the Christian toward war, whether in combat or non-combat, is a problem confronting sincere and earnest minds. Within the church there has never been uniformity of judgment. In the realm of conscience there are several classifications. This moral function of conscience is an integral part of the principles involved in any useful consideration of the basic premises.

First, there is the natural, or moral, conscience which approves or reproaches actions according to *what one believes*, whether it is right or wrong, in keeping with his information or the teaching received and believed.

Second, there is the willful conscience, originating in the evil mind, arising from bad character. It is a malicious and malevolent and criminal conscience, peculiar to the individual, below the social standards and therefore the moral conscience of the community, and which must be restrained by society through the civil state. This introduces a phase of resistance to evil which finds sanction in the scriptures of both the old and new testaments. There are examples of it in the Noachian code (Genesis 9: 6); in the Mosaic law (Exodus 22: 2; Deuteronomy 13: 9); in the teaching of Christ (Matthew 13: 52; Revelation 13: 10); and in the epistles of the New Testament (Romans 13: 1-6; 1 Peter 2: 13-15). Instances of this civil restraint of perversity may be cited in the legal proscription of the polygamous practices of the Mormons, the exhibitionist colonies of the Nudists, and in all prohibition laws. The conscience of an individual is not authority in any realm—moral, legal or religious.

Third, the opinionated conscience is egocentric, unduly attached to self-opinion, something stronger than impression, but less than knowledge—it is self-centered; it is egoism, the doctrine that the individual self-interest is the valid end, the conscious motive of all action. It is a state of mind which with proper distinctions may be termed the arbitrary conscience, an attitude of dogmatism which consists in creating a set of standards based on individual judgment and personal bias—judgmatic decisions as they apply to the person himself, in reference to what is right or wrong by the criterion of his own moral standard.

Fourth, an imperious or vindictive conscience is an atti-

tude of absolutism in one who predicates personal views for principles beyond dispute; he is an absolutist, holding his own conscience to be the dictator over all others—the vindictive attitude.

Fifth, a sentimental conscience is dominated by feeling, prompted and governed by excessive emotion—a sentimentalist, emotionally controlled rather than by intellectual conclusions. It consists of the type of an abnormal sensitivity, an extreme susceptibility or sensitivity, to conscientious doubts and fears, which is not content with self-censorship but acts as overseer of the conduct of others—the disposition to impose one's will on others. It is an addiction to censure which develops into the hypercritical complex of cynicism, condemnatory of the expressions of others. This is, indeed, the painful conscience—a pain to the one who has it and to everybody else in his presence. It extends to the attitude of hostility toward the functions of government and the processes of law and even to the Christian's right to political suffrage, in the exercise of the ballot, a prerogative of ordinary citizens to vote their choice for public officials and functionaries of government. To be against voting and participation in the functions of government are not evidences of either wisdom or virtue and is not an exemplification of Christianity.

Sixth, the true conscience is licit in accordance with and conformable to law; legitimate in that it is authorized by law and thus arrives at legal and legitimate conclusions. It is *lawful* as it respects civil government; it is *ethical* in its relation to society; it is *scriptural* in the sphere of religion. It is the genuine conscience, conforming to proven principles, authentic standards, rooted in law, ethics and scripture—"accusing or else excusing" on the basis of exactly what an existing thing is in accordance with the veritable and actual facts, agreeable with truth. This conscience which is the result of the legal knowledge for moral and spiritual dictates consists in an examination of the standard of authority to ascertain what is lawful and right; the scrutinizing of the legal premises and conclusions; the discovery of the moral principles; and conformity to the exactions of moral obligations in comparison with reactionary and enlightened standards.

Respect for law and government are so important that

only the unmistakably clear and imperative urge of conscience could possibly justify resistance. "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation"—that is, condemnation of the power resisted—"wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. " (Romans 13)

Posed here are such questions as: Is it moral to fight? Can a Christian resist? Can a soldier be saved? These questions cannot be studied apart from every citizen's duty to the social order and relation to the civil state. We all wish for a world in which these questions need not be asked, and in which no man's conscience would ever be put to the test of deciding them, but that has never been the state of society since earthly governments were established, nor shall it ever be the ideal condition of this present world. With a questionable air of august authority and the doubtful appearance of great confidence some men have answered the foregoing questions with an emphatic *no*. But when some of us have answered *yes* to the above questions, we have by no means conceded to a lack of moral discernment nor confessed to spiritual infirmity.

The revelation of God in reference to the moral order, the progress of mankind and the divine purpose in all things include retribution as well as redemption, justice and judgment as well as grace and mercy.

The persistence and pugnacity with which some have obtruded certain personal views on how to rule the society of the world by civil authority without military power is not only contradictory of the inherent character and relation of civil and military government, but is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ in his declaration to Pilate in John 18: 36. Such concepts of conscience have precipitated difficult situations in the community and in the church.

There is an organized pacificism which appeals for group conscientious objectors who refuse any alternative service in a local, state or national crisis, and which strains the right of individual conscience to a breaking point. They would enjoy all of the benefits of citizenship but deny its responsibilities and disown all of its obligations. Some elements of human society are in a country to get out of it all they can, rather than of the country to give to it all they can. We should measure duties by *rights* and social burdens

by *benefits*, and to freely receive from society is to freely give to it, even more.

Personal objection to the policies of government does not furnish ground for the conscientious objector attitude toward government. A judge may be convinced that a law requiring capital punishment for murder does not discriminate in the degree of guilt, yet the duty of his office imposes the same sentence upon all. A jurymen may be opposed to capital punishment, but if the evidence proves the accused of guilt, he is not justified in refusing assent to the guilty verdict. Official position may require doing what if one had no such responsibility he may abstain from doing.

The effort to apply the redemption of grace to punitive law and legal retribution to criminal justice and the problems of war, when they are in the realm of the functions of government, is a common mistake and is a misapplication of basic principles. The two principles do not belong to the same realm. If this is not true the civil power could not enforce a legal penalty upon an offender whom God had forgiven, whether it be adultery, murder, theft or treason. And since the Lord said forgiveness may be seven times seven, no civil or legal punishments for repeated acts could be administered if repentance and forgiveness existed. Civil law does not enforce the commandments of God, as such; neither does divine forgiveness intercept legal punitive processes. And if the Christian cannot be a statesman, the Christian cannot function as a citizen in being a party to making and electing a statesman to civil office. For instance, the President of the United States is the Commander-in-Chief of the army and the navy—the armed forces of the nation. If military duty is wrong, and to be in the army is wrong, to participate in the election of the commander-in-chief of the army would be equally wrong, and it follows that a vote for the President of the United States would be as wrong as the performance of military duty as a soldier in the armed forces which he commands. These conclusions are inevitable in the premises, and the consequences would be the dissolution of organized society, civil and military.

It is difficult for some to reconcile defensive war with the teaching of Christ, and they regard all fighting as an abandonment of the principles of the Lord's *Sermon On The Mount* and a desertion of discipleship. The failure to make the discrimination in the nature of things, when and what

to resist and not to resist, is here evident. This interpretation of the *Sermon On The Mount* and the teaching of the Lord condemns the very institution of civil government, the lack of which the world would be without the civilization necessary to the planting and progress of Christianity itself, for all civil society would be destroyed. While the pacifists deny that their condemnation of resistance or coercion condemns civil government, it is nevertheless the obvious consequence of the conscientious objector viewpoint, in that its logical conclusion would abolish all penal enactments without which no effective civil government could be established or maintained. The man who believes all resistance wrong must also object to all courts, judicial proceedings and decisions, ownership of property through warranty deeds, and all other projects requiring civil enforcement. But if civil government is right, military government must also be right, for it requires the power of the military to execute and enforce the civil enactments. They stand or fall together, whether on state, national or international levels.

Attempts have been made to by-pass the logical conclusions predicated by non-resistance theories of the conscientious objector and to span the gap in the necessary consequences that follow their sophisms, but the efforts result in the inevitable pains that invariably attend the failures to harmonize inconsistencies. The broad breach between the pacifist premises and the consequential conclusions cannot be bridged. Any interpretation of the *Sermon On The Mount* that would allow a difference between what is right or wrong in the Lord's teaching on non-resistance and the duties of the sheriff, policeman or peace officer may be colorable and have an appearance of plausibility, but it is specious reasoning and must be classed with sheer sophistry. There is no difference in the principles involved in the law enforcement agencies of the county sheriff, the town policeman, and the offices and operations of the soldier and the sailor, from the lowest to the highest rank. The people are at war all of the time against the criminal elements in our society through the law enforcement agencies of the city, the county, the state and the nation. The soldier is a national officer and does not differ in principle from the local peace officer.

Law enforcement is war at the local level, and our na-

tional defense in the recurrent international crises is war on the extended scale. If a state or nation has the right to territorial existence, it has the inherent right to defend its territories and existence. Therefore, if the civil government is legally and morally right, the military is automatically and equally so, for civil government cannot exist without the military to uphold and support it. This statement is so self-evident as to become a virtual truism. My own previous sympathy with the non-combat phase of the pacifist position was coupled with the inability to deny the inconsistency of its dictum and the consistency of the objections to it. The purpose of this volume is to help others out of the mental and spiritual confusions of political pacificism into the adjustment of the individual's relation to civil society and his membership in the church of Christ.

After the alliance of Japan with Hitlerian Germany and the Pearl Harbor attack on the United States naval installations, which precipitated the declaration of war against Japan and Germany by our national congress, the members of the church, the parents of volunteers and draftees for military service, and the youth of the nation were faced with the alternative of enlistment for military service in some capacity, or the stigma of retention in the Conscientious Objector's Camp for the duration of a war in which others would be engaged to fight and die to preserve a government of human freedom and religious liberty. Preachers took to their pulpits and editors to their pens, exhorting the churches with vociferous voices and vehement quills to file certified CO. papers with the local and national draft boards and bureaus to "put the Church of Christ on record," through the signatures of editors, college presidents and representative preachers as a Conscientious Objectors organization.

Aside from such a presumptuous misrepresentation of the church, this call for such an action presented a serious doctrinal angle. Who can represent the "Church Of Christ" as a religious body in anything? No editor, college president, prominent preacher or eldership can represent or speak for the church in any such capacity. This very action was a strike at the basic principles underlying the organization and government of the church. The church of Christ is not a denominational body, has no earthly headquarters, no conventional procedures, and no delegate system of repre-

sentation. Not even the elders of the local churches can speak for the consciences of the members. The Conscientious Objectors viewpoint has never been representative of the church, rather a small part in comparison with the whole. Certain clamorous minority elements have always indulged in considerable vocalization against what they have termed "the Christian's participation in civil government and carnal warfare, " while the great majority of the members of the church have silently ignored the ebullitions, and have continued to exercise the citizen's right of franchise, voting for their choice of candidates for government offices, holding such offices themselves, and participating in both civil and military government. It is from the misguided efforts of certain editors and preachers that the church has received adverse advertisement and bad publicity throughout the nation, identifying the church in the public mind as being on the level with such anti-government sects as Jehovah's Witnesses and the like of them.

Actually, the so-called "war question" has been divided into two points of view by the advocates of non-participation.

(1) The all-out Conscientious Objectors view—objection to military service of any kind, or the wearing of the uniform of any branch of service, choosing the detention camp or prison rather than enlistment, voluntarily or compulsory, in any corp of the army and navy, or of the government itself in time of war.

(2) The less radical Non-Combatant view, objectors to combat service only—that members of the church, a Christian, may engage in all services of the army, the navy and the government which do not require the bearing of arms.

This latter view had been my own "taken for granted" or preconceived sentiments, derived from others without the effort of logical examination of the premises and the conclusions. In the maturity of later study the inconsistencies of this viewpoint became apparent, and its fallacies patent. The war department issued statements that it would require ten men in non-combat to support one man in combat—should the one man be judged *guilty*, but the ten men aiding him declared *innocent*? If such is true, then there is no such thing as an *accomplice in crime*, and our whole judicial and penal system which decrees that an ac-

complice—one who aids and abets—and the perpetrator are equally guilty, is erroneous and must be revamped. Consistency compelled either an all-out submission to the Conscientious Objector viewpoint or the full acceptance of civil and military responsibilities of government. The alternative required a review of what had been taken for granted. My convictions had been immature and emotional, the result of which was that the first and only public or printed statement that came from me was premature and illogical, and it needed correction. As a matter of fact, the question was not singly and solely what it had been called—*the war question*—but rather the *government question*, for the potentialities of war are only collaterally related to war on all levels, local, national and international. It is not primarily a question of participation in *carnal war* but of the performance of the duties of *carnal government*, for all civil government is carnal; and all law enforcement is war.

The early statement of my views was a brief one, and was printed in my own medium more than thirty years ago, later reprinted and rescinded in another medium of my own, with candid corrections and explanations in connection with the then current discussions. The personal consequences of making these forthright retractions had not been considered, nor had the condemnations and commendations been anticipated, the latter surprisingly far more than the former. Most of the criticisms stemmed from devotion to the Lipscomb theory advanced in the book *Civil Government*, by David Lipscomb. He was a great and gigantic man in all proportions, loved and admired by all Christians who knew him or came within the influence of his powerful pen, and he was admittedly a balance wheel in the restoration days of the church. None of us has reflected on his greatness as a man, so far as human goodness goes, nor have any of us questioned his integrity, nor would we deflect his stature if we could. It has been my unremitting feeling that it was for purely prejudicial reasons that we were accused of attacking David Lipscomb by critics who were known not to indorse the Lipscomb thesis themselves, either in theory or in practice.

The general brotherhood of the churches of Christ, in all the states, have never accepted the civil government theory that a Christian cannot vote, hold government offices, and participate in both the civil and the military functions

of government. The members of the church in old Tennessee, the native land of Lipscomb and the cradle of the church in the South, have always voted *en masse* and have been elected to low and high place, positions and offices of local, state and national government, and they have served in the military from the common private to the commanding general. The objectors to military service present a pose of possessing a monopoly on conscience, but the multiple thousands of the young and the old out of the mass of some three million members of the churches of Christ who recognize the licit relation to organized society are conscientious, too, having "a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned" (1 Tim. 1: 5) wherein they do exercise (Acts 24: 16) "always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men. "

SECTION TWO

THE CIVIL STATE

—SECTION TWO—

THE CIVIL STATE

I. THE CHARACTER OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

The relation of the Christian to civil society superimposes the question of civil government—what is civil government? As a negative antecedent to answering the question, it is *not* moral government. The civil government does not legislate morality, but rather what is *civil*. The civil government is not designed to punish immorality, but rather that which is *uncivil*. God is the only Ruler of the moral realm, and is therefore the only moral Governor. The rulers of states are the civil governors—the civil magistrates are the civil rulers. The word *civil* is defined: "Pertaining to a city or state, or to a citizen in his relation to his fellow-citizens. " We owe to Caesar—civil government—only that which is civil. We owe to God that which is moral or religious. The civil statutes define crime, not sin; and the divine statutes deal with sin, not crime. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin, " and "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. " (Romans 3: 20, 23). All have sinned—have become immoral by transgression—according to Paul's declaration to the Romans. But John says, "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law. " (1 John 3: 4). One who has become immoral, a sinner, by transgression of law, cannot become moral—or justified—by law, but by forgiveness in obedience to positive command, and only by the Author and source of morality.

Civil government pertains only to what its name implies—that which is civil. Morality belongs to and is rendered to God. Civility belongs to and is rendered to the state. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. " (Mark 12: 17). While it is not the function of civil government to legislate morality, but rather what is civil, nevertheless civility is the opposite of uncivility, and the civil authority or power en-

forces certain moral precepts—murder, perjury, theft—not as the commands of God, but as violations of civil relations, as they affect all other members of the civil society. If such moral precepts are enforced by the civil authority as the commands of God, the civil power would then enact and enforce penalties and punishments for hate, falsehood, impurity, evil thought, and lust—for all of that is immorality. On the same principle, if the function of the civil power is to enforce the commands of God, then the civil magistrate could have no rightful authority to enforce civil law against one whose transgression God had forgiven. Take this case in point: Between the time a criminal is found guilty and the imposing or passing of the sentence, he repents and obtains divine forgiveness—if the civil government is enforcing the law of God, then the civil power must forgive when God forgives, and let the convicted criminal *go free*; and, furthermore, since forgiveness, according to the Lord, is to be granted "seven times seven times," it follows that the civil power must do the same thing successively and in repetition.

When one is guilty of theft, murder, perjury, or any other form of violation, and should say "I repent"—should he go free? Shall the state have nothing more to do with the case or the penalty if God forgives his sin? The Lord's command to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's applies here. The rightful existence and function of civil government is recognized by the Lord together with its just claims upon us. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Romans 13: 1). It is according to this passage that the citizen's duties under civil government pertain only to the government and his fellowmen, because the powers of civil government pertain solely to the relations of men to men and to the government. Further in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, the apostle says: "And if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It becomes evident that the civil government is ordained of God in things pertaining to the relations of man with his fellowman.

The civil government has the divinely ordained right to protect the person and the property of citizens from all invasion from within or without, but for this power to be

exercised by every person, every man's hand would be against his neighbor, and it would result in anarchy- Personal protection could be only in the degree that the ability of each person could provide. In civil government the individual surrenders to the state his rights in these respects and receives in return the protection of the power of an organized society as a corporate whole through the functions of law and government. The connection between verse nineteen of the twelfth chapter of Romans and verses three and four of chapter thirteen clearly makes this distinction between the exercise of personal retaliation and vengeance, and the performance of these functions by the officers of civil government. "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord... For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil... For he is a minister of God to thee for good... for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. " Thus Romans 13: 3-4 explains how God's vengeance of Romans 12: 19 is exercised and executed—through the offices and functions of civil government.

It is not the particular ruler or personal sovereign whom God ordains, but the genius of government. The government is derived from the governed. The absence of government is anarchy, and that is confusion—and "God is not the author of confusion, " which is but another word for anarchy, whether in the church or in the state. The genius of the civil order therefore springs from God, not from the devil, and is exercised in the legitimate sphere of God ordained government. The declaration of independence formally affirms that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and that is the truth. When William Gladstone was Prime Minister of England, he requested Queen Victoria to sign a paper, and when she refused, he said "you must"; and when she said in reply, "I am the Queen of England, " the Prime Minister responded, "I am the people of England. " If a people choose to suspend the dynastic luxuries of traditional royalty, and become a republic, it is their civil right to do so. But what has been called the separation of church and state—the administrative disconnection between the civil and the religious, the disjunction of ecclesiastical and political jurisdiction—is

essential to both political and religious freedom. The history of the Holy Roman Empire, and all subsequent history of religious bishops and political rulers, popes and emperors, vying with each other for the exercise of governmental authority and ruling power in the respective realms, afford ample proof that the functions of religious and political administration should remain completely disjoined. For instance, if the gospel were adopted as the code of government, it would become the duty of every court to act accordingly and forgive, on the assurance of repentance, every misdemeanant or felon, without respect of persons, or of the nature and degree of guilt, or whether it be a misdemeanor or a felony. That would destroy civil government completely. Conversely, if the legal and penal statutes of civil government should be adopted religiously, it would destroy the blessings of the gospel entirely.

There is no greater mark of political wisdom than that which was displayed by the fathers of this republic, in saying: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. "

II. THE NATURE OF THE CIVIL STATE

The foregoing observations advance these considerations to the question of, What is the state?

The problems of the Christian's relation to the social order and allegiance to the civil state have existed alongside with the history of Christianity in the application of principles which determine compliance with the command to "render to Caesar" and "render to God" the things of both realms. This mandate is the authoritative definition of the relation of the followers of Christ between his teaching and the requirements of existing government in civil society, and when the demands of this divine directive are relatively obeyed it automatically brings solution to the problems and effects the harmony of this dual relation which the Lord's declaration establishes and makes mandatory.

The God and Caesar pronouncement of the Lord to his disciples was definitive of a dual relation with respective obligations, and was delivered with the design to govern the attitude toward the civil power and to regulate the course of conduct in a civil society. This adjustment of

attitude and action belongs to the essence of Christianity and is as essential now as it was at the time of the deliverance of this "render to Caesar" and "render to God" oracle. The Roman government decreed that the people were the property of the empire. The Roman church declared that the state is a creature of the church and subjugated to it. The Puritan party claimed that the church should regulate the government and dominate it. The Mennonite sect taught the suppression of civil magistrates to the point of the isolation of the cult. The present day Jehovah's Witnesses denomination asserts that all human civil government is of the devil and should be disobeyed.

The various declensions of these credos developed from the monarchical assumptions that the state is invested with sovereignty over the individual and is clothed with moral, political and religious authority and power over him. But the true concept is that society is sovereign in the political sense and the will of the people resolves civil government into a social consolidation which necessarily results in a community compact, maintained for common purposes. Civil society depends upon such an accord between its constituents, a social and civil concordat between people of a concorporation, acting in obedience to law, for the protection of the whole community. Man is social and political in character, as well as moral and spiritual in nature. The impelling forces of nature move him into political society.

The principle of government is both soteriological and sociological in its essence and is related to both church and state. In reference to the former it is founded on the command of God; in respect to the latter it depends upon the consent of men. The church is a spiritual corporation and the state is a secular concorporation. The bond of communion in the church is the duty of men to God in obedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ; the band of confederacy in the state is the obligation of men to society. Membership in the church depends on the grace of God and the faith of man in its relation to the conditions of the gospel—it is grace on the part of the giver and obedience on the part of the recipient. Citizenship in the state stands on the relation of men to a political arrangement through a civil compact that creates the state, or civil government. The church is a spiritual order which is not subject to alteration, a kingdom which cannot be moved, and the faith which cannot be

changed. But the state is a human order subject to the will of the people, and its laws are liable to amendment and repeal. Civil government therefore has divine sanction, not in the sense of being severally and separately instituted, but in the principle that such a compact based on the consent of society is implanted in human nature, serving the purpose which God approves, hence "ordained" of God, existing by the authority of God, and in that meaning the apostolic statement "there is no power but of God," in Romans 13, holds its significance.

When Jesus assured Governor Pilate that he was not the leader of a seditious movement, that his mission had no subversive designs against the Roman government, and that there was no rivalry with Caesar in his claims of kingship, he said: "My kingdom is not of this world." But this statement recorded in John 18: 36 taken in its context and connotation can only denote that the kingdoms of Christ and Caesar consisted in different spheres, but were not contradictory. They occupied different bases of authority, but were not incompatible. It was both strange and startling to the haughty magistrate of Rome and the proud representative of Caesar to hear of a kingdom existing on something other than weapons of legionary might and military armaments. But the One standing trial before his stately tribunal repeated, "Now is my kingdom not from hence." The expression "from hence" means from here—the kingdom of Christ is *here*, but it is not *from* here, it is from *there*, from heaven. It is the kingdom *of* heaven *on* earth. It is the reign of heaven in the world. It is the rule of Christ in the hearts of men.

The sphere of the kingdom of Christ is the domain of the truth. The sphere of the earthly kingdom is the civil and social order. The authority for the spiritual kingdom of Christ is inherent with the divinity of his mission and the deity of his Person. In the role of the divine Teacher that he was, "he taught them as one having authority"—Matthew 7: 29—a sovereign authority which inheres in himself, descending from no predecessor, derived only from his equality with God. So the statement of Jesus Christ to Governor Pilate in the words, "my kingdom is not of this world," was declarative only of the contrast in the nature of the imperial kingdom which Pilate represented and the spiritual kingdom which Christ had come to establish. The

one was of that world—Jesus said "this world, " the world of Caesar, of Pilate, the Roman world—the other was not to be of it, not a revolution in Roman empire out of which a kingdom like it would emerge, but a kingdom of another kind and another realm, of heaven and from heaven.

It is so plain as to be patent that the Lord's declaration concerning the unworldly nature of his kingdom contains no implication from which even an inference is deducible that members of his kingdom, the church, cannot participate in the privileges and perform the obligations and administer the functions of the government that is of the world. The apostle of Christ declared in Romans 14 that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, " but it does not mean that a member of the church cannot eat and drink—rather, it is an emphasis on the nature of the kingdom of God, that it consists of the spiritual elements of "righteousness and peace" and its realm of enjoyment is "in the Holy Spirit. " One must surely feel a frustrating pressure for some semblance of a premise for a faulty conclusion who would connect, as some attempt to do, the Lord's statement to Pilate with the fallacious theory of the Christian's non-participation in a government of this world.

The popular concept of Christianity is a misconception. The world views it as some sort of an ecclesiastical, soteriological system which is in competition with secular institutions. What is called, or perhaps mis-called, Christianity is personal. A Christian is a person, a person who has been baptized into Christ, and is therefore *in Christ* and a follower of Christ. The term Christian is used only as a noun, never as an adjective, in the New Testament, and the term Christianity is not used at all. In reality there is no such institution revealed in the Bible as that which has become known to the world under the agnomen and cognomen of Christianity. On these premises, to apply the name Christian to secular institutions, private enterprises and organized charities is a misuse of the name, if not a prostitution of its character. The Christian is the person, and the designation applies only to a person. It is the individual in society who practices the principles espoused by a Christian that becomes the re-enforcement of the civil order on the basis of what is just and right. This influence has been continuous in history as a spiritual force which has had a conspicuous effect on civil society and political government.

