

News and Current Events :: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin."

"Killing on the battlefield is not a sin." - posted by Santana (), on: 2007/3/6 12:20

I read an article today where a catholic soldier is feeling very guilty for killing someone in Iraq.

He got a lot of slack for having a decal on his truck that says, "Lord forgive me, I have committed sins for our freedom."

<http://www.turnto23.com/news/11177861/detail.html?subid=22100581&qs=1;bp=t>

Is killing only a sin if it's done outside of your job/duty?

Re: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin." - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 12:34

CS Lewis talks about this subject in detail in his book, 'Mere Christianity.' Lewis himself was a veteran of the first World War and fought in the trenches in France -I trust his discernment on the issue.

(http://www.lib.ru/LEWISCL/mere_engl.txt) Mere Christianity by CS Lewis - Book III Chapter VII - Forgiveness

Quote:
 -----... Now a step further. Does loving your enemy mean not punishing him? No, for loving myself does not mean that I ought not to subject myself to punishment-even to death. If one had committed a murder, the right Christian thing to do would be to give yourself up to the police and be hanged. It is, therefore, in my opinion, perfectly right for a Christian judge to sentence a man to death or a Christian soldier to kill an enemy. I always have thought so, ever since I became a Christian, and long before the war, and I still think so now that we are at peace. It is no good quoting "Thou shalt not kill." There are two Greek words: the ordinary word to kill and the word to murder. And when Christ quotes that commandment He uses the murder one in all three accounts, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And I am told there is the same distinction in Hebrew. **All killing is not murder any more than all sexual intercourse is adultery.** When soldiers came to St. John the Baptist asking what to do, he never remotely suggested that they ought to leave the army: nor did Christ when He met a Roman sergeant-major-what they called a centurion. The idea of the knight-the Christian in arms for the defence of a good cause-is one of the great Christian ideas. War is a dreadful thing, and I can respect an honest pacifist, though I think he is entirely mistaken. What I cannot understand is this sort of semipacifism you get nowadays which gives people the idea that though you have to fight, you ought to do it with a long face and as if you were ashamed of it. It is that feeling that robs lots of magnificent young Christians in the Services of something they have a right to, something which is the natural accompaniment of courage- a kind of gaiety and wholeheartedness.

I have often thought to myself how it would have been if, when I served in the first world war, I and some young German had killed each other simultaneously and found ourselves together a moment after death. I cannot imagine that either of us would have felt any resentment or even any embarrassment. I think we might have laughed over it.

I imagine somebody will say, "Well, if one is allowed to condemn the enemy's acts, and punish him, and kill him, what difference is left between Christian morality and the ordinary view?" All the difference in the world. Remember, we Christians think man lives for ever. Therefore, what really matters is those little marks or twists on the central, inside part of the soul which are going to turn it, in the long run, into a heavenly or a hellish creature. We may kill if necessary, but we must not hate and enjoy hating. We may punish if necessary, but we must not enjoy it. In other words, something inside us, the feeling of resentment, the feeling that wants to get one's own back, must be simply killed. I do not mean that anyone can decide this moment that he will never feel it any more. That is not how things happen. I mean that every time it bobs its head up, day after day, year after year, all our lives long, we must hit it on the head. It is hard work, but the attempt is not impossible. Even while we kill and punish we must try to feel about the enemy as we feel about ourselves- to wish that he were not bad. to hope that he may, in this world or another, be cured: in fact, to wish his good. That is what is meant in the Bible by loving him: wishing his good, not feeling fond of him nor saving he is nice when he is not.

I admit that this means loving people who have nothing lovable about them. But then, has oneself anything lovable about it? You love it simply because it is yourself, God intends us to love all selves in the same way and for the same reason: but He has given us the sum ready worked out on our own case to show us how it works. We have then to go on and apply the rule to all the other selves. Perhaps it makes it easier if we remember that that is how He loves us. Not for any nice, attractive qualities we think we have, but just because we are the things called selves. For really there is nothing else in us to love: creatures like us who actually find hatred such a pleasure that to give it up is like giving up beer or tobacco. ...

Hope that brings you some light on this issue.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/6 13:14

Quote:
-----I have often thought to myself how it would have been if, when I served in the first world war, I and some young German had killed each other simultaneously and found ourselves together a moment after death. I cannot imagine that either of us would have felt any resentment or even any embarrassment. I think we might have laughed over it.