The statement in Romans 13 that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor" was made in context with the functions of civil government and in connection with bearing the sword for good against the criminal elements of society, and it is yet the fulfilling of the law in maintaining and upholding the social and civil order at every point, by strengthening the bonds of civil society and in uniting or amalgamating the social order. But in the secular state Christiana act only as citizens, not as a church, and in so doing they contribute to holding the state within its bounds, keeping the state secularized; and in this there is no conflict, but a strengthening rather than a weakening of the state. The political priest and the partisan preacher who align the church with the political administration of civil and secular government are in the true sense disturbers of the civil peace and of civil society. The church can be said to serve the state only when it is neither obtruded nor drafted into the administration of politics, bearing influence only through members of the church who are citizens of the civil society. Political Christianity is a contradiction in terms.

History is replete with examples that could be cited of priest-ridden countries and their legion of weak and unworthy kings and rulers. The moment the state undertakes to legislate religious issues it passes out of its proper sphere and by an act of governmental regimentation it becomes tyrannical. The church is not entitled to employ physical force or to appeal to corporeal power to enforce the law of Christ. Nor is the state entitled to wield spiritual weapons in punitive measures and legal instruments of punishments and penalties. The expression "not of this world" means that the kingdom of Christ is of the other world than the civil sphere; and the converse is true, the civil sphere is not in the nature of the spiritual. Each must act within its own sphere; one is a kingdom of this world; the other is not of this world—it is here but not from here. Being spiritual it is of heaven and from heaven. One is to last only as long as earth and time; the other shall endure after this world with all of its kings and kingdoms, nations and governments, shall have passed away. The apostle of Christ was standing on the site of world empires where the kingdoms of the Babylonians, the Medes and Persians, and the Grecians had arisen and fallen, and where the Roman empire was then in the inevitable processes of disintegra-

tion, and from there he uttered with exultant eloquence the exclamation, "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God with reverence and awe. " (Heb. 12: 28)

In the full view of all these considerations the factual reality is manifestly evident that the Christian as a member of the church and as a member of the civil order sustains a relation to both and is not exempt from the duties and obligations, responsibilities and functions of either. The convenient assumption that the moment one becomes a member of the church he is automatically exempt, for the moral considerations, from civil and military duties which, from the same civil standpoint, are required of others is a sheer fallacy. Morality is not a respecter of persons—it is a universal law. Anything that is morally wrong for one person would be morally wrong for all. If civil and military services are morally wrong to the member of the church, they are morally wrong to members of society, in which case no one could morally perform these services, which conclusion would mean that society must either dispense with all law enforcement both civil and military or continue in an immoral state, maintaining an immoral status. The premise is false and the conclusion is a fallacy.

On the other hand it is assumed that civil and military enforcement of law and order are not immoral acts for the non-member of the church—they are wrong only for members of the church and become so at the moment one becomes a Christian. If this be true, then the church of Christ is an incubus in civil society. An incubus in the body is the source of infectious weakness, the larger the incubus grows the weaker the body becomes. It is defined as the development of a body organism from its inception to the visible manifestation of all outward effects. In society it applies to anything that exists as an oppression, a burden or a weakening source. On this principle, if members of the church are exempt from the martial obligations and protective responsibilities that other members of society must fulfill and bear, then the growth of the church is the weakness of the nation, as the church increases in size, the state decreases in strength, and the church becomes an incubus in the body politic. In this connection the remark is frequently flung: Let the sinners do it, they are not Christians anyway. In that case, it would be disastrous to civil society to convert

too many citizens, for there would not be left enough sinners to defend us! That is an exemplification of the definition of an incubus in society, and it is an unworthy attitude, indeed.

A contingent argument has been offered that a Christian cannot be a soldier because a member of the church in the army of this nation may be fighting a member of the church in the army of another nation—and one Christian would therefore kill another Christian. But if that argument is worth anything it would mean that it is wrong to kill only those in an enemy army who perchance might be church-members but it would not be wrong to kill non-church-members. That is, indeed, a new slant on killing, and a unique definition of murder—wrong to shoot a member of the church, but not wrong to shoot a sinner. If that conclusion is not right, the contingent premise is wrong—and in either case it amounts to no argument.

Another fallacy given frequent expression is that God uses wicked men to do evil things his will requires which, because of their righteous character, he cannot use good men to do. This puts God in league with the devil and his wicked agents, for when God cannot use his own children to do his will, he compromises with the forces of evil and bargains with the devil's children to accomplish his purpose. Aside from being a defamation of God's character, this contention is reversed by example. When God ordered the execution of Agag, the king of Amalek, before all the people, he enlisted not the hands of the wicked, but assigned the task to Samuel, the best man in Israel. God has never sanctioned a moral evil; but he both commanded and sanctioned capital punishment for criminals in society and war against the wicked nation that "had lain in wait against Israel, " therefore neither capital punishment nor war as functions of government under the circumstances of these sanctions are moral evils.

In the Bible the word evil has various connotations. It sometimes refers to sin and wickedness, as when men "do evil in the sight of the Lord, " by the transgression of his law, as said of the kings in 1 Kings 16: 25-30. It is used also in the sense of moral evil, as when "the heart of the sons of men is full of evil" in Ecclesiastes 9: 3. The word is also put for the punishments which God inflicts upon the wicked. It is evidently employed in this sense when the prophet

said, in Isaiah 45: 7, that God forms the light and creates darkness, and makes peace and creates evil. It is worthy of note here that the word *evil* in this passage is the Hebrew word *war*, and is so translated elsewhere. The meaning therefore is that God used the implement of war to inflict punishment, as the instrument against evil. Organized society is at war all the time against evil.

In this connection it is contended that God in all ages has raised up wicked kings to administer punishment on other nations and on his own people, which would not be right for others than the wicked to perform. Reference is usually made to the passage in Exodus 9: 16, and quoted by Paul in Romans 9: 17, declaring that God raised up Pharaoh to show his power. But it is significant to note that the Hebrew word here is *stirred*, and the word raised means "stirred"—God stirred up Pharaoh by the demands made on him, and when Pharaoh resisted God's demands the power of God was manifested. It should be stoutly denied that God by naked omnipotence made Pharaoh an evil man in order to accomplish his good will, or that he used a bad man to perform a mean work which he could not use a good man to do. Such a notion makes God a hoodlum engaged in underworld activities. It not only discredits divine integrity, it maligns the nature of God, and is disparaging to his majesty and power.

And from some quarters now comes the subversive sophistry that God will use Russia and China as instruments to punish the people of the United States, and that we are therefore in for severe chastisement at the hands of an atheistic nation and a tyrannical dictator. If this be true, God is in league with Russia and is on the side of Communism; so for a Christian to be on God's side, he must take Russia's side in the present conflict. Furthermore, if Russia is being used to accomplish the will of God, then to oppose or wage war against Russia means to oppose and fight against God. That is Hitlerian doctrine—it is exactly what Adolph Hitler believed in the prosecution of the war against Germany by the United States, England and France. Aside from the fact that such ideology is baseless, it is concentrated fatalism, and renders opposition useless, *nil* and *void*, for defeat is foreordained. Such teaching is effective propaganda for the Communists, and its disseminators are rendering a free service to Communism.

It has always been a tenet of premillennialism that God will revive the Roman empire and its tributary pagan governments in order to assertedly fulfill the prophecies of Armageddon and the millennium. In the years between 1939 and 1945, the period of World War II, the premillennial sects, including the premillennialists within the church, openly avowed and unashamedly averred that God was using both Mussolini and Hitler with Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany to accomplish such ends—looking to the final destruction of all human governments and the establishment of the Lord's own universal government in the millennium. It was pointed out then that the consequences of such a theory placed all premillennialists on the side of Hitler's Germany during that war, and to oppose Nazi Germany and Fuehrer Hitler successfully would thwart the fulfillment of prophecy—therefore opposition to the dictators of Europe and Asia, according to these eccentric notions, means opposition to God and his prophetic plans. So now, some who are not premillennialists and who would resent being so classified, are nevertheless advocating that Russia and China have appeared on the present world scene to fulfill the prophecies and execute the will of God. If this be true, to oppose Communism is to oppose God. Some may so think, but this writer demurs.

A further inconsistency here appears. When examples are used from the Old Testament in evidence of the morality of both civil and military government, the examples and citations are declared preemptory, taken away or destroyed by reason of being in the Old Testament, thus waived aside as having no bearing on the nature, character and conduct of anything pertaining to now, or the right or wrong of anything now. But when the converse example is needed to support the assertion that God engages the services of bad men to perform unholy tasks that he cannot employ good men to accomplish, forgetting their dictum they scamper to the Old Testament and "raise up" Pharaoh to cinch their argument. That is more than a mere inconsistency, it is an arbitrary procedure of laying claim to the use of the Old Testament which is not allowed or recognized when used in exactly the same way and for precisely the same purpose by others. If the evidential value of the Old Testament example on moral principles is subject to automatic preemption, or exclusion, for being in the Old Testament, when used to up-

hold the right of military government and capital punishment, then the like use of the Old Testament is subject to the same preemption, or shutting out, when used oppositely. What is sauce for the goose should be at least salad dressing for the gander, or in more literary form—it is a poor rule that does not work both ways.

There has been a prejudicial approach to the discussion of relationship to government, by the scornful reference to "the war question"; and by the common accusation that the one who contends that from every ethical consideration the Christian bears the same degree and full extent of responsibility and obligation in the civil society as that of any other citizens is a warmonger. The apparent purpose in both the approach and the accusation is to "deceive the hearts of the simple" and scare them away from the basic principles involved. A warmonger is defined as one who stirs up war. It is an ugly epithet. The word mongering, as now used, implies discreditable dealing, and the monger is regarded as one who is engaged in disreputable traffic. These are bad words. The President of the United States is the commander-in-chief of the army and the navy, but he is not a warmonger. The Congress of the United States has been impelled in the national honor to declare a state of war, but it is not a warmongering body. Generals Douglas MacArthur and Dwight Eisenhower, the Supreme Commanders of the armies of the Pacific and of Europe in World War II, were gallant heroes of war in the defense of the life and liberty of this nation, but they were not warmongers. Why then should one who maintains that the Christian in civil society sustains equal relation with all other citizens in all of the obligations of civil government be branded with the appellative stigma warmonger.

As a matter of fact and fairness the intrinsic issue is not the war question at all. It is the citizen's relationship to civil society and the government that belongs to it, whether the individual is a Christian or not, that makes the core and forms the kernel of this controversial subject. The war question is germane to the issue only as a collateral to civil government, as the protective and defensive resort, on par in principle with any other measures of law enforcement agencies of government whether local or national, whether composed of the offices of the sheriff and his deputies in the county, or the police department in the city, or the defense

department in the nation—the principle involved is the same, and they must all stand or fall together. Whether on the local or national level society is at war all of the time against criminal elements; the soldier is but a national officer, and the necessity of war is but law enforcement on the larger scale. We are all against war and warmongers, just as we are all against crime and criminals; but we are not in favor of abolishing the police departments of our city governments, and for the same reason we would object to the abolition of the war department of the national government. They are all wrapped up in one package, the same in principle, and alike in that both are either right or wrong. It must follow that if civil government is right, military government is of necessity right, for the civil cannot exist without the military to support it. Therefore, if the Christian can participate in the offices of civil government, he can perform the functions of military government also; and if he can engage in neither, then the Christian is a parasite, and the church an incubus in human society.

III. THE PRECEPTS OF CHRIST APPLIED TO CIVIL PROCEDURES

There is an apparently wide separation between the ethical teaching of Jesus and habitual human conduct in social and civil life—a pragmatic problem, a great gulf fixed between precept and procedure. Extolled in every generation as the Great Teacher, his divine principles have been accorded a universal approbation, but an actually limited application in practice. This impasse is due to a misapprehension of the import of the Lord's precepts. The stentorian exhortation resounds from every rostrum that the sayings of the Saviour must all be accepted literally and formally observed with a rigid strictness. The clerics of Christendom have feigned to establish from the discourses of Jesus what is termed "the norms of Christianity"—authoritative rules and models and standards of teaching—but the broad gap between theological interpretations and consistent observance remains.

Specific examples of this failure are to be found in some prescribed rules of social and legal behaviour, such as: 1. Resist not evil. 2. Whosoever shall smite you, turn to him the other cheek. 8. If any wants to sue you at law, and take away your coat, let him have your cloak also. 4. Whoever

would compel you to go a mile, go with him twain. 5. Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away. 6. Agree with your adversary quickly. 7. Love your enemies. 8. Let not your left hand know what your right hand does. 9. Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth. 10. Take no thought for the morrow. 11. Judge not. 12. Every one that asketh receiveth.

That these sayings contain principles from which rules of action governing a course of conduct are deducible is not to be denied or even doubted. On all of these points we have been exhorted to "take Jesus literally, " but it should not be necessary to caution one who is familiar with the use of the metaphor, the simile, the synecdoche, and all forms of figures of speech, against making the literal application of figurative language, and against that method of an artless quotation of separated passages without considering the whole, which has been the device with which denominational creedists have attempted to establish sectarian doctrine. It is this irresponsible treatment of the teaching of Jesus that has created some consequences for which the sponsors are not able to answer. This common manner of dealing with the words of Christ turn the Master's altruistic teaching from their beneficent design. It transforms his divine ideals into an unreal idealism of a non-resistance and passivity that aids the aggressor, and constitutes a codified Bill Of Rights for the criminal. Applied to the functions of government the Christian in civil society is automatically stripped of all legal rights and at once *per se* deprived of all protective recourse of law. This misconception carries the consequences so far as to assume that the Christian cannot serve society as a civil magistrate and that a soldier cannot be saved. It must be evident even to a casual student that these fundamentals of conduct cannot be separated from each individual's duty to the social order and his relation to the civil state.

The adherents of the non-resistance notion form two distinctive classes: the pacifist and the conscientious objector. The former class promotes pacifism as a political philosophy; the latter class opposes resistance on the ground of religious scruples. By the latter class it is claimed that a category of scriptures proscribe force. On the contrary it can be substantiated that every passage so applied is misconstrued. The attempt to associate the scriptural

statements under reference with the conscientious objector's viewpoint is comparable to the effort of denominational theorists who interpret every text on the security of the believer to mean the impossibility of apostasy, although it is clearly ascertainable by candid textual examination that the passages refer to God's side of the believer's state of salvation rather than to the conditions upon which the believer is to maintain it. Thus it is that every scripture cited in support of the conscientious objector's thesis relates not to moral resistance and legal force, or to the functions of government, but to personal retaliation.

A careful scanning of some texts that are usually adduced with the attitude of offering incontestable proof for the conscientious objector's viewpoint will substantiate the assertion that these scriptures have been misconstrued and contain no such teaching.

FIRST: MATTHEW 4: 8-10:

"Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. "

As obscure as it may seem, this passage is regarded as a plausible argument that Jesus opposed all forms of coercion and methods of force in any dominion. It is claimed that the point of this temptation was the use of weapons for the purpose that Satan proposed, and that the Lord's rejection amounts to a mandatory repudiation of physical resistance under all circumstances. First of all, such reasoning carries the implication that Jesus had no established policy and no fixed or settled rule on the principle of coercion, as being wrongful under all circumstances, else no temptation could have existed for him to resort to such means. Secondly, the assumption implies that Jesus accepted the devil's claim to the ownership of the kingdoms of the world, or that all human government belongs to him. This was the devil's claim, as recorded in Luke 4: 6: "And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give unto thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and unto whomsoever I will give it. " But the devil is said by Jesus himself to

be "a liar from the beginning, " and this was one of the devil's lies, and Jesus knew that it belonged to Satan's subtlety. No earthly government could have existed then, and cannot exist now, without coercion, the symbol of which is the sword. Jesus himself declared this fact in his statement to Pilate, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight. " The fact is that the devil has no rightful claims to any territory. Government is ordained of God, according to Romans 13, and not of Satan. The devil has no title to a foot of earth's territory nor a right to an office in its government. And it was this claim of Satan which the Lord repudiated. The devil's claim was not consistent with the Lord's own relation—no Jew would accept the devil's assertion of such ownership of kingdoms, which would include Israel itself. The reply of Jesus repelled this attack of Satan as one that challenged the sovereignty of God, and it was a denial of the devil's rights in this world and of his title to any government thereof. His answer to Satan here, as in the case of Pilate later, recognized coercion as an element in all civil or human government; and that civil government of its inherent nature, and essential principles, as contributory to the kingdom of God and Christ.

The background of the temptation on the mount was Jewish nationalism in the midst of Roman power, and the propaganda for the Romanization of the followers of Christ, by which Satan proposed to make Jesus the leader of a revolution; and he held before his eyes the overthrow of the Caesars, and passed before him from a lofty height the sweeping grandeur of universal dominion over all of the kingdoms of men. This was not to be the character of the kingdom of heaven nor the nature of the power and reign of the Christ, and the Lord's reply to Satan was in principle the same as his answer to Pilate: "My kingdom is not from hence, " but from thence. It means that His kingdom is not from here, but from there—not from the earth, but from heaven. Both Satan and Pilate failed to ensnare the Lord, and what he said to Satan was later reaffirmed to Pilate. In the debate between Christ and Satan there is not the semblance of an aspect on any phase of the relation to the responsibilities of civil government or of the right or wrong of the Christian's participation in its offices and functions. But in order to a full purview of the Temptation, in the light of the beginning of the Lord's earthly ministry, it will

not be amiss here to submit a coherent analysis of the account.

In the very foreground are the verses in Matthew 4 and Luke 4 which together state that Jesus "being full of the Holy Spirit" was "led up of the spirit" into uninhabited parts to meet the tempter. The Holy Spirit had descended upon him at his baptism, and by immediate inspiration he was led by his spirit, his own inner being, into a solitary place the surroundings of which were adapted to the preparation for his mission. He stood at the door of his ministry, on the threshold of the kingdom to be established in sharp contrast with the Roman monarchy—and here is the bold emphasis that accents the entire scene.

The word "then" in Matthew 4: 1 connects the context of the temptation with the baptism of Jesus in the immediate preceding verses. These verses cannot be dissociated. The Son had been confessed by the Father at his baptism, and received his heavenly armour to meet the challenge of his antagonist, the devil. He was the subject of baptism of water in the Jordan, and of fire in the temptation, and of suffering on the cross. But the word "then" denotes more than a succession of time—it indicates also the relation of events to follow in the life of the Lord from Jordan to Golgotha. Possessed of the divine knowledge that the fulfillment of his mission called for the defeat of Satan, it was the inner self, his own spirit within him which in the words of the text "driveth him"—impelled him—to engage his adversary in the initial attempt at the prevention of the divine purposes by diabolical intervention. It was but the prelude, for after the failure of this preliminary assault, the record of Luke 1: 13 adds that "when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season"—only to return with reinforced subtility.

Concerning this Jesus said, in John 14: 30, "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. " The diabolical prince wrought his worst to have something in Him, as he had in mankind through sin, but Satan had "nothing" in Jesus—tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"—Hebrews 4: 15; and "in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted"—Hebrews 2: 18. It was ordained as a part of the divine plan that by this victory over sin and Satan, the Son of God

should become the perfect example for the sons of men. Thus it was that Jesus "full of the Holy Spirit, " which had descended upon him at his baptism, was "led up of the spirit"—driven by his own spirit—to meet in mortal combat his arch-enemy and antagonist. The captain of man's salvation went forth to battle, drawn of *his spirit*, but armed with *the Spirit*. The first Adam met defeat by the same adversary. The second Adam wins the victory and retrieved all that was lost. All that Adam lost was at issue. The whole plan of God in the history of man thus revolves around the two persons—the first and second Adams. The first Adam was given a position that he did not maintain; the second Adam in a second trial faced the whole issue again. Satan thought to nip the plan of heaven in the bud in the Garden of Eden, and seemingly succeeded. But a divine interposition was staged. The "seed of woman" of Genesis 3: 15 had now arrived to bruise the head of the "seed of the serpent. " Paradise was lost in the first Adam's defeat, to be regained in the second Adam's victory.

The scene of the first temptation was the garden of Eden; the second, the wilderness of Judea. The result of the first temptation was defeat and expulsion from the garden of God into the wilderness of the world. The second Adam takes up the conflict where the first Adam left it. There could be no fitter scene. The waste and desert places of the earth, as the signs which sin visibly left on creation, and the symbols of the waste and desolation which sin has wrought on the inner man also, are the results set forth by the apostle Paul in Romans 8: 18-23: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. "

The garden and the wilderness are antipodal, represent-

ing the highest harmonies and the deepest discords of the soul. Mark's description of the scene of temptation states that Jesus was "with the wild beasts, " indicative of the resumption of dominion as Lord over all creation, and enhancing the waste and desolation that sin had caused in the savage solitude of this scene of the Lord's temptation; and accenting the acceptance of Satan's challenge by the rightful Lord of all the earth.

The tempter of the first Adam was named the Serpent; the same tempter of the second Adam is called the Devil. It is not the same word for *devils* or *demons*, but is the Greek word *diabolos* and designates, as in the Hebrew also, *the devil*, Satan, enemy and adversary. The word has a remarkable prominence in the old and new testaments, but in both it is veiled with a background of mystery, together with the suppression of knowledge and revelation of doctrine concerning him. His existence has been a perpetual menace to all mankind. His first appearance was in the garden of Eden; afterward withdrawn for a long time from the scene of life and mention among men, the Bible afforded only glimpses of him in the indications of his being the head of a diabolical realm, a kingdom of evil, in such passages as Job 1: 6; 6: 12; Zechariah 3: 1-2; 1 Chronicles 21: 1 In the New Testament he appears to challenge the sinlessness of Jesus Christ in such passages as John 8: 46; 14: 30; 1 John 2: 13-14; Ephesians 2: 1-2; 6: 12; James 5: 7; 1 Peter 5: 8; Jude 9. The subordinate powers attributed to him in such expressions in the New Testament as, "whom resist, " and "resist the devil and he will flee from you, " reveals that sin has only a permissive nature, and is not inherent.

There is no evidence that Satan was originally in heaven and became a fallen angel. Sin cannot be associated with heaven. The passage in Isaiah 14: 12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning, " is not a reference to Satan, but to the ancient king of the context upon whom the Isaiahan judgment was pronounced. The reference to the "war in heaven" against the dragon in Revelation, who "was called the Devil, and Satan, " and who was cast out into the earth, and his angels with him—Revelation 12: 7-9—is a description of the conflicts in the existing authorities and governments connected with the apocalypse of John and has no reference to the imaginary idea of Satan being in heaven with God, and of his causing so much

trouble there that he was expelled and exported from heaven to the earth to pester mankind until the end of time. And the "angels that sinned"—in 2 Peter 2: 4—who were "cast down to hell (*tartaroo* in *hades*)... to be reserved unto the judgment, " were evidently early representatives among men of former ages, for as before stated it is not consistent with the nature of heaven, and what the Bible elsewhere says concerning its character, to admit of sin and apostasy there.

Furthermore, the statement of Jesus in Luke 10: 18, "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven, " has no reference to Satan's residence in heaven with God, but to the complete defeat of Satan by Jesus Christ. The *fall* of Satan meant his complete downfall; as *lightning* meant that it would come soon and swiftly; from *heaven* meant his own heaven or place of exalted dominion. The Bible does not teach the doctrine that God by an act of good riddance shoved the devil out of heaven and let him fall to the earth to harass the world for all time to come.

The temptations of the devil are used in various senses in the Bible. It is used in the ordinary sense of allurement or enticement to sin in James 1: 12-15. It represents the trial of faith and obedience in Genesis 22: 1 and James 1: 2. It is set forth as a snare into the commission of offenses in Matthew 16: 1, Mark 10: 2 and Luke 10: 25. It refers to the trial of God's forbearance in Exodus 17: 2 and 1 Corinthians 10: 9. All of these evils are attributed to the devil as their source and Jesus taught his disciples to pray, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. " This is not an implication that God leads one into temptation, but rather the prayer that by following Christ one is lead away from temptation, not into it.

The devil's opportunity was offered after Jesus had fasted "forty days and forty nights. " The bodily needs had been arrested to give place to the inner forces necessary to this preparation for his divine mission. It was a temporary release from the necessities of animal life, when matter does not offer stubborn resistance to spirit but is plastic to it. The chiefs of the old order, Moses and Elijah—Deuteronomy 9: 9; 1 Kings 19: 8—had similar periods and experiences of fasting, and now the divine Head of the new order superseding them is the subject of the same with greater significance.

There appears to be a divine signatory in the number forty, a relation between the foreshadows of old dispensations and the fulfillments of the new, in that Jesus Christ emerges victor over all and Lord of all. A similar relation in example is found in the confusion of tongues in Genesis 11 and the unity of tongues in Acts 2. If the power of united language had to be broken when serving an evil end, the power of a united spiritual language is indicated to accomplish the purposes of unity among the people of God today.

At the expiration of these suspended bodily needs the text states that Jesus was "hungered"—and at this moment of human weakness the devil seizes an opportunity, and the temptation begins and proceeds in successive acts. Matthew states that "the tempter came to him, " and that "the devil taketh him, " and that "the devil leaveth him"—all of which emphasizes the doctrine of a diabolical personality, called the devil. There is an element in man's life and history which nothing else can explain. The alternative of good and evil in free moral agency in the exercise of will and choice bears this evidence, and it is the source and seat of evil from which all temptation proceeds.

The distinction between the Lord's temptation and ours is in the fact that his temptation was from without as one who had no sin; ours comes from lusts within. The reason for his complete sinlessness is in the fact that the temptations to which he was subject were not born from within, but presented from without, finding no acquiescence, consent or entertainment in his sinless soul. It was only without sin that he as the divine Saviour could save men from sin; and the Redeemer of man could not be himself in need of redemption. These are the truths of Hebrews 2: 18 and Hebrews 4: 15 of previous reference. But the apostle states in 2 Corinthians 5: 21 that "he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, " and in vicarious death for the satisfaction of the law which sin had violated "he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world"—as declared in 1 John 2: 2.

This truth is even more vivid in Hebrews 5: 8-9: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. " He *learned* obedience not in the sense of education but experience. As the Son of God he was not himself

exempt from the path of obedience. He was made *perfect* not in the sense of sinlessness, for he had no sin, but in the perfection or completion of the divine plan of redemption, which required his suffering and obedience, and having been made complete and perfect as Redeemer, he is author or captain of salvation to all who follow him in obedience. All of these divine truths stem from the human presence of the Son of God among men in the world.

The initial onslaught of the temptation was Satan's challenge of the relation of Jesus to God—"if thou be the Son of God. " The devil was taking the measure of the One who was his mortal foe, challenging him to prove in the wrong way his claims of Sonship, a challenge which was echoed on the cross by the impenitent thief who said, "if thou be the Son of God, save thyself and us, " and by the taunting crowd who said "if thou be the Christ, come down. " But to comply with the devil's behest would have been to defeat the whole plan of God in the mediatorial work of Christ for redemption. The vindication of his Sonship was in the Father's hands and in the doing of His will.

The character of the temptation was threefold. The first inducement was the challenge of *materialism*—to turn the stones to bread was emphasis on the corporeal nature of the outer man, whereas the divine mission of Christ consisted in the spiritual nature of the inner man and the establishment of a kingdom within men—the kingdom of heaven, which meant the reign of heaven in the hearts of men, superseding all material considerations. The Satanic demand was inconsistent with the basic principles that Christ was ready to promulgate, and yielding to it would have defeated at the start what he had come to do, and which was the initial emphasis and keynote of his ministry.

The second approach was one of *erudition*, by extracting a passage of scripture from the prophecies with misuse and distortion of "it is written. " It was met with the balance of a counter truth in the Lord's reply, "it is written again, " showing that compliance with the devilish misapplication of scripture would mean a complete mistrust of God in the fulfillment of his will in his own way.

The third appeal insinuated a suppressed desire for *imperialism*, by putting the claims of Jesus to the test of ambition and self glory, in the proffer of "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. " It was a great offer

in which Satan was playing for high stake, yet with no right in what was offered and no absolute power to deliver it. Again it would nullify the principles of Christ's kingdom of heaven, reverse the nature of his reign, destroy the character of his rule and demoralize his spiritual throne. Satan knew what the Christ had come to do and this was his initial attempt to thwart it. The answer of Christ was the refusal to be diverted by vain ambitions from his divine ministry and mission "to do the will of him that sent me. " When, according to the record of Luke 4: 13, "the devil had ended all the temptation; he departed from him for a season, " as in the case of Job in ancient times, only to return for the final battles of Gethsemane and the cross.

Ending in undisputed victory the temptation demonstrated the Lord's declaration that "the prince of this world cometh, and hath no part in me"—and no claim by compromise or accepted proffers. From this excursion on the Temptation it is in order to return to the main line and proceed with the study of passages related to the general subject.

SECOND: LUKE 3: 10-14:

"And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then ? He answereth and saith unto them. He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. Then came also the publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages. "

The attempted argument against military service from this passage forces the admonition of John to the soldiers—"do violence to no man... be content with your wages"—to mean that the soldiers were told to accept their wages but disobey orders to perform the duties of soldiers. If this is the meaning of the passage, then John's advice to the soldiers was mutinous, a virtual encouragement to insubordination of seditious character, a mass mutiny in the form of an organized refusal to obey constituted military authority. Moreover, such an interpretation of John's instructions to the soldiers means that John sanctioned dishonesty—accept-

ing wages as in good faith, but with no intention of performing the duties for which they received compensation. Such advice could not have been honorably given. It is a low standard of ethics, indeed, which the conscientious objector here reveals, far below the ethics even of men of the world.

If the services required cannot in good conscience be performed the wages therefor should be refused—but not so, according to this argument (?)—the conscientious objectors would have John planting dishonesty of intent in the minds of the soldiers, thus teaching them all to practice deception. To the contrary, if the services required of soldiers are wrong, to be consistent John would have of necessity advised these soldiers to quit the army and take the consequences. But this he did not do.

The questions of verses 10-14 connect with the preceding verses 7-9, which record the exhortations of John to "the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him." They were informed that John was not administering a mere formal baptism, as a ceremonial rite so customary among the Jews in general and the Pharisees in particular. The baptism of John was conditioned on repentance as a necessary qualification. Their fleshly Abrahamic descent henceforth meant nothing; the axe was laid at the root of the tree of fleshly Israelism, and it was soon to be hewn down. A new generation, not fleshly but spiritual, was in process and the preparation for it was not a ceremonial baptism, but a baptism of repentance yielding the fruit of reformation—the design of which was the remission of sins—Mark 1: 4. These extraordinary declarations, so uncommon to the Jews, caused the people all to inquire what such repentance would demand of each one of them—what would this baptism of repentance bind upon them—and John's answers were the test of the sincerity of all in the multitude that "came forth to be baptized of him." The answers are classified as follows:

1. The people—verses 10-11. The "people" included the hearers among the multitude without special or distinctive classification. They were exhorted to the primary duties of charity in the sharing of clothing and food with the destitute. This demand must of necessity be put in practical form and not on the basis of a literal give-all requirement.

2. The publicans—verse 12-13. The people of this classification were the tax assessors and revenue collectors who had come to be baptized of John. What would the baptism of repentance require of them? They were told to "exact no more than that which is appointed you." Parallel with this is the case of Zacchaeus in Luke 19, who was "the chief among the publicans," and who said to Jesus: "If I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold." The Mosaic code required such restitution, and when Jesus replied that salvation had come to the house of Zacchaeus "forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham," it meant only a Jewish salvation, that by repentance and restitution he had been restored to the Abrahamic status which he had abandoned by deserting to the Gentiles in his office as "the chief among the publicans." The validity of John's baptism to the publicans who inquired of him was dependent upon the command to "bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance," granting no exceptions or exemptions by the claim that "we have Abraham to our father."

3. The soldiers—verse 14. Apparently, these applicants for baptism were local soldiers in Herod's armed services, as John baptized only the Jews. Judea had been annexed to the Roman province of Assyria and was under the provincial king Herod Antipas. There are, however, examples of Gentile soldiers who responded to Jewish influences, as in the case of the centurion of Luke 7 on whose behalf the elders of the Jews besought Jesus, "saying that he was worthy for whom he should do this: for he loveth our nation, and hath built us a synagogue." The only synagogue in that place, and the one in which Jesus preached, was the gift of a Gentile soldier. The condescending communication which this centurion sent to Jesus by his messengers in the words, "for I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee," was but the centurion's modest admission of unfitness as a Gentile among Jews—though he was a lover of the nation of Israel, but not being a Jew he did not consider himself eligible for the Lord's entrance into his house.

There is also the noteworthy example of Cornelius, the devout Gentile centurion, who "gave much alms to the

people"—which has been taken to indicate that Jewish people in need were recipients of his charities. If the offices of these centurions were evil positions it is unaccountable that the Lord should praise their character with no intimation of any moral exceptions in the services they performed. Of the centurion in Luke 7 the Lord said: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel"; and Cornelius was called "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always." Certainly, we know that these centurions were not Christians, and neither were the soldiers of Herod who applied to John for baptism; nevertheless the two which the Lord commended were morally and religiously devout, and the encomiums of commendation bestowed upon them were unattended by any implications of condemnation for the military services they performed. If these services were immoral in the nature of them, there can be no explanation of the absence of such a declaration somewhere in some way; but neither before conversion nor after conversion were these centurions instructed to abandon their positions, nor is it anywhere intimated that they voluntarily did so.

What, then, is the meaning of John's counsel to the soldiers to "do no violence"? It has the same meaning as a similar mandate by the prophet of God in Jeremiah 22: 3, which may well have been the basis of John's behest. "Thus saith the Lord, Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place." This is in substance what John said to the soldiers. To "do no violence" was an admonition against taking advantage of a military status to deal violently with people, putting them to fear by unlawful seizures as indicated in the words, "neither accuse any falsely." It meant that the soldiers should not use their positions to intimidate the populace, the common people, in the arrogance of the local policeman who would use his billy club to bully and browbeat and to cause persons to cower before him. The passage plainly refers to the exercise of unlawful violence. Otherwise, "a man sent from God, whose name was John," as mentioned in John 1: 6, used his divine credentials to influence soldiers to take an oath of service with mental reservations, to take the soldier's pay without the intent to do the soldier's

duty. This is a new slant on the "mental reservation clause," a strange moral doctrine, which allows an elected official to take the oath of allegiance to the United States Of America, and to uphold its constitution, with mental reservations in favor of his personal convictions. This has been the ground of political opposition to the election of rigid religionists to offices in our government, and lo! the conscientious objectors among us would have John the Baptist handing out that very advice to the soldiers who came to be baptized of him. But such an interpretation of John's words casts the same reflection on God, for according to John the apostle, the man who was called John the Baptist was "a man sent from God," and according to Luke "the word of God came unto John in the wilderness," so God is the author of what John preached to the people, to the publicans and to the soldiers. The misapplication of this passage is an example of how far misguided people will go in the misuse of scriptures to find a semblance of scriptural support for an unscriptural notion.

Another example of the misuse of scripture in this same connection is in the effort of some to apply Philippians 1: 29-30 to the conversion of the jailor, and to make Paul's words mean that when the jailor was baptized he accepted the consequences of imprisonment rather than to continue in the capacity of a sword-bearing officer. The record of Acts 16: 25-36 gives an account of the conversion of the jailor with the events before and after his baptism. In verse 27 he is introduced as "the keeper of the prison" bearing a sword. Verses 30-34 mention his compliance with the command of Paul and Silas to believe the gospel, his midnight baptism, and the subsequent rejoicing in the jailor's prison apartment. Verses 35-36 relate that on the morning following his baptism this same "keeper of the prison" was at his post of duty—the same jailor, with the same sword, performing the same services. If "the keeper of the prison" in verse 36 is not the same "keeper of the prison" of verse 27, then he had quit his post at the midnight hour of his baptism; or, if he is the same keeper in verse 36, but had merely discarded his sword because of his conversion—then all of these important details were completely overlooked and went without mention. The indubitable facts are that the record of Acts introduces both Cornelius of Caesarea and the jailor of Philippi as soldiers before their

baptism and leaves the both of them soldiers after their baptism. If they did not remain in their positions, the burden of proof is on the one who so asserts. Apparently conscious of this quandary, the conscientious objectors have devoted much time and energy to discover a way to get Cornelius and the jailor out of their government positions, but they cannot find it. It is in this connection that the sophism on the first chapter of Philippians is offered as a specimen of argumentation to relieve the jailor of his military duty.

This circuitous attempt on Philippians 1, too far-fetched and forced to constitute an argument, surrounds verses 29 and 30: "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake; having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me. " The "same conflict" in this passage is made to mean that after his conversion the jailor was also imprisoned; but Acts 16: 35-36 gives a detailed account of the release of Paul and Silas from the prison, in connection with their appeal to the law as Roman citizens themselves; and it mentions that they were released officially and not clandestinely by the jailor. "And the Serjeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out, and desired them to depart from the city. And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed. " It was upon this reversal of arrest, as stated in verse 39, that the magistrates "brought them out"; and, according to verse 40, "they went out of the prison"—so if Paul and Silas *went out* it is not probable that the jailor was *put in!*

The conflict and the suffering of the Philippians, mentioned in 1: 29-30, has no reference to imprisonment for conscientious scruples against the participation in the offices of government, but rather to the trials they were called upon to bear in "striving together for the faith of the gospel" and thus "to suffer for his sake. " These passages in Philippians compare with 1 Thessalonians 2: 2: "But even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with much contention. " The word *contention* in 1 Thessalonians 2: 2 is the

same word rendered *conflict* in Philippians 1: 30. A further reference is made to this conflict of the Philippians by Paul in 2 Corinthians 8: 1-2: "Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed upon the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. " The conflicts and the afflictions of the Philippians had reference to the trials and privations incident to their striving for the faith and contention for the gospel mentioned in all of these citations; and they have no application to the question of the Christian's relation to government—it simply is not the same subject; and it is not only a lame effort to support a weak thesis, it is a tenuous perversion of scripture passages.

Paul's own imprisonment was not for misdeeds and violations of law which come within the legal prerogatives of ordained government, but was for a cause, the nature of which is stated in Philippians 1: 12-13: "But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which have happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. " The word "cause" sometimes designates a ground for a suit or action, or a motive or reason for a controversy; but it also means for the *sake* of worthy principles espoused. It is this latter sense, for the sake of, or for the cause of Christ—the gospel—that Paul uses the word in 2 Timothy 1: 12: "For which cause I also suffer these things"; and in Philippians 2: 18: "For the same cause also do ye joy, and rejoice with me. " It was this cause that was manifest to the soldiers that guarded Paul, and to the whole palace praetorium, and to attendants in Caesar's own household, the Imperial residence, as stated in Philippians 4: 22—made known to them all by the discourses of Paul. Instead of affording proof that prohibits a Christian's participation in the offices of civil government, the passages actually offer evidence to the contrary—that there were numerous members of the church who occupied such positions in the government in the various provinces of the empire, and even in Rome, notwithstanding the conflicts, persecutions and tribulations which attended their loyalty to the gospel.

One such official in government is mentioned by Paul in Romans 16: 23, Erastus by name, who was "the chamberlain of the city, " who joined Paul in sending salutations to the Christians in Rome. A chamberlain in those times was a high officer in a court, or a receiver and treasurer of public money—and in this case Erastus was the city treasurer of Corinth. It does not fit the circumstances to identify this Erastus with the one mentioned in Acts 19: 22 whom Paul sent into Macedonia with Timothy from Ephesus, and who is also mentioned in 2 Timothy 4: 20 among the travelling companions of Paul. It is improbable, to say the least, that one who held such a position in government at Corinth could be available for such a mission with Timothy into Macedonia. On this point it has been assumed that Erastus *had been* treasurer of Corinth, but had resigned his office after his conversion, and that Paul referred to him as the chamberlain merely to identify him. But this is, indeed, as assumption for the text refers to him as *the treasurer of the city*, which could not have been true if he were not holding the office at the time of the Roman epistle. Paul did not say Erastus the ex-chamberlain, or the past chamberlain, but he said "Erastus *the chamberlain* of the city saluteth you. " This one example is all that is needed to disprove and refute the teaching of long standing, which has been given the prestige of some prominent names, that a Christian cannot hold any administrative office in any government of the world, civil or military. But Erastus, one of Paul's converts held a high office in government at Corinth, and continued in the office, which the apostle recognized without disapproval.

On this point Philip Schaff, in his Bible dictionary, makes the distinction between the Erastus who was a companion of Paul and Timothy, mentioned in 2 Timothy 4: 20, and Erastus the chamberlain of Corinth, mentioned in Romans 16: 23. The former, he said, was "one of Paul's attendants, sent with Timothy into Macedonia"; the latter, he said, was "the chamberlain or treasurer of Corinth, and one of Paul's converts. " This eminent authority then adds: "Some identify him with the preceding, but upon insufficient grounds; for in this case we should expect the mention of his office in the Acts and in Timothy, as in Romans—unless, indeed, he received the office after his conversion, which is very unlikely. " And by the same token

it is assuredly *very unlikely*, and equally so, that the inspired apostle would have honored this man's office by special apostolic mention without disapproval, if as a Christian he could not have continued in it. But he was in office after his conversion, for Paul said: "Erastus *the chamberlain of the city*"—now was he, or was he not, the treasurer of the city? It is an outstanding fact, much to the vexation of those who contend that members of the church cannot hold governmental offices, that the holders of such civil and military positions in the New Testament, such as the centurion in Caesarea, the jailer in Philippi, the treasurer of the city in Corinth and Queen Candace's treasurer in Ethiopia, and the holders of the offices in the praetorium in Rome, were all repeatedly mentioned with commendation, but never a word of disapproval. This fact alone dissipates the attempted arguments and the specious interpretations based on all of the passages that have been considered. The reference to the afflictions of the Macedonian churches, in the Philippian passages, have no bearing on the discussion of civil and military government, and they do not belong to that subject.

Further evidence of the truth of this statement is in the fact that Paul, the author of the epistles in which these passages appear, was not himself a conscientious objector to his own government, as shown by his teaching and his example from Acts 23 to Romans 13. On the occasions recorded in Acts, the apostle requested, received and accepted the protection of the military escort, to the extent of physical force and bodily violence, according to the connection of passages from Acts 23: 10 to 24: 7; and on a final occasion, the appeal to Caesar as a Roman citizen because he had done nothing "worthy of death," a plain implication of his own approval of the course of the law had the converse been true. The apostle was convoyed to Caesarea by a company of four hundred and seventy armed soldiers, composed of the infantry, the cavalry and a special detachment of spearmen; and there were incidents of force and violence on the way to Caesarea. It is inconceivable that it was right for Paul to request, receive and accept such armed protection but wrong for another member of the church to be in the force that provided it. And in Romans 13 the apostle's teaching corroborates his example, that the sword-bearer for good against evil-doers

is the minister of God ordained "for this very thing. " Thus we have both the teaching and the practice of the apostle Paul on the subject, the confused aberrations of the conscientious objectors to the contrary notwithstanding.

THIRD: MATTHEW 5: 38-42:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. "

There is not an illusion in the entire context of these verses on resistance to a court of justice, to restraining a criminal, to statutory coercion, to punitive law, to war between nations, or to any function of government. The literal and legal application would abolish every bar of judgment and destroy every judicial system in existence; it would empty the jails, open the prisons and let down all the guards of society. It would require the passive submission of all good people to the violence of bad men. The most impassioned pacifist and scrupulous conscientious objector would balk at these consequences. But these effects exist, and from them consistency compels acceptance of the true meaning of these admonitions on non-resistance, that they pertain to personal retaliation and exhort us to substitute deeds of benevolence for acts of malevolence; and to replace vengeance with forbearance. These rules of conduct bear on individual reactions and the doing of positive good instead of returning evil for evil.

The command to turn the other cheek is an allusion to the back of the hand slap in the face and is an exhortation bearing on the attitude of resentment toward insults and the actions consequent thereto. It is remarkable on this point that the literalists who attach the physical meaning to turning the other cheek display a noticeable disregard for the verse in the same context which enjoins giving and lending in the words, "give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. " Apply these words literally to the banker and it would reduce the banks in every community to insolvency, and to

bind it as a literal precept on individuals would result in personal bankruptcy. The disciple of the Lord by that token would be required to give to every would-be borrower, and by the same token as it applies to resistance he could not under any circumstances defend title to private property or provide protection for his household. If a restricted interpretation is allowed in these economic interests, then the literal applications made to non-resistance in functions of government, law and order, and war are destroyed. The extension of these sayings of the Lord to legal force is not justified, and Jesus Christ left no such prohibitions on record.

The charge has been made that the figurative application of the precepts is but to weaken the Lord's sayings, yet the literalists themselves exercise that well known oriental freedom of watering down his sayings on such passages as passing the camel through the needle's eye, while insisting on strict non-resistance. Their inconsistency turns into a *reductio ad absurdum* type of interpretation. For the pacifistic theory of non-resistance under all conditions and circumstances there is no recognized critical authority; that these sayings of Christ relate to retaliation for private injuries and personal attitudes rather than law and order in the functions of government is sustained by all sound and consistent exegesis. This whole set of scriptural aphorisms represents spiritual inhibitions rather than physical prohibitions.

FOURTH: LUKE 6: 27-28:

"But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that persecute you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. "

It is claimed that this commandment of love is an interdiction of justice against enemies of good in society and prohibitive of resistance against an evil-doer at all levels. It is a viewpoint that perverts the doctrine of love into a weak sentimentality that unconditionally forgives everything. A whole group of these non-malevolent and positive-good passages have been pressed into the devious and rather oblique patterns of absolute non-resistance and unreserved forgiveness of the trespasser. The words of Christ at the conclusion of the parable of the unmerciful servant in Matthew 18: 35 have been twisted to extend the exercise of

love and leniency to acquiescence and submission to all conditions under all circumstances. "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses. " That the appropriation of this passage is slanted in the wrong direction is apparent when it is observed that in verse 34 the Lord commanded deliverance of the real offender of the parable "to the tormentors"—that is, punitive authorities—"until he should pay all that was due unto him. " Thus in this parable the Lord teaches the external principle of punitive law alongside the inner law of love and the forgiveness which according to the text itself is a virtue of the heart. Manifestly then, the passages upon which pacifists and conscientious objector's rely do not attribute any such meaning to the word love or to the command to love the enemy, whether they be personal or public enemies, and there is no scriptural text that can be correctly interpreted to support the eccentricities of their viewpoints. The erratic attempt to connect these texts with voting and the civil duties of a democratic society is a complete misfire since the meaning of government to the early Christian was either the Jewish state or the Roman empire, and there was no exercise of the ballot.

The common conception of the conscientious objector is formulated into a policy of opposition to resistance by physical force but permitting resistance by words. But the instructions in the proof-texts which they have appropriated, such as the contexts of Matthew 5 and Luke 6, require the injured party to perform more than is demanded by the transgressor, both acts and words forbidden. Take note of such injunctions as when smitten on one cheek, turn the other; if one would sue for the coat, let him have the cloak; whoever would compel a mile, go with him two; and agree with the adversary without argument. By the literal application of these instructions a verbal protest is excluded.

The word *resist* denotes a wide sense of opposition, and its use or non-use must be determined by the occasions, the conditions and the circumstances, and the parties involved. An instance of damage or injury may concern none but the disciple himself, with no other person involved. When the interest of another than the aggressor and one's self exists, a third party, then the course of action by the

disciple affects more than his personal rights, but the welfare of an innocent and unoffending party also. With such circumstances surrounding him, the disciple must determine his action on the basis of an alternative: whether he will by non-resistance aid the guilty and allow damage and injury to the innocent, or choose the course that will estop the guilty and result in the well-being of the innocent. It is a question of lending aid to the one or the other, and there is no teaching of Christ that aids the criminal or that instructs his disciple to do so.

The injunctions of Matthew 5: 38-44 and Luke 6: 27-30 apply only to cases and conditions where no third party is involved, nor the interests of others than the disciple himself are at stake. The essential probity of this procedure is exemplified by the Lord himself in several instances: 1. He resisted the Pharisees by words in Matthew 23: 13-33, with scathing condemnations. 2. He resisted the traders by deeds in John 2: 13-17, with the violent acts of driving them out with cord whips and overthrowing their counters. 3. On the occasion of his arrest in John 18: 8 he did not offer his captors more than was demanded but pleaded for the protection of others; 4. at his trial in Matthew 27: 11 he refused to give an answer when it was demanded; 5. and at his examination in John 18: 22 when he was smitten he did not turn the other cheek; 6. but in Mark 12: 12; 14: 1-2 he taught the people under the influence of force when more than his own safety, but the welfare of others, was involved.

It has been averred that in the case of John's imprisonment the fact that Jesus did not use force, or make any other effort to rescue John, is apropos to the contention that in both his teaching and his practice he opposed any form of coercion. But in the record of Luke 23: 1-10, Jesus did not offer verbal resistance to the charges of his accusers, and made no defense of himself before Herod with an impact of words against priests and scribes who "stood and vehemently accused him. " So if in the case of John there is an indication that Jesus condemns coercion in actions, in examination before Herod there is the same type of an intimation that he forbids resistance in words.

Turning from the rational to the sentimental it is postulated with much fervor that it is impossible to conceive of Jesus using physical force or performing any function resulting in damage, injury or loss of life. So far as this

sentimental assertion respects the use of words his example is recorded in Luke 13: 32-33, where he was told of Herod's intention to kill him, and when he sent his reply back to the king himself, in the incisive words, "Go tell that fox. " And so far as this feeling of emotion affects a punitive action, administered by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, the example is in the record of Acts 5: 1-10, where Ananias and Sapphira "agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord, " and they both fell down dead, executed by the Lord whose Spirit they had tempted. As a further example there is the case of Sergius Paulus, the Roman deputy, in Acts 13: 6-11, where the Lord struck Elymas the sorcerer with blindness for his attempt to pervert the deputy. The example here is twofold, and retires both objections to resistance in words and acts, for Paul resisted Elymas with all the severity that can be compacted in words in saying: "O full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The action of Jesus Christ himself is expressed in the statement: "And now, behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind for a season. And immediately there fell upon him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand. " By the mouth of Paul the resistance of words was enforced, but it was by the hand of the Lord (verse 11) that the physical penalty was inflicted.