I doubt it! I don't think they would be laughing.

Here is a long thread on the issue. https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order=0&topic_id=7499&forum=36&post_id=&refresh=Go

“Would we send our daughters off to have sex if it would benefit our country? Yet, we send our sons off to kill when we think it would benefit our country!” Leonard Ravenhill

Re:, on: 2007/3/6 15:58

Tell ya what... why dont we all lay down our arms and do nothing to prevent evil in this world. Lets see how long we last.

It's real easy for people to say we should be pacifists when we have never really had to face an enemy on our own soil. We've never had someone break into our homes and threaten our families.

It's all talk.

People only want to see one dimension of God. Yes, we are to love our enemies and turn the other cheek when we are assaulted for our love of Christ. But we can not dismiss God (otherwise known as Jesus) who was a warring God in the OT. He not only fought for Israel, but in most cases He also commanded them to not leave anyone alive, and burn everything.

When it comes to pacifism people quote Jesus and ignore the OT. Guess what folks... read John 1:1... In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the **Word was God**.

Jesus created the world. (nothing was created that He didnt create) He was always there. Do you think He disapproved when God fought for Israel and destroyed their enemies? He couldnt against He would have been divided between Hims elf.

C'mon folks... there is some rather horrible misunderstandings of scripture going on here lately.

Krispy

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 15:58

Leonard Ravenhill vs. CS Lewis in a no-holds show down!

Jack has a nearly ten year edge over Leo on age, but Leonard had a more longevity. Both of them were sold out for Jesus, and both agreed on more things that they disagreed.

You might see how getting into this kind of arguement is in it's very nature not edifying.

By the way, what I think he meant by that comment about the Germans, is that once we are removed from the earthly bodies we have, everything will probably seem insignificant -wars, politics, etc.

Re: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin." - posted by beenblake (), on: 2007/3/6 16:06

Quote:
-----Is killing only a sin if it's done outside of your job/duty?

What is sin? Is it an act or is it a condition?

Blake

Re: - posted by jordanamo, on: 2007/3/6 16:13

Quote:
-----But we can not dismiss God (otherwise known as Jesus) who was a warring God in the OT. He not only fought for Israel, but in most cases He also commanded them to not leave anyone alive, and burn everything.

And yet that is in the Old Covenant perspective that you must take into consideration. God was dealing with the nations of the world. In the New Covenant God is dealing with men's hearts via Jesus. He hasn't changed but the New Covenant is in effect and it is different than the Old. If you think not then, well, I can't convince you.

All war is unbiblical thus, now-- unless it is ordained by God-- but that wouldn't happen because the only war that is now ordained by God is our war with not men and real swords anymore (like it was in the OT at times), but the war that is against the Devil and all of his workings amidst this World with the Word, Truth, and the Spirit.

War is futile, pointless, and serves no end. The nations will rage and fight, and wars and rumors of war shall come about -- that will happen no matter what-- there is NO stopping it in these end days. and that is fine. that is the eschatological view-- wars will come about and they must-- Nations have the right to defend themselves etc.-- but I shall have no part in it at all, for i am not apart of this world, and while i live in this world, i take no part in the World's doings but only as far as the 'line' goes such as commerce that is acceptable by God, but i know my limits. you may think they allow you to go to war. if so, that is fine with me but i will not approve of it. we can live in peace with eachother, but i will go to prison before i ever even touch a weapon of this world or get close to it via a war-situation.

Let us live in harmony with eachother despite our differential views on this. I am not trying to convince you of my point but we can still agree that argument is pretty futile. but this is my view and i feel compelled to state it as that.

Jordan

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/6 16:35

Quote:
-----Tell ya what... why dont we all lay down our arms and do nothing to prevent evil in this world. Lets see how long we last.

It's real easy for people to say we should be pacifists when we have never really had to face an enemy on our own soil. We've never had someone break into our homes and threaten our families.

It's all talk.

Make sure you're not assuming that only "some americans" hold to that view.

Re:, on: 2007/3/6 16:38

I hear these arguments from Americans more than anyone else.

If someone from another part of the world holds these points of view... well, I havent walked a mile in their shoes.