The purpose of these citations is not at all to establish a pattern for a course of action but to dispose of the argument based on the sentiment that it is an inconceivable thing to imagine Jesus Christ exercising coercion, performing the role of resistance, administering punitive measures, enforcing physical penalties even in the degree of capital punishment, or executing any law of physical force. And these citations do just that.

If resistance and force are wrong in principle and in all exigencies without exception, an injunction of that importance could not have failed to find a prominent place in the teaching of both Christ and his apostles. That no such prohibitions are found is unaccountable on any other conclusion than that such a theorem is not included in either the old or the new testaments. Condemnation of force would have condemned the whole Mosaic system with all of the penalties it embodied, yet Jesus was never attacked

by the scribes and Pharisees for any teaching on that point. Why ? On the contrary the Lord expressed a singular praise for a Roman soldier in Acts 8: 5-13 and in Luke 7: 1-9; and in the books of the acts of his apostles there is more than one case of soldiers accepting Christ, with no suggestion that they were required to abandon their professions or in any instance discountenanced or discredited for maintaining their status. There is no intimation of any such requirement among the many problems surrounding the early Christians with which the apostolic epistles to the churches, chiefly the epistles of Paul, had to deal. Paul himself did not hesitate to call for and claim the military protection of the government in which he was a citizen, and to collaborate militarily with his protectors, as recorded in the twenty-second and the twenty-third chapters of the book of Acts. And he was not reluctant to enter an appeal to Caesar in gaining the full benefits of the law of his government, as dramatically described in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Acts. And the authorities of Palestine did not know Jesus Christ as a pacifist, else they would have had no fear of a popular uprising or a violent revolution on his behalf as mentioned in the first verses of the fourteenth chapter of Mark. And stranger than that, if they had known Jesus Christ to be a pacifist, it is quite a quandary that they should dispatch such a formidable guard for the arrest of one whose teaching had condemned all forcible resistance.

There are yet other evidences of an incidental classification that Jesus did not give sanction to the attitude of either the pacifist or conscientious objector toward coercion and non-resistance. When in Matthew 5: 22 he warned that "whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council," it is a tacit approval of that judicial system among the Jews. The brother of this passage was the brother Jew, and the council was a punitive body. The term Raca was a Jewish expression of contempt, and the right to deal with the Jew who called his brother by this contumelious name was recognized by Jesus, and his use of it, without condemnation, gives direct indorsement of this penal court. It has the same sanction in this connection that was given in the same context to the penalties of judgment for anger and hell fire for the extreme case mentioned. If Jesus condemned all coercion he would have disapproved of the council itself. There is therefore no contra-

diction between these verses in Matthew 5 and verses 38-44 which apply to personal retaliation.

The insistence on taking certain sayings of Jesus literally cannot be allowed to stop with the few commandments arbitrarily selected as suitable to the scruples of the conscientious objector and the strategy of the pacifists. The case of the rich young ruler in Matthew 19 is an example. He was told to sell all that he had and dispense it to the poor. The religious orders use the same method of the pacifist in advocating this narrative as an example of poverty, asceticism and the beginnings of monasticism. The same method applied by the ascetics to the apostle's statement in 2 Timothy 2: 4 that the soldier, whom they interpret to mean the Christian servant, cannot be "entangled with the affairs of this life," makes this passage the ground for the justification of their monk system and the establishment of monasteries, according to the Catholic dogma that such a dedicated servant of the Lord cannot engage in worldly affairs.

The command of Jesus to the rich young ruler was to sell all that he possessed—reserving not even a portion—and to dispose of it all, not a part of it. Is it necessary for the Christian to sell all of his properties and possessions and give them all away? The literal application would require it, and the sensitive consciences of the objectors to coercion, resistance and force cannot be allowed to make capital of the few passages employed to teach non-resistance, but circumvent scriptures of the same nature which demolish their arguments and reduce them to the status of *non compos mentis*—the state of mental unsoundness. These citations cannot be ignored. Any argument to justify discrimination in the application of these references will completely nullify their premises and conclusions. It will not resolve the inconsistencies to set up scripture against scripture, for the contradictions are not in the Lord's statements but in the misinterpretation and false application of them.

FIFTH: MATTHEW 26: 51-52:

"One of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. "

The order given by Christ to Peter in the words of this text are interpreted to mean the unconditional condemnation of the use of the sword. It is thought that the same command that disarmed Peter in principle unbelted every soldier. But the Master of men did not disarm Peter—he kept his sword. The Lord merely ordered Peter to "put up again thy sword"—that is, to sheathe it, return it to its sheath and "into its place. " Now, what is the place of the sword, why was Peter wearing a sworded sheath? The Lord evidently knew that he had it before he drew it. And he was not commanded to abandon it but to sheathe it.

Since he was not ordered to discard it, why was he permitted to keep it? The conscientious objector will have a hard time with these questions. It is obvious that the prohibition is a special one. The death of Christ was not to be prevented by the use of the sword; and the vehemence of Peter in this rash act could have resulted in death to the disciples also. If the death of Jesus should have been prevented by force, he at once announced that he could have commanded twelve legions of angels as his task force, and the legions of Rome would have been no match for them. The reason for the reprimand was Peter's impetuous misuse of the sword. It is clearly a special case with the reason for rebuke plainly implied, but it does not by any implication hold that the use of the sword is wrong in itself. If so, then why did Peter have the sword in the sheath at all?

The statement "for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" is a solemn warning, but to quote it as a precept for pacificism does violence to the text. The Lord's grim declaration that one who takes the sword shall perish with it, could not possibly come to pass without its use. Since the use of the sword is an essential element of the statement, the conclusion without contradiction is inevitable: the one who resorts to the wrong use of the sword shall perish by the right use of it. The evil of the sword therefore is in the initiative of it.

All of the records give the account of the bearing of the sword at the arrest of Jesus, and the parallel passage of Luke 22: 49-51 makes it clear that other disciples than Peter had the sword also: "When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him, Lord shall we smite with the sword? And one of them smote the

servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear and healed him. " This statement verifies beyond question that the disciples were carrying swords, bearing arms, with the knowledge of Jesus and without his disapproval. All of the records give an account of the swords, none rebukes the bearers for carrying them. Mark mentions the use of the sword, but says nothing further. Matthew and John order it to be sheathed but do not condemn its possession nor command its abandonment. And Luke records the words of Christ in reference to it, "suffer ye thus far"—that is, he restrained the use of the sword there, in the attempt to avert what should not be prevented. The evident meaning of "suffer ye thus far" is that the use of the sword would not be restrained on all occasions, but on this occasion its use was forbidden for very obvious reasons—not for the wrongfulness of it, but the purpose of the initiation.

SIXTH: LUKE 22: 85-38:

"And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? 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. "

The substance of this passage bears out all that has been presented in the foregoing comments. It is argued that the command to buy the swords was ironic. If that is true, the Lord's point was lost, for it is evident that his hearers did not so understand it. And if the language is figurative so that it does not mean the literal or actual sword, then the same would be true of the purse and the wallet. But be it literal or figurative, and it could be either, in neither case could this passage provide a premise for the pacifist, for the disciples were here armed with swords, as they were in the record of Luke 22: 49-51, with not only the knowledge of Jesus, but with his consent and sanction. And when the disciples mentioned their possession of two

swords, and Jesus said that the two were enough, no matter what is meant by the expression "it is enough," it did not remove any misapprehensions concerning such an evil, if their possession of the swords were an evil. The fact remains that Peter was armed with a sword, and so were the other disciples, and in no instance were they ordered by the Lord to disarm, but were told under particular circumstances to sheathe their weapons, which implies that under proper circumstances the same weapons in all propriety could be unsheathed. These armed disciples asked the Lord if they might use the sword to prevent his arrest, and Jesus said, "Suffer ye thus far." He had said in verse 37 that the things written must yet be accomplished in him, and should not be prevented by the sword. But the phraseology "suffer ye thus far" is not the language which forbids all armed resistance, under all circumstances. Rather do the phrases "but now" and "thus far" indicate the right or wrong occasions for such resistance and set particular limits.

In the records of Matthew 26: 52-56, and Mark 14: 51-52, and Luke 22: 35-38; 49-53, and John 18: 7-9, the contexts indicate that Jesus considered the escape and future safety of the disciples. The continuation of the work the Father had sent him to do was staked on their survival, hence the necessity of preventing a general outbreak of mob violence at the time of his arrest. Thus in Luke 22: 38 the expression "it is enough," in reference to the two swords, was intended to dismiss the subject and leave the matter of the sufficiency of the swords to the discretion of the users in the consideration of the occasions and circumstances of their employment. The other expression in Luke 22: 36, "he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one," is in the character of language prophetic of the protective arm of law and order which would be necessary to the work of the apostles of Christ in the midst of the hostilities of the Jewish and Roman worlds.

SEVENTH: JOHN 18: 36:

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

The meaning imputed to this passage is that on account of the kingdom of Christ being not of the world, a member of the church cannot be a participator in the official functions of a worldly government; and that the passage is prohibitory of the Christian's connection with any administrative office of government the duties of which would require physical resistance and military force. If that is true, and Jesus here condemned the exercise of legal force, he concealed his convictions, and the cause he assigned for the abstention of his servants from fighting was fictitious. The reason specified proceeded from the spirituality of his kingdom, not from any immorality of military weapons. In the averment, "if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, " Jesus recognized that the support and protection of armed force are essential to the existence of any secular state, and that no civil government could be maintained without military armament. The passage therefore means that there can be no physical compulsions in the promotion of the kingdom of Christ. No one can shoot the gospel into a man, nor machine-gun Christianity into a community. Neither can intercontinental ballistic missiles bomb the kingdom of Christ into Russia and China, nor blast it out of existence in the United States of America and Great Britain. The Lord's saying, in Luke 17: 21, that "the kingdom of God is within you, " is a comment on the spiritual nature of his kingdom, that it pertains to the inner man, a spiritual reign in the hearts of men. The carnal weapons are not the means to spiritual ends, or the advancement of the kingdom, but rather the promulgation of its principles, the truth. These scriptures, then, have no bearing on the morality of military might for the defense of a nation and the protection of its citizens, else Jesus would not have said, "then would my servants fight. " The Lord's statements that "my kingdom is not of this world" and "now is my kingdom not from hence" have the same import as was imparted in the words "the kingdom of God is within you, " and they all convey the same distinctions; and when put in the proper perspective as a contrast between the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ and the material character of the governments of the world, it is plain that these passages carry no connotations of the pacifistic viewpoint.

EIGHTH: MARK 10: 42-44:

"But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be the servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. "

It is a strange thing that this passage should be interpreted as an interdiction of the coercion that belongs to civil government on the ground that Jesus condemned the oppressions of the Gentile lords and Roman princes. It misses the point and is a complete misfire. If civil coercion was the point in this passage, then its application would not have been restricted to Gentile authorities, for the Jewish government had its penal code and exercised coercion. The statement was made in connection with verses 35-41 in which is recorded the request of the two disciples, James and John, for the offices of the high rank among the disciples. The record of Mark uses the phrase "in thy glory"; the parallel in Matthew (20: 21) puts it "in thy kingdom. " In verse 41 of Mark's account the ten disciples were said to be "much displeased" over the petition of the two for positions of superiority in the kingdom. Apparently, the disciples were quarreling over the question of precedence and prominence in the administration of the affairs of the new kingdom to be established. The answer of Jesus that "so shall it not be among you" means that the church is not a temporal realm and there is no such exercise of authority within it. The apostles themselves were not to be vested with the political portfolio of a minister of state in a worldly government and could not therefore become candidates for higher and lower offices in his kingdom. His servants were to become the servants of men, consistent with the principles of a kingdom not of this world and commensurate with his own ministry "to give his life a ransom for many. "

And here it is said that the death of Jesus is the ultimate as an argument for non-resistance and that it is the supreme example of it, for according to Isaiah 53 and Acts

8, being led to the cross as a sheep to the slaughter "he openeth not his mouth. " If that is the point involved, then it must follow, as a matter of course, that for a disciple of Christ to offer verbal resistance in self defense, or under any circumstances to resist death, would be acting in disobedience to Christ. It should not be necessary to say that such a concept misses the point completely of the reason for the atoning death of Christ. His crucifixion did not exemplify a doctrine of non-resistance—that is not why he died nor what he died for—he died for our sins and "gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. " Any adaptation of such passages to condemn the prerogatives of the offices and functions of civil government is a mask for an amorphous mass of ignorance in comprehending the teaching of Christ.

NINTH: MARK 12: 13-17:

"And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, to catch him in his words. And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teacheth the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring me a penny that I may see it. And they brought it. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Caesar's. And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. "

The same use is made of this scripture, accompanied by the same degree of misapprehension, as of the foregoing passages examined. The Pharisees and Herodians sought to ensnare the Lord with a loaded question concerning whether it was consistent with the Mosaic law to pay tribute to Caesar. Their interrogation was: Shall we Jews give, or shall we not give to Caesar? To answer with a direct affirmative would have strained his relations with the Jews and alienated them, and to answer with a direct negative would have involved him with the Romans and antagonized them. Jesus asked them whose superscription was on the coin. When they replied, Caesar's, he answered: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the

things that are God's. " Obviously, the approval of Jesus of rendering to Caesar that which belongs to him was not predicated on the ground of either resistance or non-resistance, but on the fact that the performance of all obligations to Caesar is right. The Lord's reply was not limited to the tribute—he said "things, " render to Caesar the *things* that are Caesar's, not one thing, but all the obligations of a civil government. If it be true, that all human civil government belongs to the devil, as has been taught with considerable acceptance, then Jesus bids all of us to render certain things to the devil. It is my heartfelt conviction that neither a Christian nor any one else has ever been commanded to render anything to the devil.

The language of Jesus, without doubt, condemns the spirit of accepting the benefits of citizenship but ignoring the obligations involved in it, not merely in the matter of taxation and the paying of tribute, but in all the things that belong to it. It should be observed that if Jesus had declared that it was wrong to pay tribute to Caesar, he would have been lending support to rebellion against the Roman government, which would have the equivalent to encouraging civil disorder, in consequence of which he could have justly been judged guilty of sedition.

TENTH: MARK 12: 28-31:

"And one of the scribes... asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. "

This passage is considered final as an argument against the exercise of condign retribution which, it is asserted, love for one's neighbor could not permit. Apply the same principle to family life and there could be no parental discipline. If love for the neighbor prevents the administration of punitive law in civil society, then love for the child would preclude all disciplinary action in the family. But if coercion is incompatible with love and destructive of love's ends, Jesus Christ would not have defined one of

the prime intents of the law as the love of one's fellow man, which law was itself a penal code.

ELEVEN: MATTHEW 10: 23:

"But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. "

In the search for passages to support the pacifist view of the Christian's conduct in civil society, this exhortation of the Lord to his disciples has been cited. But in the same connection Jesus commanded them to "provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor script for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat"—verses 9 and 10. If a Christian disobeys verse 23 in the performance of civil and military duties, then the conscientious objectors to such services are in perpetual disobedience to verses 9 and 10 which prohibited the provisions of money in the purse, additional clothing and sandals, or even a staff for the hand. If verse 23 teaches civil non-resistance, then the verses above it teaches non-preparation for journeys from place to place. And to be consistent these instructions for non-preparation must be applied to the sending of "missionaries" into every field. Let the conscientious objector and the pacifist consider this consequence—no money for the purse, no shoes for the feet, no bags of extra clothing—and they will surely see that this text and others like it have no application to the ideology they attempt to impose on the members of the church in the society of this world.

Then, what is the meaning and the passage, and the import of its language? The entire tenth chapter of Matthew is devoted to the calling of the twelve disciples, who were later to become his apostles, and the Lord's discourse to them, containing not only instructions for their immediate mission but certain predictions and precepts relating to the events and the experiences of their apostolic ministry. The character of their work was such that no primary consideration should be given to the selfish interest, and there would be no material emolument from employment or office, and there should be no extraordinary preparations in the matter of additional equipment more than the ordinary. Since the period of persecution belonged to the history of the church, and the work of the apostles after its establish-

ment, and not to the experiences of the disciples of Jesus during his personal ministry, that part of the instructions reached beyond Pentecost, and as far into the future as the destruction of Jerusalem.

It is evident that the verbal inspiration promised in verse 19 was received after and not before the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them on the day of Pentecost. The descriptions of verse 23 in reference to the extreme conditions of persecution, in which they would be refugees fleeing from one city to another, did not prevail before the death of Christ and the establishment of the church. Parts of the instructions in Matthew 10 are parallel with similar instruction in Matthew 24, in the Lord's discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem. The coming of the Son of man in verse 23 is an evident reference to the establishment of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. " This statement is parallel with that of Matthew 16: 28: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom"; and also with the statement of Mark 9: 1 that "there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power, " Both the day of Pentecost and the destruction of Jerusalem are described as the coming of the Son of man. Hence, these passages have a dual application to the establishment of the kingdom on Pentecost, and the further fact that the gospel work of the apostles would not have been completed in cities of Israel, or in Judea, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The use of passages of this nature to promote the ideology of pacifism and the idealism of non-resistance is a misuse of scriptures. Nothing is said on either of these subjects in these verses, and the narrations of the imprisonment of the apostles of Christ and the persecutions of the early Christians are not cases in point, and they do not compose the issues involved in the mission of civil government or of the Christian's relation to the civil state.

TWELVE: JOHN 8: 3-11:

"And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, they say unto him, Master, this woman was taken

in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more. "

This narrative has been considered as the condemnation of the Jewish penalty of stoning in certain cases of adultery, and has been used as an implication against the infliction of physical punishment by civil magistrates. From any viewpoint the passage could mean no more than the Lord's refusal to become a Jewish judge, or to preside over an improvised court; and that he did not pass a judicial Mosaic sentence upon an unfortunate offender, but rather directed attention to spiritual results which no judicial procedures could accomplish. The law of Moses did not command stoning for all who were guilty of adultery, but only that an adulterer should die. The form of death was in general cases not prescribed, but according to the traditions of the Talmud, it was administered by strangulation. But the penalty of stoning was specified in the law. The adulteress was an espoused damsel or a betrothed bride. It appears therefore that the victim of this narrative was an espoused but unmarried woman. It must be assumed that the charge against the woman of being "taken in adultery, in the very act, " was true, and that the enactment of Moses "in the law" was explicit; and in order to involve Jesus in a dilemma, the scribes and Pharisees said to him, "but what sayest thou?" This was intended by them as an insinuation that Jesus had claimed an authority superior to that of Moses, hence a challenge to him to exercise it in solving the present predicament. The dilemma in which they imagined this question involved Jesus corresponded to the tribute

money in Matthew 22: 17, and the question "is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not?" In that instance, a direct affirmative answer would have alienated the Jews, and the negative answer would have antagonized the Romans, and would have subjected Jesus to the accusation of encouraging civil disorder. In the present case, to affirm the judgment of the Mosaic law would have been an action contrary to the Roman law; but to set aside the penalty of the Mosaic law would have been inconsistent with his claims of fulfilling the law. The supposed dilemma was that any answer to their question in this case would be fatal to his teaching and his mission. By declaring the validity of the judgment according to the law of Moses, he would have become liable to the civil power; but any disparagement of the law of Moses would have meant to lose the favor and the following of the people.

In a somewhat strange mechanical action of writing on the ground, the Lord indicated his intention to follow his own course rather than to become involved in leading and loaded questions. When they "continued asking him, " and thus pressed him for an answer, he said: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. " This language does not imply that her accusers were all guilty of the specific sin of adultery, but that in each of them was felt the same natural inclinations which had issued in the sinful act of the unfortunate woman. It is to be assumed that the espoused husband of the betrothed bride was among her direct accusers, and when the Lord's words revealed to all of them his knowledge of their own hearts and the depths of their thoughts, they shrank from his divine presence without claim to innocence. The question had been raised from the legal to the spiritual level, and the accusers and the judges of the sinful woman were taught that restraint from overt acts, or freedom from outward guilt, is no ground for the presumption of sinlessness. And they all, one by one, withdrew, leaving the woman alone in the presence of the One who had known and revealed the depths of the hearts and minds of her accusers.

When Jesus arose from stooping, "and saw none but the woman, " he asked: "Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?" Her answer, "No man, Lord" indicates that she expected the Lord to render the judgment, but Jesus said, "Neither do I condemn thee:

go, and sin no more. " Unlike her accusers, Jesus was himself sinless, but he passed no sentence upon the woman. The question of the forgiveness of sin is not involved in the Lord's statement, "neither do I condemn thee. " The condemnation refers to legal punishment and not to moral guilt. When Jesus said to the accusers, "he that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her, " he was requiring that one to take the place of the legal witness, according to the law of Deuteronomy 17: 7; but here the guiltless was summoned to take the place of a witness in a sense that convicted them all of guilt. But these men were not magistrates of the law, and had not been appointed to a legal procedure against this woman; and Jesus merely refused to assume the prerogative of a judge of either a Jewish or a Roman court in pronouncing a legal sentence. There is nothing in the words, "neither do I condemn thee, " to disparage legal justice, much less to prohibit the administration of punitive law in the procedures.

THIRTEEN: ROMANS 13: 1-7:

A critic thought he had discovered a glaring inconsistency in a speech delivered by the author on the subject of "Premillennialism, " and his argument from Romans 13 on the government issue.

The querist wanted to know by what authority do we change "*he* beareth not the sword in vain, " to "*we*" in Romans 13: 4? It was by the authority of the law of the mind—a simple step in logic. It did not occur to me that any hearer or reader could not make the transition by one simple step that would not even throw them off balance, or interfere with their train of thought. If the brother cannot span the stream, it will require but a few moments to build him a footbridge.

When Paul asserted that the "powers that be are ordained of God, " did he limit the statement to the then existent powers? If so, Romans 13 has no bearing upon any question of the Christian and his attitude toward government today, unless it might be used merely as an illustration of what Paul taught at one particular period. When Paul said, "There *is* no power but of God, " did he mean that only at the particular moment in history when he was speaking, the statement was true? But prior to or subsequent to that time the powers were not, and are not, of God? If so, by

what authority does this brother and others contend that Christians should today even "submit" to the government, by paying taxes, or in any other way acknowledge any obligation whatever to the government?

According to the argument on the pronouns and tenses in Romans 13, by what authority does the brother teach men to repent and be baptized today? If he cannot vary the pronouns and the tenses of the commands spoken by Christ and his apostles, how can he apply the gospel to men today? Do we not expect an audience to take the same simple thought-step every time a gospel sermon is preached?

It reduces itself to the question of what part of that which we read about in the New Testament can be applied to us today, and what cannot be thus applied. The statement, "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years," appears in the midst of the figurative language of a book of prophecies and symbols. There is nothing leading up to it in the plan of salvation; there are no duties or commands growing out of it. There is no obvious application to ourselves today.

On the other hand, there are definite duties and commands respecting the government, and an obvious application to those who would serve God in their attitude toward them. We know there are governments; we can see the manifestation of them daily. We can study their history; we can perceive their nature and functions. When Paul instructs the Romans as to what their attitude should be toward their government, and speaks of the "powers" that be, even asserting that there is no power—that is, government—except of God, he was speaking "for" and "to" all Christians throughout the gospel dispensation. Paul did not specify monarchies, empires, republics, democracies—he said "powers," and there was no civil power not within the scope of his discourse.

The brother thinks it ridiculous that Paul would tell us to obey ourselves, if we are the government—but it is foolish to argue against a demonstration. We do have a government that derives its authority from the consent of the governed. And in such a government each individual has some attitude toward the government—even if it does sound ridiculous to the brother for an individual to have an attitude toward himself. That fact depends not so much on a passage of scripture to be analyzed as it is a fact to be

recognized; there is not much of a way to help a man to recognize a fact. We can help men to understand what they see; but we cannot see for them. We hope the readers can see this fact, for it is a very visible one.

If and when the objector comes to recognize the fact that the government is composed of the people living within the scope and influence of it, we will be in a position to advance to the thought that those born within the scope of the government, and who continue to dwell therein, are inherently in possession of citizenship in the government—unless he has taken some step to repudiate his citizenship. If he does not consider himself a citizen, he should in common fairness make known his attitude to the government.

A point worthy of repetition is that the very preacher who argues that the pronouns and tenses of Romans 13 do not include the Christian as a part of the government, reverse their claim by their practice. As has been shown, they themselves function as civil magistrates every time they perform a marriage ceremony. Marriage licenses are issued by "the powers that be" and it is written on the face of the license that the officiating officer is an agent of the government, acting by the authority of the State. Every preacher who has the credentials necessary to perform marriages is a civil magistrate in the exercise of such credentials. In that capacity he does not act as "a minister of Christ" or "the minister of the church," he acts wholly and solely as a minister of the government, an officer of the State. But some "ministers" have solemnized the rites of matrimony in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. What kind of an illusion or delusion is it that makes a preacher think the Holy Spirit has appointed him to execute marriage licenses issued by the State? It so happens that it is not the "seal of the Holy Spirit" on that particular legal instrument, but the seal of the State, and the preacher's credentials to execute them are on file in the county court house instead of being on record in the New Testament.

On this point we are sometimes told that Paul said (in Phil. 3: 20) that his *citizenship* was in heaven. Yes, the citizenship that he *referred to* in that passage was in heaven, but Paul's *Roman citizenship* was not in heaven. When Jesus said to Pilate, "my kingdom is not of this world," (Jno. 18: 36) he was merely emphasizing the *nature*

of the kingdom of Christ in contrast with the material kingdom. If the statement that his "kingdom" is "not of this world" means that a Christian cannot be a part of a government of the world, then Paul's statement that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink" (Rom. 14: 17) would mean that a Christian could not eat and drink! Those passages do not deny the privileges of the earthly government, they merely emphasize the *nature* of the spiritual kingdom.

It is claimed that the statement in Romans 13 that the *he*, the government, is a minister *to thee* just puts the Christian on the receiving end of the line. Here we are told that the Christian *pays* for that protection in taxes, or tribute. But the part of society that furnishes him the protection pays just as much in taxes and tribute as the Christian does, in addition to the protection given to the Christian. Romans 13 says that for this cause we pay tribute *also*. What is the *also* in addition to the tribute, or rather what is the *also* that the tribute is *in addition to*?

It resolves itself once more into the fact that this theory of civil government makes it right for a Christian to claim equal privileges of citizenship, but wrong for a Christian to bear the equal responsibilities of citizenship. Romans 13, according that idea, does not bar a Christian from all the blessings of the government but does *exempt* him from its responsibilities. The doctrine looks worse every time we see it.

When all attempts have failed to explain away Romans 13, the Conscientious Objectors fall back on the stock saying that if the teaching of Romans 13 on sword bearing applies to Christians, it includes Christians in all countries, which would result in members of the church bearing the sword against each other—hence one Christian killing another Christian. But as stated in a previous comment, to offer that contingency as an argument constitutes a tacit admission that it would be right to use the sword against any foe except a member of the church—so, after all, it would not be wrong to bear the sword to kill a sinner! Such evasions serve to show the inconsistency of the Conscientious Objector viewpoint and to further emphasize that bearing the sword "for good" against him that "doeth evil" is the rightful function of government equally

applicable to all citizens in the various responsibilities and diversity of assignments, combatant or non-combatant.

FOURTEEN: 2 CORINTHIANS 10: 3-4:

"For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; and having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. "

It is usually claimed that the carnal weapons of this passage refer to the material implements and armaments of warring nations, and that the expression "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal" condemns the bearing of arms in civil and military government. Such an application of this language ignores not only the immediate textual connections but the entire context of the Corinthian epistles, and misses the whole point in this passage.

The defense by Paul of his apostolic ministry was current through the second Corinthian epistle. He addressed his comments on the authenticity or genuineness of his apostleship directly to his critics and to those members of the Corinthian church who were victims of beguilement. Not satisfied with their own Jewish bailiwick, these agitating Judaizers had invaded Paul's own province among the Gentiles, and their subversive influence threatened destruction to his work as "the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, " as he had declared in Romans 15: 16, in the "ministering of the gospel of God, " as a called and qualified apostle of Christ. This apostolic critique was introduced in the third chapter, where Paul directed several questions to the leaders of the opposition to him on the necessity of commendations from them as an apostle, and his affirmation that the Corinthian church was itself, in a figure, his epistle of commendation as the fruit of his apostolic labor, being metaphorically "the epistle of Christ, ministered by us"—that is, established by himself—and "written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God"—that is, when Paul established it by the preaching of the gospel, by the Holy Spirit, as recorded in 1 Corinthians 15: 1-4. This is how he "ministered" the Corinthian church as "the epistle of

Christ, " and his own epistle of commendation as an apostle, sufficient as his apostolic credentials without the commendations of the Judaizers. In the first verse of the fourth chapter the apostle said, "therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not. " The "we" in this verse refers to Paul himself; the "ministry" means his apostolic office; and "we faint not, " means under their opposition to his apostleship.

In the fifth chapter, verses 18 to 20, he relates how he had first been reconciled to God by Jesus Christ, in his appearance to him on the Damascus way and his subsequent conversion in Damascus, a fact that was known to all the Jews. And having reconciled Paul to himself, he states that God "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation"—that is, after his conversion he was made an apostle of Christ—and having received the apostolic ministry God had "committed" to him "the word of reconciliation" (the inspired word). And in verse 20, the apostle adds, "now then we are ambassadors of Christ"—as a *bona fide* apostle he had, with the other apostles, the office that belonged only to an apostle, the portfolio of an ambassador.

Thus the defense by Paul of his apostolic credentials continues through the epistle to the tenth chapter. In this chapter he contrasts his own spiritual weapons as an apostle with the carnal weapons of the Judaizers in their opposition to him. They had attacked his person as well as his office, seeking to destroy him as an apostle by discrediting his person. They had resorted to the carnal tactics of calumny, deceit and slander. But in his defense against their attacks, he would not condescend to their carnal methods. "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh"—that is, as a man Paul was as other men, in the flesh; but as an apostle of Christ, his office was not of the flesh, but of the Spirit, and his weapons were of the same nature.

The whole context points to the Judaizers who had constructed a composite system out of a mixture of the elements of the gospel of Christ and the rudiments of the law of Moses, and this constituted the stronghold of Judaism, the most formidable foe of the gospel, and the greatest obstacle in the path of the church. Corinth had become a citadel for the gospel which Paul had preached there; and

Judaism was represented as the stronghold of the adversaries of Paul's gospel, and of Christianity, and the Judaizers were operating as subversive agents in the churches of the Gentiles to discredit Paul and thus to destroy his apostolic work. And it was in this connection and on this point that Paul said: "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds," The carnal weapons referred to the wicked methods of the Judaizers, and the mighty weapons of Paul referred to the spiritual endowments and miraculous powers which he possessed as an inspired apostle. Through these powers he was able to cast down every high thing, including the system of Judaism, that exalts itself against the knowledge of God—what God has revealed in the gospel—and bring them all into the captivity of obedience to Christ.

In verse 6, the apostle completes his comparison of weapons with the statement, "and having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled." The apostle was ready to employ the full force of his powers to revenge the work of his Judaizing enemies, not by use of the carnal weapons which they had employed against him, but through the power of the gospel—but to make their defeat effective in the Corinthian church, the residual recalcitrants who had become parties to the defection must be brought into obedience. Thus it was that the apostle to the Gentiles cast down every system that exalted itself against "the knowledge of God"—which simply means what God revealed through Paul for the Corinthians to know—and in so doing he was waging a spiritual warfare with weapons that were not carnal.

It is not complimentary to any one's knowledge of textual and contextual interpretation who would so distort these words of Paul by adapting them to outlaw all material weapons, to condemn military armament of the nation for the protection of its citizens, and to denounce the bearing of arms by soldiers who are members of the church for the defense of the society of which they are also members. It is a prepossession that prevents honest hermeneutics, compromises intellectual integrity, and deprives one of the basic qualification to expound the scriptures. This is what makes partisans of men.

FIFTEEN: JAMES 2: 8-12:

"If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well: but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. "

The common concept of this passage enforces the compatibility of the Royal Law with the Ten Commandments, making the command to *love thy neighbor* the companion to the code *thou shalt not kill*, and adducing both commandments as a conclusive argument against the infliction of death upon a violator of law under any condition or circumstance. It is thus that the Decalogue is made a premise from which the conclusion for the Royal Law is drawn, making the latter an extension of the former. But from such a premise the conclusion which bars capital punishment becomes illogical—for the same law of the Ten Commandments that prohibited murder, imposed the death penalty on the violator and made the death sentence mandatory.

The fundamental purpose of punitive law in any civilized criminal code is twofold: first, the protection of society against crime; second, the primary principle of justice, the just reward of deeds. The thief on the cross recognized this principle in his rebuke to his railing companion, in Luke 23: 40-41: "Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. " The supreme principle of law is to do justice. Both capital and secondary punishments are administered in regard for what justice demands, but in the Mosaic dispensation of punishment, when the deeds of the offender had no connection with society except the effect of bad influence, justice was outside the pale of human administration, and he was "cut off" from the people, and left to his fate before God. The law of Moses did not prescribe imprisonment by direct mention, but in the Pentateuch there are numerous references to the cases where the offender was "cut off from the people, " which appears to indicate an

exclusion from society, and excommunication from association, or banishment.

The Mosaic code makes a difference between the act of killing and the crime of murder, and draws a clear distinction between legal executions, such as capital punishment and war and self-defense on the one hand, and murder on the other. The law defined the murderer as one who slays another from enmity, malice, hatred, or with intent by lying in wait. For malicious murder there was no legal remission or pardon. The murderer could find no asylum in the cities of refuge, nor at the altar, nor with the purchase price of money, as can be observed in Exodus 21: 14, 28, 29; Numbers 35: 30-32; 1 Kings 2: 5-6, 28-34. The crime of murder was one of the most abominable acts in the category of crimes, a fact which made it subject to early legislation, direct from God, before the Ten Commandments or the laws of Moses existed, as recorded in Genesis 9: 6: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man."

But the clear distinction drawn between the act of murder and the taking of life in self-defense, or other legal or justifiable reasons, is unmistakable in such passages as Exodus 22: 2, where it is plainly stated that it was a legal act to kill the thief in defense of one's household. This is the record of some remarkable legislation in view of the rather widespread failure to make proper discriminations.

Deprivation of life may be lawful or unlawful in the sight of God, as well as in the eyes of man. God himself is said in Lamentations 2: 20 to have many ways by which to deprive the guilty of life when it is necessary for the accomplishment of divine ends. "Behold, O Lord to whom thou hast done this. Shall the women eat their fruit, and children of a span long? shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord? The young and the old lie on the ground in the streets: my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword; thou hast slain them in the day of thine anger; thou hast killed, and not pitied. Thou hast called as in a solemn day my terrors round about, so that in the day of the Lord's anger none escaped nor remained: those that I have swaddled and brought up hath mine enemy consumed." The dispossessing of life, whatever the means, is included in the term kill, or killing, whether it is directly or indirectly performed; and whether it is right

or wrong is determined by the cause and the motive and the exigence.

The deprivation of life by man is also lawful in the sight of God when a malefactor is put to death by judicial sentence, as commanded in Deuteronomy 13: 8-9: "Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterward the hand of all the people. " It is further stated in Exodus 22: 2 that if the thief is slain when breaking into the house, there has been no violation of any law of God or man, and the slayer of the thief is without guilt. But the taking of life unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, is murder and is not justifiable.

Noteworthy examples of the unlawful taking of life are the cases of Amnon and Naboth. In 2 Samuel 13 it is related that Absalom premeditated the death of Amnon and he was slain without legal authority by Absalom's command. "Now Absalom had commanded his servants, saying, Mark ye now when Amnon's heart is merry with wine, and when I say unto you, Smite Amnon; then kill him, fear not: have I not commanded you? be courageous, and be valiant"—verse 28. In the record of 1 Kings 21 the death of Naboth was unlawfully obtained by the subornation of heathen witnesses against him through the evil plotting of Jezebel and Ahab. When their evil machinations were exposed, God said: "Thus saith the Lord, Hast thou killed, and also taken possession?... In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine"—verse 19.

In the record of the New Testament reference is made in Mark 15: 7 to one Barabbas "who had committed murder in the insurrection, " which is a further illustration of the proper distinction between the lawful and unlawful taking of life. The horrendous character of murder, and the heinousness in which the murderer and his act were held, all have been given a graphic description in Deuteronomy 21: 1-9. So heinous was the crime that when the people were unable to track down the murderer, a law of ceremonial cleansing was enacted to deliver the elders of the city and the people from the blood of the slain man. "So shalt thou put away the guilt of innocent blood from among you, when thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the Lord"—

verse 9. But the deprivation of life in self-defense, capital punishment and defensive war have nowhere in the Bible been classified as murder or the unlawful taking of life. Yet, almost universally, the people and the preachers are wont to quote the sixth commandment of the decalogue, "thou shalt not kill, " and indiscriminately apply the prohibition to all phases of the subject, without regard to the bearing of the foregoing scriptures on the lawful or unlawful deprivation of life. An extended discussion of these scripture classifications in relation to the sixth commandment of the decalogue, of Exodus 20: 13, is in order.

It is argued that James joins the "royal law" of love to the Old Testament command, in Exodus 20: 13 and Deuteronomy 5: 17, "thou shalt not kill. " This is an effort to make the taking of life under all conditions an act of murder, and incompatible with the law of love.

The commandment is repeated in the following New Testament references: Mark 10: 19: "Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill"; Matthew 19: 18: "Thou shalt do no murder"; Romans 13: 9: "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill"; James 2: 11: "For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. " These several parallel passages are quoted to indicate the fact that whatever the command "thou shalt not kill" meant in the decalogue, that is the meaning of the command in the New Testament, for the command is enforced in the New Testament by the quotations of the writers from the decalogue itself. This is an important consideration, for if the sixth commandment of the decalogue applied to murder only, and did not apply to legal executions, capital punishment, self-defense and war, the same restriction applies to these quotations of it in the New Testament, and defines its meaning. The command "thou shalt not kill" in the New Testament means no more and no less than it meant in the Old Testament, so far as the act of killing is concerned.

The Noachian law of Genesis 9: 6 should be studied in comparison with the Mosaic code of Exodus 20: 13. The former declared, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. " The latter made statutory the command, "Thou shalt not kill. " It is obvious at a glance that the Noachian command could not have been obeyed without the

shedding of the blood, or the killing, of the one who was guilty of shedding man's blood. The question is, do the requirements of the Noachian command contradict the Mosaic code? On the same principle the same Mosaic law that codified the command, "thou shalt not kill, " also made capital punishment and legal executions mandatory. Does the Mosaic law contradict the decalogue? An elucidation of the meaning of all these passages will be effected by the examination of the various original words used in the texts, and by the comparison of the scriptures under consideration.

In the first instance of the taking of human life, in Genesis 4: 8, where it is said that Cain "rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him, " the word *slew* is the Hebrew *hahrag*, as it is also in verse 25, referring to Abel "whom Cain slew. " It is significant that this is also the word used in Deuteronomy 13: 9 where the command "thou shalt surely kill him" was a statutory enactment. This word is used in 1 Kings 18: 13 in the reference that "Jezebel slew the prophets, " and in Genesis 32: 20 where the brothers of Joseph conspired, saying "come now therefore, let us kill him. " But in Deuteronomy 12: 15, in the law governing the killing for food, "thou mayest *kill* and eat flesh" is the word *zahvagh*. Then, in reference to the thief of Exodus 22: 2, if he should "be smitten that he die, " the word smitten is *nahchah*, and the phrase *that he die* is from *mooth*. Now, in contrast with all these variations, in the command of the decalogue, as recorded by Moses in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, "thou shalt not *kill*, " the word used is *rahtzagh*, and is the word for *murder*. It is the word so used in Numbers 35: 19 for the "murderer, " and in verses 21 and 35. That is why in Matthew 19, verse 18 the Lord quoted the decalogue in the words "thou shalt do not murder. " The command in the original is not "thou shalt not kill" but "thou shalt do no murder. "

The Noachian command, "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, " and the Mosaic command, "thou shalt not kill, " are not contradictory. Both statutes provide for putting a murderer to death, and allow for legal execution of criminals, capital punishment and defensive war. Using the same word Job said, "the *murderer* rising with the light killeth the poor and the needy, and in the night is as a thief, " chapter 24, verse 14. And a New Testa-

ment parallel of "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" is found in Revelation 13: 10: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. "

The foregoing citations, showing the variations of the word *kill*, are taken from Bagster's *Englishman's Hebrew And Ckaldæe Concordance Of The Old Testament*, giving the verbal connection between the original and the English translation, and is the companion to *Englishman's Greek Concordance Of The New Testament*, the works of the Bagster's Greek Lexicon publishers, for the purpose of diminishing the difficulties of dealing with the original Greek and Hebrew words by students who have a limited knowledge of the original language. These works are reliable, and the variations that have been indicated are not distinctions without a difference. The radical thinking of pacifists and conscientious objectors in opposition to capital punishment and defensive war is due to an ignorance of distinctions between the killing of criminals and the act of murder, distinctions that are made in all civil law and in the Bible as well. But if the life of the murderer is forfeited, and his blood required, the same thing is true of a murdering nation—it is the principle of capital punishment on the extended scale.

There is a significant parallel in the citations from the old and the new testaments: Genesis 9: 6: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"; Matthew 26: 52: "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"; and Revelation 13: 10: "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. " The harmony of these passages add emphasis to the fact that the Noachian code was not intended for Noah's time only, but for all posterity.

The claim is made that all war is sin, and that all soldiers are sinners. There is no indictment in the Bible that says so; but to the contrary, there are cases and examples that refute the assertion. In the Old Testament God commanded war under defensive circumstances, and under the same law which said, "thou shalt not kill. " To say that all war is sinful, and that all who participate in war are sinning, is to make indictment against God. In the New Testament the apostle made a glorious example of the Old Testament warriors and commended their deeds of valor.

On the honor roll of Old Testament heroes were the names of those who "waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight armies of aliens" and were "tortured" in the atrocities of savage enemies, "not accepting deliverance" on terms of compromise, surrender or violation of military honor. Of them it is said in Hebrews 12 that they all "received a good report through faith. " But if they were sinning in all the deeds displayed, they should have received apostolic condemnation instead of an inspired commendation.

In a similar way in Matthew 8, the Lord commended the centurion's "great faith" without intimation of reservations in regard to his military trade. In the case of Cornelius in Acts 10, he was told "what thou oughtest to do, " and in Acts 11 the "words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved, " but not even a remote allusion to the abandonment of his military connections. If such occupations were inherently evil, it is unaccountable that the Holy Spirit selects these men of military affairs, citing them as instances of unusual faith and examples of conversion, without censure or exception in reference to trade and profession. If a soldier cannot *be* a Christian, a soldier cannot *become* a Christian, and an initial requirement would have been the repudiation of such a vocation or employment.

No one has the right to abrogate the Noachian code of Genesis 9: 6 that puts the murderer to death. Jesus repeated it in Matthew 26: 52 **and** reaffirmed it in Revelation 13: 10. Paul recognized it as a just principle of law in Acts 25: 10-11 by his statement to Festus in the appeal to Caesar that if he had done anything worthy of death, he refused not to die. Previously in Acts 21 and 23 the apostle requested, received and accepted armed protection and a military escort to Caesarea, in connection with which there was considerable violence reported, and in Romans 13 the same apostle declares that the bearer of the sword for good is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon evil doers, and ordained of God for that very thing. In Paul is exemplified the principle of precept and example—Acts 23 records his example, and Romans 13 his teaching. It is here that an important question is posed: Paul, an apostle of Christ and a Christian, requested, received and accepted an armed force of nearly five hundred soldiers to escort him in safety to his destination. Suppose now, without stretching the imagination, that one or more other Christians,

such as Cornelius, had been soldiers in the armed guard that protected Paul. It would be a queer mind indeed that could reach the conclusion that Paul could consistently as a Christian request and accept such armed services, but another Christian as a soldier could not consistently render the service which he received.

God himself gave the prime law requiring capital punishment and the use of the sword, did he by so doing corrupt mankind? If it be urged that the prime law is an Old Testament law, be reminded that its repetition in Revelation 13: 10 is in the New Testament, along with Romans 13.

Another question for consideration is, why is it that the Bible does not condemn capital punishment and war in so many words, as it does murder and adultery? It is remarkable here that the command "thou shalt not commit adultery" has no modifications—God does not under any circumstances sanction adultery. On the same basis, the command "thou shalt not kill," according to Jesus in Matthew 19: 18, means murder; and God has never under any circumstances sanctioned murder. But God commanded both capital punishment and war upon criminal men and nations, therefore neither is murder, and all objections to them on the ground of the sixth commandment are swept aside.

There has been a campaign of blunders in reference to the Christian's relation to civil and military government. The whimsical scruples allowing the guilty to escape makes those who advocate them answerable for the augmented danger to society before the bar of civil rectitude.

It is a truism that Christianity is a religion of peace, but the word peace does not mean mere rest or tranquility, or absence of annoyance. It means a state of blessing, a condition of mind and conscience, won through struggle and in defence of right against wrong. Thus the doctrine of peace may be the doctrine of war, temporally and spiritually, for the obligation to "fight the good fight of faith" applies to maintaining the cause of truth and right in every realm against the strongholds of evil and error of every kind. God is a God of peace, yet when his people martialled their armies to fight against their enemies, at the time of battle, the prophet of the people would present himself at the head of the army with the clarion call: "Hear, O Israel, and be not in fear of your enemies; for the Lord your God

fight for you. " If such was not inconsistent with the nature and character of God then, as the God of peace, any just war against all the evil forces which are destructive of civil society is consistent with the God of peace now. In the spiritual fight, the weapons of warfare are not carnal; but in the temporal fight, the Lord said, "if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, " with armaments suited to the warfare. The same method cannot be applied to both realms. The ethical standards of the Lord's discourse, known to all as the *Sermon On The Mount*, cannot be set up as a civil statute in which all the ethical difficulties of civil government are codified, labeled and ticketed.

SIXTEEN; JAMES 4: 1-2:

"From whence come wars and fighting among you ? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. "

The general epistle of James was addressed to "the twelve tribes scattered abroad"—that is, to the whole church everywhere. The twelve tribes in the Old Testament were the whole of fleshly Israel; but in the New Testament the expression is used figuratively to denote the whole church of God, the spiritual Israel. "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the (true) Israel of God"—Galatians 6: 16. It is in this meaning that Jesus referred to the twelve tribes in Matthew 19: 28: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. " The Lord's words in this passage may be paraphrased as follows: In the regeneration (the gospel dispensation) when the Christ occupies the throne of his kingdom in heaven, you apostles will be ambassadors extraordinary, and as his ministers of highest rank, you will occupy twelve thrones (or seats of authority) judging (or governing) the twelve tribes of (spiritual) Israel—that is, by the authority of Christ the twelve apostles would rule and govern the whole church by their apostolic word. So it is that the general epistle of James is not addressed to a local church, such as the epistles of Paul, but to "the twelve tribes" of spiritual Israel—the whole church.

The epistle is intended to reach a widespread audience, and it deals with the general conditions which prevailed in the churches and among Christians in the far away places of Gentile countries. This epistle was put into the hands of the Jewish Christians in pagan lands as a guide to the converted and as a source of instruction by precept and example for the unconverted.

The fourth chapter of James is a denunciation of the anarchy and rivalry that had developed among the members of the church springing from lust, envy and greed. They were divided into wrangling parties, and while thus warring among themselves they could not convert the heathen.

Verse 1 states that the warring and the fighting was in the church—"among you," it says. It was a war of rivalries proceeding from the lusts that "war in your members"—that is, the members of the body were the instruments of the sins that possessed them. The war in this passage is of the same nature as the "warring" mentioned by Paul in Romans 7: 23: "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." The law of the mind here does not mean that one's mind is his law, but rather refers to the law of God which pertains to the mind, and being addressed to the mind, or the intellect, it is called the law of the mind as a designation for the law of God, which in this verse means the gospel. This law of the mind was at war with the law of sin in the members of the body, the fleshly body. The law of sin is simply the rule of sin, and the law of God was contrary to the rule of sin, therefore at war with it, opposed to it.

In the first verses of the following chapter, Romans 8, the apostle declares that "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." The brief analysis of this verse is this: First, the law of *the spirit of life* is the gospel; second, *the law of sin and death* is the rule of sin which results in spiritual death; third, *the law*

is the law of Moses. The gospel is the law of the spirit of life because it gives life; the law of sin is the law of death because its end is death. The law (of Moses) could not make one free from the rule or dominion of sin, but the gospel does that which the law could not do—makes one free from the rule of sin. It is therefore this law of the mind, or the spirit—the gospel—that is opposed to and at war with the law of sin in our members. And this is the war of James 4: 1, "even of your lusts that war in your members. "

Verse 2 is a scathing rebuke of the warring and fighting in the church, among its members. "Ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. " The entire environment of the passage indicates that reference is made to the violent contentions among themselves—envies, jealousies and party ambitions. One had and the other had not; hence the wars and the fightings. And it is evident that the denunciative words, "ye kill, " refer to the destructive effects of strife and contention. They were playing the part of murderers in the church by destroying one another, as stated in the phrase, "and desire to have, and cannot obtain. " The apostle then adds, "ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not"—that is, in the warring and fighting among themselves they had followed their own fleshly lusts and partisan ambitions, without regard for the will of God or asking for God's direction; and in not asking for it, they did not have it, but were left in their lusts.

The interrogation of *verse 5* is conclusive as to the nature of the war of James 4. The apostle asks a question of them which sums up his rebuke on their warring. "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?" The reference here to what "the scripture saith" is not a verbal quotation of any one passage, and is either intended as a summary of what is taught in numerous other scriptures, or a reference to the truth of that which had already been stated. The apparent meaning is that the spirit which God gave to dwell in us should not become depraved by the lust and envy that breeds the contentions among the members of the church which the apostle had so unsparingly reprov'd. But whatever else may be included in the exegesis of James 4, no candid consideration of these verses can make them applicable to non-participa-

tion in the obligations and functions of civil and military government.