By the way, never criticize anyone until you've walked a mile in their shoes. That way, when you do criticize them... you are a mile away **and** you have their shoes!!

:~)

Krispy

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/6 16:48

Quote:
-----By the way, never criticize anyone until you've walked a mile in their shoes. That way, when you do criticize them... you are a mile a way and you have their shoes!!

thats great :lol:

But what about "we wrestle not against flesh and blood..."?

I'm just interested in hearing... er, reading your thoughts on that.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 16:48

Should a Christian serve his country and fight in a war and possibly kill other christians and non christians?

Wow, this is one of those questions that has a million and one different circumstances... there is no generic one size fits all answer.

When the Muslims were invading europe and threatening to destory Christianity, wasn't it a good thing that there were C hristians who took up arms alongside non-christians to defend their lands and in turn our faith?

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2007/3/6 16:53

Quote:
-----When the Muslims were invading europe and threatening to destory Christianity, wasn't it a good thing that there were Christians w ho took up arms alongside non-christians to defend their lands and in turn our faith?

No.

2Co 10:4 For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;

Re:, on: 2007/3/6 16:53

Ian... also, was it wrong for the Allies to fight against Nazi Germany? I challenge anyone to say that it was wrong. That w e should have just let Hitler run amuck and done nothing.

Krispy

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/6 16:54

Here is a part of George Fox's journal.

The time of my commitment to the house of correction being very nearly ended, and there being many new soldiers raised, the commissioners would have made me captain over them; and the soldiers cried out that they would have none but me. So the keeper of the house of correction was commanded to bring me before the commissioners and soldiers in the market-place, where they offered me that preferment, as they called it, asking me if I would not take up arms for the Commonwealth against Charles Stuart. I told them I knew whence all wars arose, even from the lusts, according to James Å' doctrine; and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars.

Yet they courted me to accept of their offer, and thought I did but compliment them. But I told them I was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were.

They said they offered it in love and kindness to me because of my virtue; and such-like flattering words they used. But I told them, if that was their love and kindness, I trampled it under my feet. Then their rage got up, and they said, Å"Take him away, jailer, and put him into the prison amongst the rogues and felons.Å" So I was put into a lousy, stinking place, without any bed, amongst thirty felons, where I was kept almost half a year; yet at times they would let me walk to the garden, believing I would not go away.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 16:55

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Tours

Quote:
-----Many modern historians maintain that the Battle of Tours was one of the most important battles during the Umayyad conquests. As a devastating defeat for the Umayyads, it helped trigger their downfall, and this battle determined that Europe would be Christian, not Muslim.

Re:, on: 2007/3/6 16:57

People often quote the "wrestle not with..." verse as meaning that we should never fight physically... such as in a war. This is not what this verse is talking about at all. It is not a condemnation of all physical fighting (i.e. war). It is exhorting us to use spiritual discernment and realize that our true enemy is Satan. It is telling us to not lose sight of what is really going on. But it should not, nor do I believe it was meant to be, a condemnation of physical warfare.

Krispy

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/6 16:58

Quote:
-----Many modern historians maintain that the Battle of Tours was one of the most important battles during the Umayyad conquests. As a devastating defeat for the Umayyads, it helped trigger their downfall, and this battle determined that Europe would be Christian, not Muslim.

John 18:36 "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight..."

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2007/3/6 17:01

How amazing is that sometimes even non-christians have found that the key of the victory is not force (carnal), here is what Napoleon Bonaparte said:

"Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and myself founded empires; but what foundation did we rest the creations of our genius? **Upon force.** Jesus Christ founded an empire **upon love**; and at this hour millions of men would die for Him."

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/6 17:05

Quote:

-----People often quote the "wrestle not with..." verse as meaning that we should never fight physically... such as in a war.

absolutely right! But...

what it does say that our warfare is not against flesh and blood. they are not our real enemies. His kingdom is not of this world.

We're just strangers and pilgrims passing through this land. Our vision (hopefully) is set on things above, and not on the things of this world.

If i'm seeing this wrong, or if you think I'm not making some things clear; teach me. I'm always open to the Truth.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 17:14

Maybe it's because I was raised in a military family. Every generation of my family that has lived in the United States has answered the call when the need arose.

My Grandfathers both fought the Japanese in the pacific. One was storming beaches in the Philipines, the other was on e of the first on the ground in Nagasaki after the surrender.