SEVENTEEN: ISAIAH 2: 2-5:

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

There are two erroneous interpretations of this prophetic passage. The millennialists assign its fulfillment to the second coming of Christ and the millennium, when it is asserted that the house of God will again be in Jerusalem, and the law of Zion will from there be administered and executed, and by universal disarmament all nations will be brought under the millennial rule of Jesus Christ. The other false interpretation is that swords and spears and war apply literally to "carnal warfare" and is therefore a condemnation of any participation in military government. It will not require a labored examination of the passage to expose the fallacies of both adaptations of these verses.

The first five verses of Isaiah 2 compose a prophecy of the New Covenant, of the gospel dispensation and the establishment of the church. The Lord Jesus Christ alluded to this prophecy in the record of the Great Commission given in Luke 24: 46-47: "It is written... that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. " There are only two places where the thing mentioned by the Lord was written—in Isaiah 2 and the duplicate prophecy of Micah 4. Both of these prophecies declare that the events named related to "the last days, " an expression denoting the gospel dispensation, and that they would be fulfilled at the time of the establishment of the church, and when the new covenant

would embrace all nations, by the promulgation of the gospel to both the Jews and the Gentiles in the execution of the Great Commission. The words of the prophecy describe the universal character and scope of the new covenant in that God would judge the "nations" and "decide between many people"—that is, both Jews and Gentiles—by this new covenant proceeding from Jerusalem. The Jews and the Gentiles would not be separated by enmity in the new covenant, the two nations would merge into one new nation in Christ; and the rivalry between the two nations having ceased, the one nation would not lift up sword against the other nation, they would learn war no more—a figurative description of the peace that would exist between them in the new covenant, in Christ and in the church of Christ. Prophetically, figuratively and spiritually the state of war between the Jews and the Gentiles would come to an end with the inauguration of the new covenant, and they would cease to be spiritual belligerents. In Ephesians 2: 14-16 Paul refers to the fulfillment of this imagery in the metaphor of breaking down the "middle wall of partition" between the Jews and Gentiles and making them "one new man" in Christ.

There is no more reason to make the swords and spears literal in Isaiah 2, than there is to make the middle wall of partition literal in Ephesians 2. The prophecy of Isaiah closes with the announcement that in the new covenant the Jews and Gentiles would walk together in the light of the Lord; and the parallel passage in Ephesians is concluded with the statement that they are both reconciled unto God in one body by the cross.

The equivalent declaration in the duplicate prophecy of Micah 4 is in the expression, "they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid," which is a magnificent metaphor of the blessings of the new covenant in which, without respect of persons, the Gentiles would share equally with the Jews. If it is insisted that war has not ceased, and that swords and spears have not been beaten into plowshares and pruning-hooks, the answer is that the figurative armaments of war were figuratively beaten into the peaceful implements of agriculture in the spiritual fulfillment, and therefore and thereby ceased. That fact is made evident in the comparison of the passages cited. No one would dare affirm that the "wall" mentioned by Paul is a literal "partition" of brick

and mortar, or lath and plaster, or stucco and sheetrock. Then it is a figure of speech. But if these descriptive terms are not literal in the Ephesian passage, for the same reason they are not literal in the Isaiahan prophecy. That the passages in Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 refer neither to a future millennial age nor to the carnal wars of earthly nations, but rather to the spiritual relations between the Jews and the Gentiles in the new covenant church, a candid consideration of the text and context clearly sustains, and it follows that the pacifists and conscientious objectors to civil and military resistance again lose their passage. There is not one scripture to which by fair and logical exegesis they may lay claim.

IV. THE FALLACY OF PACIFICISM

There is a general misconception of the meaning of peace. Politically, it stands for the absence of war, and in other connections it denotes a freedom from oppositions and hostilities of all classifications. But such is not the meaning of peace, for there may be peace in conflict in the sense of having happiness in hardships or comfort in sorrow. The New Testament word for peace is *eirene*—*eirenicon*—and means a tranquil state of the soul. The Old Testament word for peace is *Shalom*, or Salem. It is stated in Hebrews 7: 1-2 that Melchizedek was king of Salem, "which is king of peace, " yet he collaborated with Abraham in the war with Chedorlaomer of Genesis 14, referred to in Hebrews 7 as the slaughter of the kings. In another place it is said that "David asked for the *shalom* of war"—the peace of war. When Jesus said "blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God, " he referred not to peace with man, but peace with God in the midst of all the hostilities, oppositions and oppressions of men, and those who make the peace by maintaining the cause of right are the peacemakers who are performing the function of the children of God and are living up to the designation "sons of God. " The possession of peace is a life-long conflict, a never-ending struggle, summed up by the words of the apostle in Romans 12: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. "

The ideals for the world offered by a pacifist political system do not obviate the necessity for nor neutralize the morality of the maintenance of the military arm of govern-

ment to protect a nation of people, and the constant charges made by propaganda groups, whether political or religious, that such war is organized murder are not only unwarrantable, but rank and flagrant. As well make the same charges against the organization of a posse of citizens by the county sheriff, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, for the tracking down of convicts and criminals, as to make such an indictment against the armed forces of the nation. In the earliest annals there are records of the federation of peaceful clans of people and nations for mutual protection from the ever-existing threats of predatory tribes.

The primary object for national armament is morally right and legitimate—a sufficient reason for which is the innate desire for security, liberty and justice. Any nation that has the right to exist has also the inherent right to protect and preserve its existence. But nations no less than individuals are subject to immutable moral law, and the nation that takes the sword in disregard for and violation of this universal morality is subject to punishment with the sword, and to perish with it.

Whatsoever a nation sows, that shall it also reap, has national as well as individual application. The chronicles of history are full of examples of nations that flourished by evil might, but perished by the power of justice. The case of the nation does not differ essentially from that of the individual. Morality was not legislated as a law of the church; it was enacted before the church existed, and commanded before there was a people called Christians. It was a law for all men individually, socially and universally. The non-christian is subject morally to the ethics of truthfulness, chastity and integrity on the same principle of morality as one who is a Christian. To teach otherwise would be bad doctrine for the young of all ages, in their association in the schools and on the campuses, respecting their conduct before they enter the church and become Christians.

The difference between the Christian and the non-christian is not moral, it is beyond morality—the Christian has become more than moral, he has been made *righteous* through obedience to the gospel, and is in the state of justification, or pardon, and that is the meaning of the term *righteousness*. The apostle, in Romans 1: 16-17, states that the gospel reveals the righteousness of God—that is how God makes man righteous, by justification through forgive-

ness. The righteousness of God, as it pertains to the gospel, has no reference to the character of God, and is not an attribute of God. Referring to the Jews, in Romans 10: 3, the apostle declared that they were ignorant of God's righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness, and had not submitted to the righteousness of God. But the Jews were not ignorant of God's character, that he is himself righteous. They were ignorant of the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel—that is, how God makes man righteous, or just, by forgiveness—and that is righteousness, the state of justification.

The common notion, frequently expressed, that becoming a Christian obligates a man to *do right* is incorrect. It would mean that the man who is not a Christian has no obligation to tell the truth, pay his debts, be faithful to his wife in the vows of wedlock, or respect the virtue of women. It would indeed be tragic to indoctrinate the young generation with this double standard of ethics, the consequences of which would be morality for Christians only, and immorality for non-Christians without restraining obligations. To do right is the obligation of all men, in all the relationships of life. Becoming a Christian simply projects one beyond the sphere of morality into the realm of righteousness, or pardon, into the state of justification not attainable by morality, because it involves an act of divine grace, an executive act called pardon, received through obedience to the terms of the gospel which involve faith, repentance and baptism. That is the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian, the difference of the pardon of sins and a state of justification. But in becoming a Christian one does not abandon the society of the world nor is he all at once exempt from the responsibilities of civil society and government, his status in that sphere is unchanged, a *status quo ante*, and his obligations remain the same.

In contrast with primitive times the security and protection of modern civil society is provided by a police force, and nationally by armies and navies. Any concession that resistance to predatory elements in society is allowable on a limited local level becomes a deadly admission, and is a significant retreat from the consequences of the pacifist premises; for once it is admitted that coercion is permissible on the police scale, the whole structure of non-resistance collapses—the same principle applies to all levels.

The evil effects of war are admittedly deplorable, but this was no less true when God ordered the total destruction and complete liquidation of Amalek. As much can be said of marauding criminals stalking our land, raiding society, preying on the innocent, ravishing the women, plundering and murdering, having no respect for the law and order of God or man, and before which all society would be reduced to abject helplessness and cringing fear, without the protective arm of law enforcement. Peace in the world between nations, as between individuals, is the outcome of justice established by orderly and organized society, and applied through the functions of civil and penal law.

The usual assumption by theorists who moralize on the ethics of war that war is a moral evil *per se*—of itself, intrinsically immoral—is a pragmatic fallacy. In all epochs of the past virtuous liberty has been maintained and moral justice preserved only by war. It is the moral sense of the people of a nation that is stirred to militant action when libertine dictators attempt to impose an immoral tyranny on populations that cherish the prized possession of moral freedom. It is when these moral issues are at stake that a nation with a moral conscience can by voluntary enlistment muster armies of millions of men, who without malice or immoral motive fight for the right of a nation of free people to live and move and have their being in a world of the free moral agency of man.

It is the national sense of moral integrity that impels patriotic citizens to support the President and the Congress in a declaration of war against the tyrant of autocratic governments which at the will of a wicked despot would coerce all men into submission to his despotic rule. No immoral motives can be attributed to a nation of people whose wars have been defensive and without indemnities and annexations, but fought and won solely for the sake of the inherent principles of our national existence and perpetuity. It is when these fundamental truths affecting every human being are in jeopardy, endangering the foundations of God-ordained government, that non-resistance to the lawlessness that would destroy it becomes itself immoral.

When a despotic totalitarian power is bent on the domination of the world and the exploitation of all mankind, to the extent of the extermination of all other people who oppose its diabolical aims—then resistance in the ultimate

degree of war is right, and non-resistance would become a supreme moral evil.

It is now being emphasized that the time has come to launch a crusade for a warless world. But that time has always been here. It is the ideal of humanity, but law and order, as the means to an end, should not be abolished meanwhile. The Honorable William Jennings Bryan crusaded for peace many years, but he was not a CO. and was not affiliated with a pacifist party.

A change of men's hearts is being preached as a cure for war. The doctrinal necessity for a change of heart in all men is not deniable, but the fact remains that a Hitler, a Khrushchev, a Mao, and even a Castro, will not all be converted when other people's hearts are changed, and they must always be dealt with according to the principles of law and order and justice. And if all the people in the United States were members of the church, law and government would be necessary—and jails for some of the brethren!

If the change of heart sentiment were applied to law enforcement against marauding and murdering criminals it would result in a local calamity and a social catastrophe, and there would not be a city, town or hamlet in which it would be safe to dwell. Idealism does not change the psychology of hostile nations nor put an end to their aggressive designs and preparations. Only the bearer of the God-ordained sword "for good" against "him that doeth evil" can meet such eventualities. The historian, Lord Bryce, said, "if we do not destroy war, war will destroy us"—a statement that is more true now than ever before—but that ominous fact does not validate the political theory of pacifism nor authorize the religious beliefs of the conscientious objectors. It is also true that "we cannot be Christians in our homes and pagan in our politics, " but military government is not paganism, and the author of the inspired oracle of Romans 13 was not a heathen. Inspiration there declared that the sword is ordained of God, and when wielded for good as a revenger to execute wrath upon the doer of evil, the one who bears it is a minister of God for that purpose. It would be difficult, indeed, to prove that a Christian cannot perform any duty ordained of God.

The struggle for peace has been and must continue to be perpetual for the welfare of mankind. But it is the long process of enlightenment by both secular and spiritual education.

Concerning the secular education, a literary author said: "Give the children a true idea of war in their history books and the next generation would no more want a war than they would want an earthquake. " That is a veritable truth, but its practical solution on all planes is conditional, since achievement of peace depends on the actions of others than ourselves, and there may be forced upon our generation a state of things as far from being wanted as the poles are apart. This is true of us all collectively and individually, and that is why the apostle included in the exhortation in Romans 12 the condition "if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, be at peace with all men. " But after all has been said to justify the pacificism of political groups and the fanaticism of religious cults, it still remains that no one can argue against a demonstration, and both history and current events verily demonstrate that political pacificism is not feasible.

The early philosopher and statesman of the American colonies, Benjamin Franklin, once said: "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proof I see of this truth—that God governs the affairs of men. " So says also the inspired apostle in Romans 13: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God... for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. " Any political propaganda or religious philosophy to the contrary is theoretically, ethically and practically untenable.

There is in the realm of religion an affectation that is designated pietism, which among many people has become a religious belief. It is the sentimentalism that substitutes feeling for intellect. Those who understand the teaching of the Bible have always taught and preached that feelings are not an evidence of conversion as opposed to the notion of heartfelt religion that is "better felt than told"—the substitution of a religion of feeling for the religion of will. It is a curious enigma that so many people in the church, including preachers of the gospel, who know the difference between so-called "heart" and "head" religion, are pietists, on the present subject and are governed by sentimental emotions, rather than by the consistency of the truth.

It has never been the desire of the author to glorify war or to halo the heads of military heroes. The civil officials and military officers of our government have all, without exception, proclaimed hatred for war and disclaimed any war purposes in the preparation for national defense. And no man's hatred for war can exceed my own. But the subject under consideration is not primarily "the war question"—it is the government question, and the issue of war is only collateral to it as a military phase—for, as it has been previously emphasized, if civil government is right, then military government as the means of enforcing it is necessarily right also. War is not here advocated as a "method" of settling international disputes, but it is simply averred that both civil and military government are ordained of God for the ends affirmed in the passage of frequent reference in the thirteenth chapter of Romans. In so doing the purpose has been twofold: first, to correct the misapplication of a group of oft-quoted scriptures and expose the false teaching which by many has been too long taken for granted; second, to lend encouragement to the young men of the church who have been and are being called into the military services and to give to them and to their parents the comfort of knowing that entering the army and the navy of our country does not make them potential murderers, and that the assertions that the Christian cannot be a soldier, nor the soldier a Christian, are not true.

It is not necessary to lay the Bible down in order to be a soldier. Like Nehemiah of old, in chapter 4 and verse 17 of his book—"they that builded on the wall, and they that bare the burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held a weapon"—so should we, with the God-inspired book in one hand and the God-ordained sword in the other, perform the duties of a Christian and a citizen. For what good is the farmer's harvest, the merchants goods, the banker's assets, community wealth, family life, personal freedom and religious liberty—if these all are not protected by the civil power, the general validity of which is based on the right of government derived from God for the purpose of maintaining the social order which in origin is divine.

That God is concerned with the progress of the world and the welfare of mankind is hardly subject to doubt or discussion—but to what extent and in what manner he

"governs the affairs of men" is an academic question, and will remain theoretical. The subject of divine providence in the present world is classified in two parts in respect of two realms. The first realm is the dominion of nature, pertaining to the dispensation of the general providence of God in the world, which is the natural realm. The second realm is the dominion of grace, pertaining to the dispensation of the special providence of God in the church, which is the spiritual realm. In the world God operates his general providence through the laws of nature, and in the church God dispenses his special providence through the law of faith and grace. In general providence God governs the world through his predetermined order by the law of nature pertaining to the universe and the law of the mind pertaining to man. The relation of God to current events has been the source of many-mistaken and misleading notions. God is not a national God, and any providential control of the course of events in human history must in the very nature of divine providence have as its ultimate if not its immediate object the welfare of all mankind. "For he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust," said the Lord himself in Matthew 5: 45. And in 1 Timothy 4: 8-10, his apostle said: "For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation. For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe."

In comparison and contrast here are dual realms and lives, salvations and blessings. The "bodily exercise" mentioned describes the temporal life that belongs to the realm of nature, and is limited by time and therefore profiteth "little"—that is, for a little while, and for that reason it is of least importance. But godliness—the system of salvation or redemption—pertains to the spiritual life that belongs to the realm of grace; and though it improves the present life by its spiritual qualities, its fruition will be the eternal life "which is to come."

In relation to these two lives there are also two salvations. First, the temporal salvation that belongs to the natural realm consisting of the enjoyments of corporeal life with all of the temporal blessings that belong to it; and

this salvation is universal without regard to character or goodness, for in this realm "he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. " God is therefore "the Saviour of all men"—in the sense that all men have access alike to the physical enjoyments of the temporal life. Second, the special salvation "of those that believe" is spiritual, consisting of remission of sins to believers—"he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, " Mark 16: 16—and of "all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, " Ephesians 1: 3. One enters the dominion of nature by the natural birth, and its temporal blessings are received through the general providence of God, which is universal; but one enters the dominion of grace by the new birth, and its spiritual blessings are procured through the special providence of divine grace, which is salvation "by grace through faith" in obedience to the gospel.

The third realm pertaining not to this world but to the world to come—the dominion of eternity. It is for the redeemed and it will be the realm of eternal glory. This eternal dominion is entered by a birth also—the birth from the grave, the resurrection of the dead. The Lord said in Luke 20: 34-36: "The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection. " Of this resurrection the apostle Paul said in Romans 8: 18-23: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us... For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. " This realm of the redemption of the body is the resurrection state, the dominion of eternal glory, and the path that leads to it is marked by the virtues and graces of the Christian's life which are designated in 2 Peter 1: 5-11: "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to

temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity (love)... For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "

Returning from this excursion to the theme—the principle of government in the world is divine, whatever may be the circumference of divine intervention within which it is executed through the operation of the laws of the universe and the workings of the laws of mankind, and we stand before the throne of His power.

V. THE INCONSISTENCY OF NON-RESISTANCE

The harmony of civil and divine law finds emphasis in a threefold application of coercive action. First, there is the corporate coercion which defines the right of the people to the protection of the state against the violators of law and order, without being as citizens at the mercy of the state, for the people are the state. Second, there is the legal coercion which takes the form of recourse to judicial procedures in the redress of wrongs. And, third, there is a civil coercion that is chivalrous in its character in the protection of the weak by the strong against oppressions and aggressions of those unconscionable men in society who are ever ready to prey on the poor and the defenseless.

The consequences of non-resistance make impossible the rights of property which depend on coercion to defend warranty deeds and titles, and renders us all incapable of supporting the weak and securing order. But this classified coercion under the three heads has also the threefold motive: first, the retributive motive in legal justice; second, the deterrent motive in the protection of the weak; and third, a reformative motive in the correction of the wrongs and of the wrongdoers and restoring character in the rehabilitation of the corrigible. But for incorrigible enemies of human society, murderers and marauders, the condign punishment of removal from the course of society is required, in the exercise of an ultimate law of coercion, provided by the original decree on capital punishment, that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. " This is a law which God has never repealed. It rather has its New Testament parallel in the sword of Romans 13. It flatly reverses

the fallacy that under no circumstances can human life be forfeited, and that there are no conditions upon which man's life may be taken away by man.

There is an unwarranted assumption that the redemption of any criminal by moral suasion and spiritual persuasion eliminates the need for such legal measures as life imprisonment and capital punishment. This is a presumption that redemptive non-resistance is always sufficient, that morality restricts any penal actions exceeding these bounds. It is a sentiment that overlooks, or ignores, the basic fact that the ethics of resistance and of non-resistance is based on a dual law of love. Here is a point of issue between those who condemn all coercion and those who hold that it is a necessary instrument under proper authority. It is a matter of fact, hardly subject to negation, that he who condemns all coercion, but accepts the benefits of government, condones by his own actions what he condemns by his words. The consequences of it would require that he refuse to own property, the title to which requires civil coercion to defend and with an ultimate result that could lead to even military force.

There are circumstances under which force is not only beneficial but altogether consistent with a dual rule of love. Fire is force, and may be used for evil or for good, depending on its purpose. This dual principle of love involves the question of actions and deeds not merely from the viewpoint of the application of a penal code to the criminal, but also in consideration of the interests of innocent and unoffending victims of the offenders criminal acts—in other words, the effect of non-resistance on a third party. This would involve love for the victim of criminal action, and raises the question of whom one should love the most by the refusal to resist—the criminal or the victim of his crime. Take as an example the criminal rapist, what will love do—leave the criminal unopposed, and leave a helpless victim without the protection of resistance? On the basis of love itself, a choice would be inevitable. It was on this point that R. L. Whiteside said, that if he should see a criminal dragging an innocent woman or girl into a secluded spot to assault her, he would have no more compunctions of conscience against shooting down that criminal than to shoot a mad dog attacking a child. We subscribe to that statement unreservedly.

The assertion that love never uses coercion is contradicted by all of the facts of life. It assumes that forcible restraint may not ever be used to protect more important considerations and greater interests than are involved and endangered by its use. There are conditions therefore under which non-resistance would be a moral evil, an example of which has been cited.

The golden rule has been invoked by advocates of non-resistance in a rather oblique application of it: that another should not be defended by any means that one would not want used against himself. That puts the golden rule to working in reverse! It commits the golden rule to a total non-resistance that would protect the wrong-doer and desert the victim to his aggressions. Such a sentiment is the result of the confusion of an incoherent conscience, apart from that which both the natural and the spiritual desire would wish defence. So, as an ethical factor and on the same principle, what one would naturally wish done for him, it is his duty to do for another—and the golden rule is made to go in the two directions at the same time. Such theorizing makes the teaching of Jesus Christ aid the criminal. To the criminal it declares: You are allowed to inflict suffering on your defenseless innocent victim rather than be resisted. It forces the teaching of Christ to aid the evildoer, and makes the *Sermon On The Mount* a Bill Of Rights for criminals.

The effect of non-resistance on a third party involves love for the victim, and ceases to be an obligation to the aggressor. The advocates of non-resistance ignore the difference between just and unjust actions, and the conditions under which non-resistance becomes an evil. It means that when a third innocent person is wronged as a result of not resisting the wrong-doer, if words do not cause the transgressor to desist, love is debarred from further action, and love for the criminal prevents the exercise of love for the victim. The truth of the matter is, under such conditions love can act only in defense of the victim, and never in protection of the criminal. It is plain that the Lord's injunctions in Matthew 5, including the command to "resist not evil" cannot be applied to any situation that involves an innocent third party. One has no right under the *Golden Rule* to surrender by non-resistance anything necessary to fulfill obligations to another. When such an interest is at stake, non-resistance is wrong. When personal retaliation is

the only point for consideration, non-resistance is right. But it is a bad mistake to make the tenet of non-resistance, based on the Lord's statement in Matthew 5: 39 to "resist not evil, " to contradict the command of his apostle in James 4: 7 to "resist the devil, " nor does James countermand that which Jesus enjoined.

Some non-resisters have assumed that the interests of a victim's soul is less than that of an aggressor. But that could be true only in an instance where the victim is a saved person—and that would mean that resistance is right if the innocent victim is not a member of the church, but if the innocent third party is a Christian resistance in his behalf is wrong. It is a queer quirk of mentality that attempts to reason in such circles.

But the reasoning (?), as oddly peculiar as it is, makes an admission fatal to the contention of the conscientious objector: that in certain situations resistance would be permissible. On the principle that coercion does not convert the criminal, the safeguards of society must all be removed and every barrier to the criminal lifted, leaving transgressors of the law amenable only to moral suasion, the logical consequence of which is that constitutional government should give place to ecclesiastical law, and the officers of enforcement should all be preachers!

The ramifications of the pacifist and conscientious objector theories overlook an essential element in resistance, namely: the moral ends accomplished. A political tyrant determines to reduce the population of a country to slavery. The people exhaust all of the moral measures of persuasion to prevent the conditions which would be a handicap to all moral development of their country, but when all such efforts fail to alter the tyrant's course or change his will, mass resistance defeats him, and thus accomplishes a moral end. There is therefore an intrinsic morality in the designs of a strong government to control the lawless elements of society and to thus obviate fear and insecurity of all the citizens, though it may not change the will of the lawless. There are some laws which of necessity must be punitive and not reformative in their character and ends.

The principles that are inherent in the right of resistance extend to all levels of government, the local offices, the state, interstate, national and international. The *Sermon On The Mount* is not an international Bill Of Rights to aid

criminal dictators any more than it is to protect evil men who would roam society and prey upon the helpless without the restraint of law. Under some conditions war is a duty to conserve the moral good, a principle of government which is undoubtedly imbedded in the context of Romans 13. The objections of taking human life are cancelled when by one's own act he compels another to choose between his own life (the life of the attacker) and greater ends. The underlying motive of all sincere conscientious objectors is the repugnance which all sensitive men hold within themselves to the wounding or killing of another, no matter what the circumstances; but even this sensitivity must work both ways—for instance, to protect from such an attacker and prevent the killing of others, a consequence more abhorrent than the other is repugnant. It is an accepted truth in other realms that feelings cannot by itself determine the tightness of any thing, and it is nonetheless true in the area of these principles.

These are some dilemmas of pacificism which present the conscientious objector with alternatives that are equally conclusive against him, and these are not all.

The waging of war is condemned by conscientious objectors on the ground that, even when it is defensive war, it results in injuries, physical and moral, on the people and property of the cruel and wanton aggressors. But their calculated aggressive violence and destruction inflict untold misery—physical, mental and moral—on their victims. Here the difference between just and unjust resistance is ignored, with the implication that unjust coercion is less harmful and sinful than a just resistance.