My Father flew Cobra helecopters in Vietnam, and continued to serve for twenty more years after the war.

I am the first male in my family to go to Asia without a rifle in his hands -I was carrying a sword, the Word of God.

I have chosen a different path than my forefathers, but will not take away anything from the service that they gave to their country. It would certainly be a wrong application to suppose that the bible condemns all men for serving in the military -there are countries in the world with forced conscription, like South Korea, Singapore, Switzerland etc... there are plenty of men who are in the military AND Christian.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/3/6 19:06

Quote:

-----When the Muslims were invading europe and threatening to destory Christianity, wasn't it a good thing that there were Christians who took up arms alongside non-christians to defend their lands and in turn our faith?

This is a good question....however if we answer "yes" then we would have no reason to not use our current military superiority today, including nuclear weapons, to exterminate our current Muslim enemies who also are committed to destroying Christianity. It is easy to imagine that the crusaders and popes would have used the god-like power of nuclear weapons if they had the technology. They probably would have written chivalric poems about it like Rowland.

Rowland, when first I read thy stately rhymes
How in mushroom clouds did'st heaven send us signs,

I then beheld thy 1000 pound hailstones metal frame
Put on the wings of thy immortal style and laser-guided aim .

O how thy fiery spirit mounts up to the sky,
untill God's power rains down, causing all our foes to fry.

Hmmm...considering our present situation I think it's better not to justify the crusades as 'defending our faith.' They happened because two worldly civilizations were clashing. (Actually, it was Huns of the East that obliterated Islamic civilization, setting it back for a thousand years...I wonder why they don't hold a grudge against China?)

In any case I don't believe the crusades, especially the second and third ones were Christian endeavors...I think they were worldly. I doubt there were many true Christians calling the shots back then. Now one of the few things to our western credit is that we have restrained from doing the full measure of what we are capable of doing to our enemies. The world, including our own rulers, needs to keep in perspective that the United States is not yet fully mobilized for war. And in the interest of not becoming horribly medieval with modern fearsome technology I hope our government is morally beyond 11th century Europe or 21st century Iran. (With man's sin nature being what it is...maybe that's impossible...)

MC

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/3/6 19:13

Compton, I really don't know what school you studied history at... but the aforementioned historical battle was NOT part of the crusades... happened nearly 300 years earlier.

That would be like saying 'George Washington founded America to fight the War on Terror.'

Bad history.

Re: In what armor do we trust? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/6 19:32

Quote:
----- People often quote the "wrestle not with..." verse as meaning that we should never fight physically... such as in a war. This is not what this verse is talking about at all. It is not a condemnation of all physical fighting (i.e. war). It is exhorting us to use spiritual discernment and realize that our true enemy is Satan. It is telling us to not lose sight of what is really going on. But it should not, nor do I believe it was meant to be, a condemnation of physical warfare.

Consider this Old Testament application of the Ephesians 6 portion of scripture that is under question:

The nation of Israel was being ruthlessly taunted by the Philistine enemies. Every day that mighty Philistine giant, Goliath would strut about in front of the Israelite army and dare someone to kill him. The Israelites were terrified. Many of the soldiers ran away and hid in caves.

Those Philistines were proud, aggressive, and ungodly. Therefore they were eager accomplices for the prowling lion, the devil – who wanted to destroy God’s nation - Israel.

The Israelites themselves were easy prey for their enemy, that is, the invisible enemy: they had turned against God and did not trust him to help them. They relied on their own might. But their might was no match for the might of the Philistines. No wonder Israel was paralyzed with fear.

Israel was in danger of being wiped out – not because of the strength of the Philistines, but because of their own dark hearts. Their weapons were useless.

From 1 Sam. 16

There is a good reason why Jesus said, “He who lives by the sword will perish by the sword” He is warning us not to rely on the flesh. Whatever we rely on for power and protection will not work – In fact, it will ultimately destroy us. We can never overpower all the evil forces pitted against us.

Resist the devil: James 4:7

Resist him, stand firm in the faith 1 Pet. 5:8

That’s how David conquered Goliath – by standing firm in his faith. He did not look at the size of the giant, but at the size of his God. He said: “The Lord who delivered me from the paw of the lion and the paw of the bear will deliver me from the hand of this Philistine.”

David, filled with confidence in his God, approached the giant, calling out, "You come against me with sword and spear and javelin, but I come against you in the name of the Lord Almighty, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you have defied. This day the Lord will hand you over to me."

You know the story. With a mere slingshot and a stone, Goliath was struck dead. Then the entire Philistine army, seeing that their hero was killed, turned and ran away.

What was the weapon that worked for David? Was it the stone? The power of the slingshot? Of course not! Was it the words that David spoke? Was it his faith? No, His faith did not kill Goliath, but his faith enabled him to move into the place where God could use him.

It was God, himself who killed the giant. David had simply put on the spiritual armor of God. That was his life practice, and we can clearly see when we read his psalms: "God is my shield," he wrote.

Question: What IS the spiritual armor of God, and how does it protect us from our enemies?

Diane

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/6 19:38

I have a question: How did the Allies win WW2? Was it a divine miracle, or was it by man's strength?

I suppose our answer to that makes all the difference in the world.

Diane

Re: roadsign - posted by tjervant (), on: 2007/3/6 19:44

Great post about David Diane.

Re: Murder, on: 2007/3/6 20:21

The commandment is "thou shalt not murder", not "thou shalt not kill".

To murder is to lie and wait and kill and refers to criminal acts of killing and has nothing to do with fighting wars, or working as a policeman and having to kill someone in the line of duty.

However, when we pick up our Bible and read the sixth commandment we see "Thou shalt not kill." In this form, pacifists, animal rights groups, and those opposed to capital punishment have chosen this commandment as their rallying cry.

Indeed, "kill" in English is an all-encompassing verb that covers the taking of life in all forms and for all classes of victims. That kind of generalization is expressed in Hebrew through the verb "harag." However, the verb that appears in the Torah's prohibition is a completely different one, "ratsah" which, it would seem, should be rendered "murder." This root refers only to criminal acts of killing.

If we look at Romans, chapter 13 we see that God is in control of history and in setting up world governments. He also authorizes Governments (the Sovereign) to carry the sword and to punish those that do evil with the sword (the gun, the sword, the rocket launcher, etc.) with wrath ---"a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"

1. 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. 2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

3. 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: 4. For he is the 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. 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/3/6 23:15

Quote:

----- but the aforementioned historical battle was NOT part of the crusades

I wasn't combining the two wars brother...I apologize if that seemed unclear in my comments. I was making an incidental observation that the Crusaders of Christendom weren't the only threats to Islamic people in the middle ages. But you are right...my history was a bit rusty. It was actually the Khans, (Not the Huns) that sacked Bagdad in the 13th century, killing their Caliph.

MC

I got a confession Ian, on: 2007/3/7 1:27

First of all, God bless your grandfathers and your daddy, I served too, as well as my bro Krispy Steve. I loved the military, still do, and continue to love our guys and gals in uniform, they are heroes to me, as are missionaries, whose stirring biographies I love to read.

I was the first in my family, thru the centuries to have served in a military, the Navy specifically. (thats wrong, I did have an uncle Harold who served in the Army during WW2, got a photo of him next to my maternal families surname of a town in Germany, Scharwzenberg)

anyway, here's my confession, I have an odd tension in my soul of late, its King David versus Jesus, I'm just being real. The King David side sees the looming danger that Iran and its nuclear program presents to Israel, and if I was an Israeli policy maker I wouldnt even bat an eye to give the green light to a pre-emptive massive strike to terminate this program, that the Iranians have stated would be used to "blot the Zionist entity from the map".

Now remember King David was a "man after God's own heart", but man did he stumble and sin, murder, adultery, etc. It was so bad, God didnt even allow him to build the Temple.

But Jesus said, love your enemy, turn the other cheek, pray for your enemy, and there's where my inner tension lays.

Y'know, I always thought this war in Iraq was ill-concieved, I dont say that to get into agrument, but I always knew the pre-war intelligence was cooked up, we had no coherent terms of what victory looked like, we didnt follow the "Powell Doctrine", ie overwhelming force, meaning 500,000 troops, like the first Gulf War, etc etc.

but then I began to think, maybe Iraq was done to give us a staging ground for the real enemy, Iran, I dont know.