A consistent condemnation of coercion in all categories would require abstention from the use of all the facilities that become the occasions of it, or that make resistance necessary—that is, the ownership of property, warranty deeds, financial transactions, the maintenance of police force and the ballot box. Consistently the premises of the pacifist require the abolition of all these elements of society. Therein is the incubus of pacificism in our civil society, for if more of our citizens refused to defend our country than those who are willing to do so, the nation would be compelled to yield to the demands of any militarist, surrender to his orders, and become a subjugated nation of subservient vassals. The nation that would thus refuse to fight

for the good of its citizenry would be guilty of moral dereliction which descends below the moral level of civilization itself.

There are other moral effects of non-resistance and coercion that are subject to comparison. In the matter of corporate coercion, where a government ceases to have the civil and military strength to enforce law and order there is the diminution of moral development, resulting in the retrogression of all moral levels. So universal is this fact, with multiplied examples of small nations that have been trampled under the heel of unconscionable dictators of tyrannical totalitarian power, that to deny it would place the onus of proof with those who possess the audacity to challenge it.

It is said that war never accomplishes its end. That depends upon what is regarded an end. If it stops the aggressor, and saves a nation of people from oppression and slavery, it serves an end. The Revolutionary War of 1776 brought the nation of the United States of America into existence, and if this nation is worth its existence, that war accomplished an end; if not, then the Fourth of July celebrations in which we hand down from ancestry to posterity the meaning of the Declaration Of Independence, which stands for the liberty and the freedom purchased by the blood of our sires, should all be discontinued; and this union of states symbolized by the stars and stripes should be dissolved, and returned to the British crown.

It is true that war is a blight and its abolition is the ideal for which all devout people should work and pray, but there have been times when it was essential to civilization itself, and it may be so again. Another ideal for society to attain would be to end all crime, but it is not likely to be accomplished, and in the meantime it would not be advisable to abolish the sheriff's office, and the police force, and close up the jails. The same principle applies to the War Department and the Army. It would be ideal for all men to believe the truth, for there to be no religious debates, no strife in the church; but as long as such exist, heresies serve to manifest the things that are approved of God, said Paul to the Corinthians, chapter 11. So it is of war, as bad as it is, for it is impossible to leave the frontiers of the nation unguarded and undertake to live as though the ideal existed.

If war is the worse thing under all exigencies, then it is never permissible; but if something else is worse than war, then it may be reckoned to be not only permissible but imperative. As a matter of fact, war is being waged all of the time in the city, the state, and the nation against gangsters and hoodlums, thieves and murderers, and every criminal element. Whether it is on the local level, or extended to the national or international scale in no manner or degree changes the principle.

It has been asserted, as if it were a matter of record, that Jesus taught against war and spake in condemnation of it. If that is true, there could be no argument, for there would be nothing deducible. The issue would be settled beyond any doubt or question by the Lord's statement on the subject. But where did he teach anything on the subject of war, and what did he say? To quote "thou shalt not kill" will not suffice, for that is not on the subject. Under the decalogue that contained the sixth commandment, God commanded war, and that fact alone is proof enough that the commandment referred murder. Murder is defined to be the intentional killing of one human being by another, with malice aforethought, and without moral right or legal authority—and that is not the definition of defensive war. Many ignoble wars have been waged in the centuries of time, but to say that all war has been of that character is a charge against God who commanded the wars of Israel, which resulted in positive good. In the defense and the preservation of liberty it has been so since that time, and may be so now.

The advocates of non-resistance and pacificism have apparently established a group strategy. Some of the groups allow for what is termed non-violent resistance, which may be compared to that method called *judo*, the technique of a skillful, lightning quick, maneuver in overcoming an opposer without harm. But the victim of it could hardly be persuaded to say that it is non-violent! Others who vote, thereby acknowledging that they are a part of the body politic, have adopted the attitude that a citizen is free from responsibility and should be exempted, if the election did not result as he voted, and if the government does not follow his advice. These are political pacifists and they do not deserve the consideration of being mentioned.

As long as government exists there is little hope and

much doubt that all war will end, as fervently as we may all wish that it could; but if the curse of war continues to be forced upon the just by the unjust, let us hope that the curse may always be turned into blessings of peace.

The word *peace* is tranquillizing, and it is precious; but it is precarious—it is dependent on uncertain conditions and on the will of others. "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, be at peace with all men." Peace is held on sufferance, existing by the consent and sanction implied by the lack of contingencies of interference, and endures by the power to withstand.

When Isaiah said, in chapter 45, verse 7, that God makes peace and creates evil, it means that peace is maintained by overcoming the forces of evil. The Hebrew word for *evil* in this passage is *war*—God makes peace and creates war—that is, there are circumstances under which God recognizes war as the agent of peace, as the means to the end.

The wise Preacher of Ecclesiastes, in chapter 3, mentions among many other contingencies, that there is "a time of war, and a time of peace." The Preacher had said that there is "a time for every purpose under heaven: a time to be born, and a time to die"—it has been divinely decreed that individual life has not only a beginning, but an end, and the general providence of the Creator governs the happenings in the history of life between the two extremities, subject to the interventions of man's free will. The Preacher said in verse 3 that there is a time for the taking of life either in defensive battle and warfare or by judicial sentence; and the "time of war" and the "time of peace" implies that in the order of the world, civil hostilities and comities will always exist in the recurrent history of human destiny; and amity between nations and peace among people are made subject to menacing hostile forces. In these words of the Sage there is a vein of the consciousness of tensions between temporary enjoyments of peace in a society of friendship and the ever-present feelings of immanency of the bugle call to martial duty.

It is recorded in 2 Kings 20: 19 that Hezekiah said to Isaiah, "Is it not good, if peace and truth be in my day?" But the prophet knew the conditions were precarious and the times were ominous because of the pretended emissaries of peace who had come from Babylon. Jeremiah warned, in chapter 6, verse 14, that preachment of "peace, peace; when

there is no peace, " in a state of affairs inimical to it, is false preaching. It means that peace cannot be preserved by complacency, it is not a mere passive possession. The king and psalmist of Israel knew this truth, both by experience and inspiration, and in chapter 34, verse 16, of his Psalms he exhorted all to "depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it. " This being a universal truth, worthy of emphasis in all ages, inspiration repeated it in the New Testament, as quoted in 1 Peter 3: 11. These principles apply nationally as well as spiritually.

There are some who preach total disarmament, which of course would mean national suicide. There are others who put the nation's trust in armaments alone. Neither view is right, Our national symbol presents the right concept of peace: the great eagle with a pack of arrows in the left claw, and in the right claw the olive branch. The olive branch offers peace, but the arrows symbolize the necessary preparation for the defense of peace.

The national benediction that God commanded Moses and Aaron to pronounce upon Israel, in Numbers 6: 22-27, should be coveted by all nations of the earth, and of all the nations, our own: "The Lord bless thee and keep thee: the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. "

APPENDIX

THE CONSCIENTIOUS PATRIOT

The following article entitled "Go Tell That Fox" by Frederick Brown Harris, an eminent theologian and writer, is taken from the *Congressional Record*. It was inserted in that official record at the request of Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin.

And because we believe there are many fine things in this article worthy of reflection, we are passing it on in the *Bible Banner*. Particularly does it reveal that there is more than one side to the claim of being "a conscientious objector." It is generally understood that the use of that term is restricted to one whose conscience causes him to object to doing military service. But those who do military service, who are defending with their lives the liberties of men, also have a conscience—they, too, are conscientious. Moreover, they are *conscientious objectors*—but to what? They are conscientious objectors to a doctrine of non-resistance that aids the criminal and gives the forces of evil the full right of way in every realm of human life. They are conscientious objectors to pledging the Bible to that kind of pacificism.

In passing this exceptionally excellent article on to our readers, it is understood, of course, that the author of it is a denominationalist and it is not expected that his view of "the church" would be correct or that his use of the term would be according to New Testament usage. But we believe that his conception of the issues of this war is correct, and that his views concerning the compatibility of Christianity with the individual's participation in it are right. The issue is not one for "the church"—but for the individual, whether a member of the church or not a member of the church—because it involves the moral rights of men in the consideration of the ethical issues of civilization.

GO TELL THAT FOX

Jesus could not have hit upon a more exact label—that fox. The Herods representing Rome's totalitarian tyranny ruled with an iron hand. Sometimes, to be sure, they reared for their subjects impressive buildings, even temples, and

fostered material advantages, but always at a price. They regimented life. They wielded a wicked, ruthless sword.

It was a Herod who is reported to have murdered many babies in an effort to slay the Babe of Bethlehem. It was a Herod who cared so little for human life, even the life of a rugged prophet of God, that he presented the severed, bleeding head of John the Baptist a ghastly gift to satisfy the whim of a frivolous dancing girl. It was a Herod who in the days when the disciples were first called Christians stretched forth his hand to vex the followers of Jesus. This fox killed James the brother of John with the sword; then, because he saw it pleased the Jews, he wanted to carry the purge further. Herod accordingly threw Peter into prison; when he escaped, the dictator ordered the Gestapo of that day to seek for the fugitive. When they could not produce him, Herod commanded, in true dictator style, that the keepers through whose fingers Peter had slipped be put to death. The last we see and hear of that Herod is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

The Master was warned that His life was in danger at the hand of Herod. What was Christ's reply to Herod's threat? Now, of Jesus, it was said "gracious words proceeded out of His mouth. " But let us forget at our peril, the peril of blurred moral distinctions, that that category of graciousness by no means covers all the recorded words of that One who spake as never man spake. Sometimes His words were soft and comforting as a tender lullaby. Sometimes they were sharp as a sword and hot as molten lava. Sometimes, even in the days of His flesh, He was as John saw Him at Patmos: "His eyes a flame of fire, and out of His mouth a two-edged sword. " He who had the capacity for so great a love also had the capacity for a great wrath. Always the two go together.

No record of the Christ's ministry is complete without the words of His moral indignation, words that bite and blister and burn, that sting and smart.

Here we have the reply of Jesus when He was warned that Herod was secretly threatening to kill Him as he had others. Listen, those who in this day of dictators' threats against all that is high and holy are afraid lest they violate the spirit of Jesus in calling a spade a spade, a snake a snake, a fox a fox, a tyrant a tyrant—listen to Christ's stinging reply to the threats of a ruthless ruler: "Go, tell

that fox—tell that fox here I am today, doing what I came to do; here I will be tomorrow, still facing my task of casting out devils and healing the sick; and I will be here the third day, until I am through. "

Nothing craven nor cringing nor pseudo-pious about that answer! It rings with defiant daring.

In the days since the swastika floated over Germany, I sat in Berlin with a noted church leader. I confronted him with the undeniable deeds of a dictator persecuting the church even as in the New Testament story. He fell back for a lame excuse on Paul's assertion that the powers that be are ordained of God. But there was none of that moral subterfuge in Jesus' answer. Apparently He did not see any holy ordination in Herod's bloody sway.

Here was a creature of the prevailing political system of the time, but there was no attempt to whitewash him. With words of sweetness and light, Jesus did not begin to philosophize, saying, "we must look at all this from Herod's point of view; we are all involved in Herod's unfortunate attitudes; we must meet his threat with understanding; we have all sinned with him. " Jesus did not say, "Tell Herod I think there is a lot of good in him, and I am praying for him that his brutal heart may be softened by love and that we may have peace in our time in Palestine. "

Tears of a maudlin type of penitence are blinding some people today to a keen sense of moral distinctions. In the diagnosis of the author of *The Keys of the Kingdom*, "a vile and Pagan creed has reared its hydra-head—a creed which degrades the morals and the minds of youth, preaches only the fever and the lust of conquest, suppresses all religion, murders the ministers of God, desecrates churches, hangs, shoots, beheads, and burns alive innocent captives, children and old women; in wanton savagery cuts tolerance and liberality from the lives and hearts of men. It is to destroy this horror that we have joined ourselves in battle. " The only thing some have to offer to a threat of that kind is a mourner's bench where those attacked can weep their eyes out—not at this foul monstrosity but at their own part in the world's iniquity. We are asked to repent of the dictator's sins.

We humbly confess we have all come short of the glory. We are all entangled in the world's sin. We all ought to repent. But true penitence does not paralyze, it purges. There

are some among us so busy counting the mistakes and faults of the yesterdays that they are oblivious to the Frankenstein whose hot breath is withering the bright and beautiful flowers of today.

When Britain was holding our own front line of defense there were some so busy counting the bungles of Britain that they lost sight of bundles for Britain. Out of historical causes these folks constructed a wash basin in which to cleanse their hands of any moral responsibility for the grim realities of today. But even imperfect men are not called to spend all their time or strength at a wailing wall. Even men and women whose record contains many blotted pages have a right to fight for God's truth against the devil's falsehood.

John, whom Herod killed, preached repentance. So did Jesus, the Holy One at whose life this dictator without pity or conscience was clutching. But even so, when Jesus framed His reply it was a barbed arrow of utter defiance; in it Herod's sins were vividly epitomized by an apt phrase "Tell that fox, "

That brings Jesus of the flashing eye very near to us in these times. The Herods of today are threatening all the sacred things we hold nearest our hearts. They are warring against the garnered treasures of the centuries, bought with a crimson cost. We cannot discount nor minimize the resourcefulness of those running rampant and roughshod over the cherished rights of man. They have the treacherous cunning of a fox. With diabolical ingenuity they hide not their designs, they disguise not their threats. They have spread their hellish blueprints in books for all to see. They have uttered words so brazen and blasphemous that civilized forces of decency have refused to believe the putrid pages are really the maps of an attempted new order. The ravenging threats of Herod the Fox are so fantastic as to be perilously disarming.

In a jumbled, illogical book printed by the millions, one of these human foxes declares: "If nations fight, all considerations concerning humanity resolve themselves into nothing and are excluded. " Thus speaks blatant bestiality: All considerations concerning humanity are nothing, are excluded.

Faced by such a threat of Herod the Fox, the one pertinent question that looks every intelligent Christian in the

face is: "What shall the answer of the followers of Jesus to the openly avowed purpose of ruthless gangsters to raid the right of man?" When the great heritage of human freedom is attacked by fanatical, mechanized forces representing a throw-back to the barbarism of the Middle Ages, when all the flowers and fruits of the Christian centuries are trampled by regimented hordes armed with the weapons of destruction which modern science has fashioned, what shall be the answer of the followers of Jesus to this stupendous moral challenge?

The anguished question which Thomas Carlyle declared rent the air of his troubled day is heard once more: "Can the church help us or not?" For any religious leader to shout, amid the din of this titanic struggle, that the church is not at war is an irrelevant and impertinent observation. Neither is the Rotary Club at war. But the embattled powers which we all face are at war with all for which the church stands. Certainly all church members are involved in this global conflict. God's children are puzzled and distraught.

When multitudes turn to the church of the living God for guidance and strength and assurance, they expect to hear something else than just curses for all war. Surely, the eternal verities of religion must be related to this day when revolution shakes the earth,

A secular paper has rightly declared, "The church that does nothing to raise its voice against all war, and does not take a side in this war, either lacks the sense of moral distinctions or the courage to stand up against brutal tyranny and monstrous injustice. If the church has nothing to say about this war, is not willing to help win it and bring its moral and spiritual forces to bear upon it, then the chances are it will have no hearing after the war. The church that is too holy to become spiritually involved in this war is mortgaging its future and repudiating its mission. "

May I say that I verily believe that the voices which are to be heard in the post-war world must speak now. Voices silent now in the presence of this abomination of abominations will not be potent later. The summons is, speak now, or else for ever hold your peace. Those who will not speak out for freedom, right, and justice will lose their voice, their right to be heard. Those who will be trusted to build for the future are those who are now in the thick of the

fight to make that future possible. The beatitude of the peacemakers is upon those who through the blood and sweat and tears of today are making possible any peace worth while living for, or dying for.

It is one of the most inconsistent phenomena of today that so many people who will have nothing to do with the war—because, they say, it is an utterly evil thing—who seem to feel that they are upon a higher level of ethical conduct than those who are in the thick of the fight and who, unspotted from the warring world, thank God they are not as other men, nevertheless talk glibly about the post-war plans for peace. They even offer themselves as the architects of a just and durable peace which would never come if the majority accepted their attitude.

This century will be dominated either by the ideals of free men or by the pitiless bayonets of tyrants. As Dr. Robert A. Milliken, the greatest scientist, has put it: "Our children are going to live either under the Atlantic Charter or else under the Gestapo and the brutalities of Mein Kampf. " Unless we win this war there will be no peace to make—only debasing servitude to accept. Like our Master, we must form some reply in our hearts to Herod the Fox.

May I present certain convictions which color my reply as an individual Christian, as a minister of the gospel, and as a shepherd of the flock of Christ, on what this age on ages is telling that Fox?

I am a conscientious objector. Because of those objections, facing the threats of Herod the Fox, I am compelled to say, Here I stand. God helping me, I can do no other. For anyone who follows his conscience, no matter what the verdict, I have profound respect—that is, for his conscience; not always for his intellectual processes and his moral eyesight. However, while I can understand how one can face the results of non-resistance so far as he himself is concerned, how he can face the consequences of such a choice in the lives of others I cannot understand. The human misery and tragedy of others for which such an attitude gives the green light would make that decision, however conscientious, haunt me forever. A conscience that preserves its own integrity while humanity is being butchered, I still must respect but, frankly, I cannot understand.

First, I am a conscientious objector to any interpretation of the teaching of Jesus which makes the cross of Cal-

vary an instrument in the hands of the enemies of that cross.

For me, the cross is the eternal symbol that there are some things worth dying for. I am a conscientious objector to turning the cross of Jesus into an opening in the moral dikes of the universe. I object to making the holy cross the sign of an ethical betrayal where the putrid pestilence of unabashed and unbridled paganism pours through to flood the good earth. I have a conscientious objection against making Calvary, that sacred place of moral splendor, a place of abject surrender.

Second, I am a conscientious objector to the theory that war is the supreme evil.

War is horrible; it is un-Christian; it is all the dreadful things which have been charged against it. You may pile the accusing adjectives as high as the Washington Monument, and I will agree. But a world with the pattern and dream of peace seized upon a growing universal protest of the peoples of the earth against want and scarcity and a determination to find plenty. The Fox grasped the steering wheel of that protest, the ominous mutter of millions of common people who were dissatisfied with their lot. The crafty dictators promised the good things of life for their own people with the virtual subservience and slavery of the rest of the world. To all who bowed down in servile idolatry to the Nazi Baal they offered the comforts and security of a more sanitary prison. These good things of life for which all yearn were to be obtained by murder, lies, plunder, and loot, by deriding and denying what tyrants call the slave virtues of Christianity. Truth was to be exiled, for the truth always makes free. In this attempt to lead humanity back to the pit out of which it has emerged, truth is what the Fox says it is.

Here is one page in a thousand of that black record in the book of lies. A German professor of biology confided to an English friend that he knows, as a scientist, that the basic dogma of Aryan superiority is utterly false; yet with anguish of mind and heart he declared he had been ordered to teach it to his students on pain of being thrown into a concentration camp with unspeakable horrors awaiting his wife and children. And thus education becomes just the tool of the state to compel its citizens to surrender body, mind, and soul to the absolute sway of the leader. That

legalized perversion of truth destroys the very foundation of the good life and corrodes and corrupts the accumulated riches of man's long climb from cloud to cloud.

What Herod the Fox is endeavoring to do to the churches which in the name of Christ are continuing to say, not "son of man, fall down before a dictator, but son of man, stand upon thy feet," is written on the vivid skies by the brave protest of the Niemüllers and by the courageous defiance of the Catholic and Protestant bishops of Germany and Norway. For them the furnace has been heated seven times hotter than ever before; but still they reply, "We will not bow down."

And so from the free shores of America we give our answer.

Tell that fox we know that the fundamental issue is whether humanity is to march on or to go back.

Tell that fox we know that the common people of the world are contending for freedom, decency, and justice; that they are defending the crown of jewels of humanity; that they are fighting for a chance to build a better world for all men. They have glimpsed the glittering towers of the earth of a redeemed humanity whose "alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears."

Tell the fox we know of a hundred things rooted in the past that are now irrelevant, because this is a fight between a slave world and a free world.

Go, tell that fox we know that the flags of the crooked cross and of the rising sun are signals that where that cross flies liberty dies and where that sun rises freedom sets. Czechoslovakia and France cry aloud as to the blighting torture of that cross. Korea and China attest the scorching terror of that rising sun.

Tell that fox that the attempt to lead a retreat back to slavery and darkness will dismally fail. We are told why it will fail in *The Moon Is Down*. John Steinbeck puts immortal words into the mouth of the mayor, that little man who knows he is to die because he refuses to bow down. The mayor turns to the conqueror who can never conquer the souls of freemen and says, "You see, sir, nothing can change it. You will be destroyed and driven out. The people don't like to be conquered, sir, and so they will not be. Freemen cannot start a war, but once it is started they can fight on in defeat. Herdmen, followers of a leader, cannot

do that. So it is always the herdmen who win battles and the freemen who win wars. " That is what we say to the threatening fox—we refuse to be herdmen.

And we tell that fox also, in the ringing and defiant words of Vice President Wallace, that "Here in the United States are 130, 000, 000 men, women, and children, who are in this war to the finish. Our American people are utterly resolved to go on until they can strike relentless blows that will assure a complete victory and with it win a new day for the lovers of freedom everywhere on the earth. "

Go, tell that fox who has dared to spit straight into the eyes of God and man, we will fight with a relentless fury which will drive the ancient Teutonic gods back cowering to their caves.

And we turn to that dauntless leader called for these times, the volcanic wrath of whose speech resounds like echoes of the ancient Hebrew prophets, whose words as was said of Job's "have kept men on their feet, " even when Dunkirk's black night caused trembling knees to sag—we turn to that intrepid world statesman who, with our great President sat in this sanctuary in that historic pew, as he reverently worshipped with us last Christmas morning—for no reply to the dictators would be complete without the voice of Winston Churchill whose phrases march and charge and smite:

Tell that fox, thunders Churchill, "These gangs of bandits have sought to darken the Light of the World, have sought to stand between the common people of all the lands and thence march forward into their inheritance. They shall themselves be cast into the pit of death and shame, and only when the earth has been cleansed and purged of their crime and of their villainy will we turn from the task which they have forced upon us. Whatever the cost and the suffering, we will do our duty, God helping us to the end. "

Tell that fox that both his boast and his doom are found recorded in ancient words of Sacred Writ:

"We have made a covenant with death and with hell are we in agreement. We have made lies our refuge, and under falsehoods have we hid ourselves. But thus saith the Lord God, 'Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, your agreement with hell shall not stand. The hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies and the waters shall overflow your hiding place.' The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. "

We want nothing for ourselves that we do not want for all the world. The war aims as they are emerging are more and more sharply focused on the screen of the future. We join the peoples of the world in fighting for the rights of individuals and for the conquest of new rights as members of the universal brotherhood. The attack on the democratic revolution can only be met by accelerating the democratic processes, by democratic professions made into programs. Those who in this epic day have eyes to see and hearts to feel and moral courage to fight will be sons and daughters of the final revolution. America is mobilizing her might to fulfill the prophecy engraved on her own Independence Hall Liberty Bell:

"Proclaim liberty unto all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof. "

Democracy has the final answer to the world's struggle of ordinary people for a better way of life. Our own democracy mending its obvious flaws must go on from political freedom to economic freedom. That is the only kind of an America God can bless. There has been something dreadfully wrong in a prosperous democracy where one-third of its people are ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed. This is a battle for the souls and bodies of men. Back of the bombs and airplanes, submarines and battleships, back of the soldiers of freedom lying in foxholes in fetid jungles and infested swamps, back of the men fighting on, around and above the seven seas against overwhelming odds, gaunt-cheeked and tight-lipped, back of those in deadly peril on the sea, on the land, in the air, dying that freedom may live, is the battle of ideas and ideals. The armies locked in deadly struggle stand for different conceptions of the way in which human life shall be ordered and conducted. There face each other two different conceptions of the nature of man and of God. The real conflict is between the powers of darkness and the hosts of light. Humanity is fighting for its life. It is literally we or they.

The outcome of this struggle will have vast effect upon the next period of human history. The decision as it molds the future is of importance so stupendous that in comparison all other considerations pale into insignificance. We fight for a democratic wage which offers gains without chains. The dictators offer material things with the acceptance of mental and spiritual fetters. The democratic heart

and the democratic world spurn such an offer even from a benevolent and efficient dictator.

This is a total war, for total democracy, for total humanity. Pearl Buck flashes a red light to embattled democracies with the oil of Asia in her lamp, as she warns: "Democracy, if it is to prevail at this solemn moment in human history, can do so only if it purges itself of all that which denies democracy—if it dares to act as it believes." Of course, the bright new world of our dreams cannot be brought into being at the mere waving of any peace wand. But ancient and accepted attitudes can and must change at once if a new world of equality is to be built. Every creed and color demand that they be treated as equals. That is the revolution which is on. The four freedoms are not just to be set to music, they must be set to work. By its fruits is any economic system to be known from now on.

President Roosevelt, in inspiring words, has sounded forth a trumpet that shall never know retreat, as he declared to Congress and to the world:

"In the future days which we seek to make secure we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure every nation a healthy, peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

That means that if any system leaves human beings, who are willing to work and able to work, without food and without shelter, without opportunity for development, that system is built on sand; and the storm is on the way which will send it crashing to the ground, and great will be the fall of it.