I'm 47 now, and I can tell you this in all sincerity, if I was 27, I'd already been re-enlisted in the Navy and studying Farsi, as I did Korean some 30 years ago, because I believe in that if a young man is so led, he should serve his country. We need guys on the wall.

I know we are to "have no country" and thats where the King David/Jesus tension arises in my soul and in my heart, and in these days, I dont have the answer, except to say I love Jesus, Prince of Peace, Savior of the World. Marantha. I'm just trying to be real transparent and honest with myself, with you and others and the Lord. These are dark days, and they promise to get even darker.

May the Lord have mercy on us all, neil

Re:, on: 2007/3/7 1:51

Quote:

-----by PreachParsly on 2007/3/6 15:54:52

Here is a part of George Fox's journal.

The time of my commitment to the house of correction being very nearly ended, and there being many new soldiers raised, the commissioners would have made me captain over them; and the soldiers cried out that they would have none but me. So the keeper of the house of correction was commanded to bring me before the commissioners and soldiers in the market-place, where they offered me that preferment, as they called it, asking me if I would not take up arms for the Commonwealth against Charles Stuart. I told them I knew whence all wars arose, even from the lusts, according to James's doctrine; and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars.

Yet they courted me to accept of their offer, and thought I did but compliment them. But I told them I was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were.

They said they offered it in love and kindness to me because of my virtue; and such-like flattering words they used. But I told them, if that was their love and kindness, I trampled it under my feet. Then their rage got up, and they said, "Take him away, jailer, and put him into the prison amongst the rogues and felons." So I was put into a lousy, stinking place, without any bed, amongst thirty felons, where I was kept almost half a year; yet at times they would let me walk to the garden, believing I would not go away.

AMEN.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/7 4:13

Quote:

-----In any case I don't believe the crusades, especially the second and third ones were Christian endeavors...I think they were worldly.

The issue, almost always, is territory. The early church was pretty indifferent to territory. The New Testament is pretty indifferent to territory but when religions have integral territorial claims there will always be war.

Some, but not all, forms of Judaism namely Zionism, have integral territorial claims as part of their understanding. (Although Zionism was originally completely secular) Islam also has territorial claims as part of its understanding. When two religious groups both regard the possession of Jerusalem as 'none negotiable' there is not much space for diplomacy. New Testament Christianity had no territorial claims. When Christianity degenerated into Christendom it quickly acquired a territorial aspect to its theology and hence the Crusades.

"Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here."

(John 18:36 NKJV)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/7 4:41

Summary:

In the past, Beijing has spent heavily on adding submarines, jet fighters and other high-tech weapons to its arsenal, which despite its size, lags well behind those of other major nations.

However, Jiang said the \$44.94 billion military budget would mainly be spent on boosting wages and living allowances for members of the armed forces and on upgrading armaments "to enhance the military's ability to conduct defensive operations."

America... Still leading by example...

U.S. Military expenditures are approximately twelve times that of the current Chinese military expenditure.

The USA, responsible for about 80 per cent of the increase in 2005, is the principal determinant of the current world trend, and its military expenditure now accounts for ALMOST HALF of the world total...

Dan. 11:38 But in their place he shall honor a god of fortresses; and a god which his fathers did not know he shall honor with gold and silver, with precious stones and pleasant things. 39 Thus he shall act against the strongest fortresses with a foreign god, which he shall acknowledge, and advance its glory; and he shall cause them to rule over many, and divide the land for gain.

What is the evidence of the path that the United States now walks?

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/3/7 13:31

Quote:
-----"Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here."

I am more and more coming to feel that this is as important to the good news of the Gospel as is our personal redemption. How grievous if we could know our good God and yet still be required to live under the power of this world. (I am talking about the principalities...not the civil authorities.) Praise God, Jesus said "Be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world..." and John recorded "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ..." Yet it is a sad mystery much of history shows Christendom being overcome with the Gospel of this world.

This world has its kingdom Gospel too. "Caesars" face is on all its coins, mile markers, monuments, battle banners and even religions. The world's Gospel is a thesis that permeates all the actions of men, but the Gospel Christ brings is an thesis that interpenetrates the world, like rays of light. This light is our distinction from the darkness all men live in, and though it may provoke contempt, and even death, this distinction, which is both cultural and cosmic, is vital to the word of our testimony. The church is a proclamation of the good news that the Kingdom of God is open to those who seek. The truth will set a man free..again not to outwardly anarchism against all peaceable and decent civil law, but inwardly from the hidden sway of the evil one. I run in the path of your commands, for you have set my heart free.

Isaiah saw a righteous government that would be upon the shoulders of the Messiah. The earliest Christian believed in this government and proclaimed it to the world. No wonder the Roman government persecuted the church, for while Christians could be amiable ambassadors, their ultimate loyalty was with another King.

They did not overcome the evil one according to the principles of this world but by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Apparently being a witness to the light could be dangerous business!

Centuries later many of us believe that the spirit of anti-christ will become manifest as a man who will rule over nations. Will Christians loyal to these nations still dutifully go to war for him?

And yet the spirit of anti-christ is already in the world. What implications could this have for those of us whose patriotism

shakes hands with our worship? Like Neil, I find that these questions reveal a conflict in my American orthodoxy. In time s past, when America had a more pronounced 'Judeo-Christian' culture, we believed we could harmonize the two kingdo ms, but it may be that presently the dissonance grows so great that we will be forced to finally choose one kingdom over the other.

Just discussing these things with hope brethren,

MC

Re:, on: 2007/3/7 14:23

Would someone please answer the question that I asked?

Was it wrong for good people (many who were born again Christians) to use military might to defeat the Nazis? Whether or not it was a miracle of God that Nazi Germany was defeated is not the issue... was it wrong to use military might to defeat them, and put a stop to the atosities?

I ask this question everytime this topic comes up, and not **one** time has anyone who believes we should never use physci cal force under any circumstances answered me. The question either goes ignored or they beat around the bush.

It's a simple yes or no question.

Krispy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/7 14:29

Quote:

-----Would someone please answer the question that I asked?

The reason I have not provided an answer to the question is that I think it starts from a false premise. The question is n ot "Was it wrong for good people (many who were born again Christians) to use military might to defeat the Nazis?" but r ather "Would it be wrong for ME to use military might to defeat the Nazis?"

No one can answer that question for ME, and I cannot ask it of another. Let each be persuaded in his own mind and giv e freedom of conscience to another's conscience too.

The other unanswered question is "Would Jesus have gone to war against the Nazis?"

Re:, on: 2007/3/7 14:44

Quote:

-----The other unanswered question is "Would Jesus have gone to war against the Nazis?"

I believe He did... I believe God brought His wrath down on the Nazi's for the treatment of the Jews, while at the same ti me using that horrible situation to accomplish His will for the end times. Chiefly bringing the Jews back into the land.

The Nazi's werent the first people to mistreat and spit upon the Jews, only to be utterly destroyed... I seem to remember Egyptians, Babylonians... etc.

People who think that God is not capable of war should read Psalm 18. (Thats not directed at you, Philologos)

Krispy

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/7 15:30

I think we could look at this from another perspective. Can God be glorified in sin? now lets for a moment say that war is wrong, and that Christians should not take up arms against the enemies of our country. Could God still use this sin for His glory and to accomplish His will?

Re:, on: 2007/3/7 15:42

Not sure you can ever say war is sin, or war is not sin anymore than you can say sex is sin, or sex is not sin.

In marriage, sex is not sin. Outside of marriage, sex is sin. So it would depend on the situation under which war was started.

But no one can make a blanket statement that all war is sin, because if you do... you say God is a sinner.

Consider:

2Sa 22:35 He teacheth my hands to war; so that a bow of steel is broken by mine arms.

Psa 18:34 He teacheth my hands to war, so that a bow of steel is broken by mine arms.

Psa 144:1 A Psalm of David. Blessed be the LORD my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight...

Also consider the book of Joshua as the children of Israel conquered the land that God promised their fathers. Over and over again God fights for them and destroys their enemies.

God is a God of love, mercy, salvation... but God is also a God of war. People (even believers on this website) want to forget that God is a God of judgement and punishment. There are many dimensions to God... but people only want to believe in the "teddy bear" God... the God of children's Bibles.