Here is mirrored God's plan for the entire world. If we are for that, we are on God's side. It is vain to debate whether or not this is a holy war. If we are fighting for mankind everywhere we are fighting for holy objectives, we

are fighting for the men and women and children of Germany and of Japan as well as for ourselves.

The new spirit which is to change the face of the world is manifested in a recent statement by the mayors of several English cities. As one reads those words, utterly devoid of any suggestion of hate or of vengeance—the voice not of church leaders but of political servants, elected heads of England's devastated cities—it makes one realize why an American dreaming fondly of the white cliffs of Dover wrote those poignant lines:

"I am American bred. I have seen much to hate here (in England), much to forgive; but in a world where England is finished and dead I do not wish to live. "

But here is the declaration of the English mayors:

"To restrain aggression is a Christian obligation; to take revenge, never. Today many of our homes, our cathedrals, our schools, and our factories are damaged or destroyed by war, but the spirit of our people has never been higher. The destruction which we see around us presents an obligation to plan and build a noble, civic, national, and international life. In the hearts of our people that rebuilding has already begun. War is teaching us that the whole world is a unit in which the needs of each can be met only by taking into consideration the needs of all. "

Here is revealed a Christianity which judges us and our causes as well as our enemies. The world shrunk by science is now one room where voices carry. No nation aileth to itself. An open sore anywhere poisons the arterial blood of the world. Ignorance, superstition, blighting poverty anywhere is a peril everywhere. No one is safe until all are safe. Selfish isolation but builds vaults which will prove to be sepulchres where the very privileges meant to be guarded are smothered and strangled. All discrimination based on race, color, or creed, in the end proves to be a boomerang. These are axioms of the new order which gleams through the tribulations of today. God the Father of all mankind is for it. If God is for us, who can be against us? This is the faith humbly, yet exultantly, in which we must keep step as one great brotherhood marching with undivided ranks toward the dawn.

The call of today gilds with a new glory every church spire, hallows with a new splendor every church altar, lifts to a new eminence every Christian pulpit. It is a challenge

which dynamites the calm conventions of complacent Christianity. But we must beware lest we assume that the vital proclamation of the Christian Church is simply right views. It is not that. It is good news.

The church has the secret of how good men can be made for the good order. Blue prints for Utopia are futile unless matched with white characters. Outer altitudes depend on inner altitudes. Reformation never gets far without regeneration. There must be new creatures for the new creation, new minds, and new hearts for the new world.

Knowing that this is the victory—even our faith in God, in our cause, in the better world, and in better men—we send our reply to the tyrant's threats.

Tell that fox we know what he is fighting for.

Tell that fox we know what we are fighting for.

Tell that fox we know what the final issue of this fight will be, because the dictators are fighting the universe; they are fighting the stars; they are fighting God.

In the name of the Lord our God we set up our banners as we fight for individual freedom and against autocratic authority; as we fight for responsible self-expression and against servile submission; as we fight for enlightenment and truth and against ignorance and sophistry; as we fight for the state as the servant of man's material and spiritual well-being and against the state which degrades man into a regimental robot; as we fight for that which exalts the individual as a child of God with an eternal destiny and against that which debases personality into a mere cog in a dictator's totalitarian machine.

It is no wonder that Senator Wiley recognized the merit of the foregoing eloquent and impassioned appeal to the inherent patriotism within us all, which from any viewpoint, literary, moral or religious, qualifies it for permanent record in *Congressional Record*, a place in *Library of Congress* and future dwelling in the *Archives* of the nation. It is not theological in its character or denominational in its structure, but rather moral in principle, universal in obligation, and in its proper application "worthy of all acceptance."

THE LAW OF GOD ON CAPITAL
PUNISHMENT

Under the above caption the scholarly M. C. Kurfees published a treatise in the nineteen hundred twenties on the functions of government bearing on the controversial political, social and religious question of *Capital Punishment*. During these years, and until shortly before his death in 1931, the name of M. C. Kurfees was as wide as the church through his editorial contributions to the *Gospel Advocate*, and by the outstanding and exhaustive work entitled *Instrumental Music In Worship*, by far the most significant and scholarly production against the use of mechanical instrumental music in church worship before or since published, and which has been reproduced through the years according to demand by the *Gospel Advocate* Company, on which staff Brother Kurfees served so long as an associate editor. Added to this signal service, he distinguished himself among churches of Christ by the forty-five years connection as preacher for the Campbell Street Church, (later the Haldeman Avenue Church), in Louisville, Kentucky, the longest record as a *located* preacher known in the history of the churches. Because of its value to the issues of the present work the M. C. Kurfees address on "The Law Of God On Capital Punishment, " which for a long time was available in print, is here again reprinted. Read it and *study* it.

In view of the very serious and startling crime situation in the United States, the author of this production was led, in the fall of 1924, to deliver a sermon to the Haldeman Avenue Church, Louisville, Kentucky, on "The Law of God on Capital Punishment. " At that time, he had not thought of its publication beyond its oral delivery to the church and community; but the Louisville Christian Ministerial Association, composed of the ministers in Louisville and the surrounding region including southern Indiana, and which meets monthly in Louisville, having heard of the sermon, sent in a courteous and urgent request to put it in the form of a paper and read it before that body. The author gladly consented to do so and read it before them in their January meeting in 1925.

Since that time, there have been repeated and urgent requests from different persons to publish it in permanent form for general distribution, but numerous other duties have so monopolized the author's time that he could not consistently do so till now. In the meantime, the crime condition becoming more and more alarming in some parts of our country, he availed himself of a more extended study of the subject and hence, in its present form, though the position taken and defended is the same, it contains some quotations from authorities which were not used in the sermon as originally delivered. So far as the settlement of the question is concerned, the author appeals to and relies exclusively on the word of God, but the average reader will be interested in what different men and different countries have said and are saying on the subject, and hence some significant facts are given along these lines. It is hoped that the entire argument will be carefully studied, but the author takes occasion to urge all, into whose hands it may fall, to read and note with special care the reasons which God himself assigns for His law on Capital Punishment. The booklet is sent forth with the earnest prayer and hope that it may help to magnify His will and word.

That it is eminently important that man should know the law of God on all matters relating to human conduct, no right-thinking student of the Bible will call in question. But it is not only a lamentable fact that there is today general and widespread ignorance of God's law along a number of vital and important lines, but this fact can be easily discovered and verified by conversing freely with the people in general along these lines.

One of the subjects on which this ignorance prevails to a large extent is, I humbly think, the law of God on capital punishment. It is true, however, that sometimes and in some instances it is not ignorance of God's law so much which leads to a disregard of its solemn and imperative demands as it is a mere misguided sympathy or sophomoric sentimentality.

The address before the ministerial gathering follows:

In response to a most courteous and brotherly request from this ministerial body, I have prepared and now read to you on this occasion the present paper. I not only thank you for and highly appreciate this courtesy, but I shall en-

deavor, in every word in response to it, to speak in the fear of God and in respect and love for man. Please permit me to say also, at the very outset, that the conclusion to which I have arrived on the subject in hand and which are disclosed in this paper are not only the result of many years of devout and earnest study of the word of God, but, in view of the inexorable laws of logic governing premise and conclusion, I see not how properly to avoid these conclusions or to draw any other. Hence, the leading purpose of this paper and the only motive actuating its author in preparing and reading it is to present, in God's own words, God's law on capital punishment. This may be followed by some statements from men in high places, showing how they are impressed with that law. I shall do my best to make it an occasion, not of theological wrangling or acrimonious disputation, but rather one of calm, collected and dispassionate investigation—an investigation which, on the one hand, appeals for proof to the sacred record alone, and, on the other hand, to the serious and sober judgment of men.

By capital punishment, as the Latin origin of the term signifies, is meant punishment which takes the "head," and hence, the life of man; and in this connection, it means that his life, for what is regarded as a justifiable reason, is legally taken by the existing form of government under which he lives. That the subject may come before us in intelligible and logical form, I shall present it under a twofold division, namely, first, by presenting a citation of those passages of Holy Scripture which state, in specific terms, the divine law; and, secondly, by following this with some reflections on state laws on capital punishment. Hence let us now consider—

I. Passages of Holy Scripture which Specifically State God's Law on Capital Punishment.

1. *Passages cited.* Such a statement of that law, both in the Old Testament and in the New, with some general references to it, is found in the following passages: "And surely your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made

he man, " Genesis 9: 6, 6. "Thou shalt not kill. " Exodus 20: 13. "He that smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death. " Exodus 21: 12. "And if an ox gore a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be surely stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit. But if the ox was wont to gore in time past, and it hath been testified to its owner, and he hath not kept it in, but hath killed a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death. " Exodus 21: 28, 29. Moreover, ye shall take no ransom for the life of a murderer, that is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death. And ye shall take no ransom for him that is fled to his city, of refuge, that he may come again to dwell in the land until the death of the priest. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for the blood, it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. " Numbers 35: 31-33. "Thou shalt not kill. " Deuteronomy 5: 17. "And behold, one came to him and said, Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, why asketh thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good; but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. He said unto him, Which? And Jesus said, Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother; and, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. " Matthew 19: 16-19. "And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and made trial of him, saying, Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. This do, and thou shalt live. " Luke 10: 25-28. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another; for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. " Romans 13: 8-10. "How be it, if ye fulfill the royal law, according to the

Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect of persons ye commit sin, being convicted by the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all. For he that said. Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art become a transgressor of the law. " James 2: 8-11.

2. *Love.* Let us note the very prominent and significant place here assigned to love. It is the one great and universal antidote against all wrong. Not only is it true that neither murder nor any other crime would ever be committed if love were properly enthroned, but it is here distinctly declared that it comprehensively covers the entire ground of human obligation—"He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. " The word "neighbor" here is an imperfect translation of the term used by Paul. It literally reads: "He that loveth the other (*ton heteron*) hath fulfilled the law. " That is, anybody and everybody, whether in one part of the world or another, is to be the object of our love.

3. *Three Statements Selected.* Now, from these plain and unequivocal passages, I select three statements which succinctly and incontrovertibly set forth God's law on murder:

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

(2) "He that smiteth a man so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death. "

(3) "Ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood, it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. "

And we may add here that the vital principles underlying these legal enactments existed long before the "thunders and lightnings" pealed from the smoky summit of Mt. Sinai and when, at the divine presence, "the whole mount quaked greatly" and "the voice of the trumpet waxed louder and louder"; but on this momentous occasion, these principles were embodied in specific legal form.

II. *The Law Contained in These Passages.*

1. *The divine law on murder is universal in its application.* Now, let it be carefully observed here, first of all, that there is not even the remotest intimation of anything in these inspired declarations that is local, national, racial, or temporal. They apply equally to all places, all nations, all races and all times. They were not spoken of the Jews in particular nor of any other nation in particular, but of mankind in general as found in all nations, in all ages and at all times. Neither is there the slightest intimation that they will not be in force as long as mankind exists on the earth.

2. *The force of the reasons assigned for the divine law.* Moreover, the reasons which God himself assigns for this law are of a nature that makes them coexistent with man. They certainly should appeal seriously to all thoughtful persons. These reasons are: (1) that man is "made in the image of God"; that "no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it. "

3. *The reasons assigned for the divine law examined in detail.* That we may see their solemn import, let us now examine these reasons. (1) The first is stated in these words: "For in the image of God made he man. " Is that reason any less true today than it was when first uttered? Most assuredly it is not. In other words, is it not just as true now as it ever has been that man is created "in the image of God"? Most assuredly it is. Hence, the very same identical reason which God himself assigned for the law on capital punishment exists today with all the force it had when he first assigned it. In my humble judgment, no living man can answer this argument. It is simply unanswerable, standing on the sacred page as an impregnable rock. Hence, according to God's own specific declaration, as long as it is a fact that man is in the divine image, that long will this law on capital punishment be in force. (2) In like manner, let us look at the second reason for God's law on murder. It is stated in these words: "No expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. " Here again let us inquire, was that statement true when God first uttered it, but is not

true now? If so, why so? Is it not just as true now as it was when God first said it that "no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it"? If not, why not? Whoever says it is not assumes the logical obligation to tell why it is not. Here again, in my humble judgment, no such reason can be found in the whole universe of God because of the fact that it does not exist.

4. *Human sentiment and the divine law on murder.* I am fully aware that when we come to consider the different nations of man and their legal enactments on murder, we shall find, as in all other things submitted to man for decision, that human sentiment fluctuates and is marked by various and over-changing turns. A few illustrations will suffice. For example, many years ago, in Belgium, as given in the American Statistical Association, Volume IX, pages 307 and 308, we have this statement:

"From early in the reign of Leopold I until 1835, capital sentences were systematically commuted to life imprisonment with hard labor. This, no doubt, was due to the influence which in matters of severe punishments the first queen of the Belgians, Marie Louise, wife of Leopold I, exercised over her husband and her son, the present King. Her attention had been drawn to the cases of several persons who had been beheaded for crimes of which they were subsequently proved innocent. It was at the same time brought to the notice of both the king and his legal advisers that such miscarriages of justice were by no means rare either in Belgium or elsewhere. Moreover, it was found that capital executions were not necessary to the preservation of life and property in Belgium. Judicial statistics for the period of clemency preceding 1835 showed that grave crimes had actually decreased. But in 1834 the number of capital crimes and condemnations abruptly rose and the advocate of the death penalty immediately ascribed this augmentation of grave criminality to the inactivity of the scaffold."

This fluctuating and vacillating sentiment was illustrated some years ago in our own country as shown by the following statement from the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Volume 17, page 187:

"In at least six states there has been recent active discussion of the death penalty for murder. In Kansas and Colorado it is proposed to introduce capital punishment. In these two states, lynchings have given the opportunity to believers in capital punishment to say that if the law had been operative the lynchings would not have occurred. In Massachusetts and New York, on the other hand, there is a movement which in Massachusetts at least has strong backing to abolish the death penalty. The Governor of Kansas is reported to have said that the lynchings in that state will almost certainly result in a return to capital punishment. The Attorney General of Massachusetts insists that the punishment of murder by death does not tend to prevent or diminish that crime, and that the infliction of the death penalty is not in accord with present civilization; that it is a relic of barbarisms which the community must certainly outgrow, as it has already outgrown the rack, the whipping post and the stake. In Wisconsin a bill has been introduced providing capital punishment for certain degrees of homicide. In Maine, also, where capital punishment was abolished in 1887, there is pending a bill to re-establish it. "

Here, I grant most freely and gladly that the community may very properly and should outgrow "the rack, the whipping post and the stake" or any other form of *cruelty* devised by man, *but it cannot properly outgrow a law of God made for all mankind and for all ages.* Moreover, God's law on capital punishment is not, like the rack, whipping post and stake, to punish and make men suffer, but to rid society of them. He does not say treat them cruelly and this should never be done. *God says put them to death.* The sentiment of communities is sometimes against God's law on different matters, but we should always, nevertheless, stand by the latter. Moreover, in the realm of morality, principles are unchangeable and do not vary with the changing sentiment of men.

Hence, the importance of teaching to the youth of our land God's own law on murder and even teaching it in the schools of our country was emphasized some years ago in a speech on "The Death Penalty," delivered by Dr. George B. Cheever in a debate with Wendell Philips and others and reprinted in Volume 133 of the North American Review. From this memorable speech, I quote the following statement:

"And the more effectively God's law and a future final retribution are denied or obscured in the murderer's consciousness by his never having heard of these truths in the common schools through which he graduated, and by the legal and social habit of denying the authority of the Scriptures and of God over both government and people (a habit which the exclusion of positive religion from the state, its constitutions and its schools, fosters from childhood), the more rational and righteous it appears, in his own view, to take care only of himself, no matter what becomes of others. He has never been taught that God requires murder to be punished by death, much less that there is an endless retribution, in another world, for crimes unrepented of in this. Had the state done its duty in his education, he would never have been a murderer. It is moral assassination by the state to have let him grow up in such brutality. A law so benevolent and illuminating as that of God against murder, with its very reason grounded in the immortality of man and his accountability to God, and his obligation of love to his fellow man in God's image, binds the government to teach its whole meanings, and to proclaim it with all the light thrown upon it from God's successive revelations from the preceding broadening down through ages, and from the final teachings of Christ. Government, in assuming the authority to punish, is bound to flash the whole lightning of the state to the uttermost depths of society, till its divine meaning penetrates the entire mass. "

And we may add here, that as long as murderers in any degree, and especially such as are savagely brutal, atrocious, villainous, fiendish and diabolical, accounts of which so often meet our gaze in the daily press, are allowed to escape the divinely imposed penalty for their crime, just that long will murder, in some measure, be encouraged and will most likely increase. Lax execution of the laws is a great defect in our country.

5. *Harmony of the Decalogue and the divine law on murder.* The claim sometimes made that capital punishment for murder is forbidden by the sixth commandment of the decalogue, which says "Thou shalt not kill, " is easily met by the fact that such a claim makes God squarely contradict himself. Assuredly he would not give specific directions in

a number of places in his word to put men to death for certain crimes, and then in the decalogue, forbid it to be done. I think we shall see that there is no conflict here at all. Let it be observed here, first of all, that there are different kinds of killing mentioned in the Bible, and when it is done unawares or unwittingly, the protection of the slayer is distinctly provided for and he must not be put to death. See Numbers 35: 9-15; Deuteronomy 19: 1-10. Again, there are at least seven different Hebrew words used in the Hebrew Bible and at least that many Greek words used in the Greek New Testament, all substantially meaning, in some sense, to kill; and while, so far as I have ever been able to see, the facts in neither Testament warrant the conclusion that the idea of murder inheres in any one of these words in either language to the exclusion of the others, it is, nevertheless, a fact that in each Testament one particular word in each language is ordinarily used when murder is the idea to be conveyed. That word in the Hebrew language is the word used in the decalogue in the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" which, strictly rendered, means, "Thou shalt not commit murder"; or, as stated by Brown, Driver and Briggs, "*murder, slay*, with premeditation;" and the corresponding word in the Greek language is the word used in the Greek New Testament where the sixth commandment of the decalogue is quoted. They both forbid killing when it is murder, but they do not forbid it when it is the legal execution of a murderer, distinctly provided for elsewhere in the word of God.

6. *Comparison of the case as it exists in different countries.* That the reader may further see the crime situation in our own country with its lax execution of the laws in comparison with the situation in other countries, I here give a list of significant quotations from leading newspapers and other sources of authority on the question. It will be seen that some of these are speaking out with no uncertain sound in favor of the divine law. From the facile pen of Dr. S. Parks Cadman, of New York, in the *Christian Herald* of May 29, 1926, in "A Searching Discussion of the Crime Problem" we have this statement:

"The heavy indictment stands against the United States that it is the most criminal nation in Christendom. It is useless to deny a condition that facts demonstrate, and

which imperils the general welfare and safety. Side by side with a large majority of our citizens who desire the abolition of injustice, oppression, needless poverty and war, is a growing and brazen body of the armed and desperate criminals who have become the scandal and the inward menace of the nation... It is necessary to understand the magnitude and the difficulty of America's crime problem. Few respectable and lawful Christian people do understand the problem. They lament its symptoms and are amazed at its consequences, but seem impotent to arrest its causes ... One of these causes is law itself... Laws can become so burdensome as to defeat their own intent by their sheer number or triviality. The ancient saying that "the more laws a democracy has, the more corrupt it is, " applies to the present condition. There are more than 100, 000 statutes of various degrees of significance or insignificance upon the legislative codes of our State and Federal governments. These statutes are not known in their entirety to the most learned legal authorities in the land. How then can they be known to the layman in matters of the law?... The second cause of crime is the bad nature and weak administration of criminal law. The larger percentage of murderers in this Republic escape the prescribed penalty for their deed, and other hardened offenders evade legal punishment in ratio. Of course, justice should be blended with mercy, but it ceases to be either just or merciful when it indirectly encourages lawlessness and crime. One criminal advocate, who has an unenviable record in this respect, asserts that the death penalty need not be suffered by any murderer who has sufficient wealth to employ clever counsel for his defense. In nearly every county, city and state of the Union is some notorious practitioner, who can be relied upon to cheat the hangman's rope of its lawful prey... During the coming year at least 9, 000 to 10, 000 people will be murdered in this country. Its burglaries and other forms of robbery and illicit depredation cost it the staggering total of nearly ten billions of dollars annually. Four billions of this incredible amount can be charged off to losses from crime alone; the balance to the expense of maintenance for police, criminal courts, prisons and places of detention. The annual crime loss and penalties paid for criminal operations in the United States during 1923 was three times the national budget for that year. "

From the official records of Louisville, Kentucky, the following figures were handed to me. From September 1, 1925, to August 31, 1926, there were 58 murders in Louisville. Of this number: 2 were executed; 4 sent up for life; 12 sent up for 2 to 15 years; 40 either found not guilty or dismissed by the grand jury, or were not apprehended—a few not yet tried when these figures were submitted.

Hence, according to all the facts and figures now before us, we are face to face with the appalling and significant situation that where there is one murder in all England and Wales to every 100, 000 of the population, there are ten and sometimes more than ten in the United States; and that in Philadelphia, in 1923, with a population of about 2, 000, 000, there were 54 more homicides than in the whole Dominion of Canada with a population of about 10, 000, 000! Then, added to this is the equally significant and increasing crime record in Chicago in which city alone, as we have seen from the different authorities quoted, there were in 1918, 222 homicides; in 1921 there were 852; in 1923 there were 389; in 1924 there were 509; and in 1925 there were 562! That is certainly a ghastly and shocking record. And in Philadelphia there were thirteen murders the first nine days of May, 1926! Or, as viewed from another angle, in all England and Wales with a population only a little less than half the population of the United States, there were in 1923, as already cited from the *Literary Digest*, 200 deaths from homicide, but about 10, 000 at the same time in the United States! Thus, as revealed in the *Digest* quotation and previously stated, the figures present the ratio of about four murders per million of the population in England and Wales, and 102 per million in a majority of the large cities of the United States! The situation in this country is not only alarming but the vast difference between it and the situation in England should wake up our citizens to the perils of the hour.

But why such difference between the murder record here and in England? The reason is found largely in the fact, already quoted from the New International Encyclopedia, that "in the United States where murder is punished by death with comparative infrequency the crime is far more common than in England where conviction for murder is usually followed by execution."

That is what tells the story. Of course lack of child

training in the home and elsewhere is, no doubt, the primary source of all wrong, but next to it, lax execution of the laws and particularly the lack of enforcing God's law on murder is, if not the primary, at least one of the leading factors in the whole crime situation in the United States. If the murderer knew when tempted to commit the terrible deed that, if he does it, his own life, as God's law distinctly and imperatively requires, will be the unfailing penalty, then in probably ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, he would be restrained from the fearful act. God's law is always best for men and *when civil governments properly recognize this fact, it becomes a deterrent to crime.*

Beyond all question, if crime in all its multifarious degrees and phases, were promptly met and properly punished, improvement in the situation would soon become general all over the country. Hence, a most serious responsibility rests upon the courts and upon all persons legally empowered to bring criminals to justice; *and Christians as well as all other citizens share in this responsibility* and should, within the limits of proper conduct, exert all possible influence, both from the pulpit and from the pew to aid in the effort to check the deplorable tide of crime.

7. *Christian modification of the Mosaic Law.* It is a significant fact that when the Lord placed his own teaching in Matthew 5: 38, against the ancient law recorded in Exodus 21: 23-25, which required "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe, " he confined his modification of that law *to the point of personal resentment in returning evil for evil.* Paul teaches the same thing when he says: "Render to no man evil for evil" and "Avenge not yourselves... for it is written Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. " Romans 12: 17, 19; Deuteronomy 32: 35. Again, concerning "brother going to law with brother, " he said: "Why not rather take wrong? Why not rather be defrauded ?" I Corinthians 6: 7. Hence, if a man smites his fellow man, the latter must not smite him in return. Yea, if he smites him to death, neither a member of his own family nor anybody else is permitted personally to take vengeance upon him for his crime, but Paul distinctly says: "The powers that be are ordained of God, " and that they are "a minister of God, and avenger for

wrath to him that doeth evil. " Romans 13: 1, 4. This should help us to appreciate the fact that, when Christ died on the cross, while the entire ceremonial law was, by that tragic and momentous event, taken out of the way or, as Paul expresses it, Christ "abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (Ephesians 2: 15); and "having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us; and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross" (Colossians 2: 14); nevertheless the entire decalogue is reincorporated in the New Testament and is in full force under Christianity, with the single exception that the fourth commandment enjoining the keeping of the seventh day holy is modified by the revelation that, as to the sanctity or holiness of days under Christ, men, as set forth in the Roman epistle, may "esteem every day alike. " See Romans 14: 5.

Finally, in the light of all the facts now before us, it seems clear and conclusive that the question here presented is not to be settled by either the philosophies or the sympathies of men, but by the word of God; and hence, I respectfully suggest in closing that, since the fact that man is created "in the image of God" remains today, so far as we have any means of knowing, precisely as it ever has remained unchanged, and since the additional fact that "no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it, " remains equally unchanged, the conclusion is simply inevitable that God's law on capital punishment is still in force and will remain so while man as man remains on the earth; and it well becomes us as children of God, striving to follow divine wisdom and leadership, to ponder these facts in the fear of God. —M, C. Kurfees, on *Capital Punishment*.