Vico... I understand your question, but when I hear you say "*now lets for a moment say that war is wrong*" ... I hear "lets say for a moment that God is a sinner, or God can do something wrong". I just want to caution you to not do that.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Ruach34 (), on: 2007/3/7 16:23

I agree with your statement, philologos. Let each one be persuaded in his own mind. I have not read this whole forum and will, but wanted to interject here and say this has been my struggle as I am in the military. No, I have not been in war, yet. But, seeing many guys come back from the war, I see nothing good in it. They are full of anger, nightmares and run so ragged, physically, emotionally and spiritually.

they are led into war by machines made to destroy and destroy well and quickly. We show off these machines as 'strength' and 'might.' "Not by power, or by might, but by my Spirit, says the Lord."

I have had a couple visions, I believe from the Lord, concerning killing...and through the past three years have been led to pursue and apply for chaplaincy. there is much more peace within me to lay down the weapon of destruction and carry the weapon of the Spirit. And it is in this capacity that I believe pleases God. That is how I have been persuaded in my own mind and will be faithful as the Lord gives grace.

Rich

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/3/7 16:44

Hi Krispy,

I was wondering what you take is on how the Lord changed certain aspects of the law or revised certain things so as to disallow things that under the law had been lawful. I am referring to the whole love your enemies thing?

Just wondering,

God Bless,

-Robert

Re:, on: 2007/3/7 23:41

Quote:

RobertW wrote:
Hi Krispy,

I was wondering what you take is on how the Lord changed certain aspects of the law or revised certain things so as to disallow things that under the law had been lawful. I am referring to the whole love your enemies thing?

Just wondering,

God Bless,

-Robert

It has always been my understanding that as individuals we are to love our enemies. However, as citizens of nations the Bible is clear, that in New Testament times the Government acts as the Sovereign and carries the sword.

I posted this earlier, and I believe that it applies to what has been discussed on this thread.

God's Word, in Romans, chapter 13 tells us God is in control of history and is behind setting up world governments. He also authorizes Governments (the Sovereign) to carry the sword and to punish those that do evil with the sword (the gun, the sword, the rocket launcher, etc.) WITH WRATH ---"a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"

1. 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.
 2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.
 3. 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:
 4. For he is the 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.
 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.
 6. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.
- xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The Old Testament is also clear on this issue. I posted this previously from the Old Testament:

The commandment is "thou shalt not murder", not "thou shalt not kill".

To murder is to lie and wait and kill and refers to criminal acts of killing and has nothing to do with fighting wars, or working as a policeman and having to kill someone in the line of duty.

However, when we pick up our Bible and read the sixth commandment we see "Thou shalt not kill." In this form pacifists and other groups have chosen this commandment as their rallying cry.

Indeed, "kill" in English is an all-encompassing verb that covers the taking of life in all forms and for all classes of victims

. That kind of generalization is expressed in Hebrew through the verb "harag." However, the verb that appears in the Torah's prohibition is a completely different one, "ratsah" which, it would seem, should be rendered "murder." This root refers only to criminal acts of killing.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I served in the Navy while Viet Nam was heating up. Being in the service seems to me to be a great mission field for Bible Believing Christians that are willing to witness to the lost. Most of the men that they serve with are not saved, and are eager to hear the "good news" of salvation and eternal life, especially on the battlefield, or aboard ship when a war is going on.

You don't have to be a conscientious objector to spread the Gospel, you can do that wherever you find yourself- even if that place is in the Army, while you are driving a tank, defending your Country.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/8 0:40

Brother Stever wrote:

Quote:
-----God's Word, in Romans, chapter 13 tells us God is in control of history and is behind setting up world governments. He also authorizes Governments (the Sovereign) to carry the sword and to punish those that do evil with the sword (the gun, the sword, the rocket launcher, etc.) WITH WRATH ---"a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"

This does not mean that the governments obey God. It only means that they are subject to His judgements.

Job 34:
23 For He need not further consider a man,
That he should go before God in judgment.
24 He breaks in pieces mighty men without inquiry,
And sets others in their place.
25 Therefore He knows their works;
He overthrows them in the night,
And they are crushed.
26 He strikes them as wicked men
In the open sight of others,
27 Because they turned back from Him,
And would not consider any of His ways,

From the Scriptures we learn that God does select those who rule, but we also learn that most reject Him.

Proverbs 1:

10 My son, if sinners entice you,
Do not consent.
11 If they say, "Come with us,
Let us lie in wait to shed blood;
Let us lurk secretly for the innocent without cause;
12 Let us swallow them alive like Sheol,

And whole, like those who go down to the Pit;
13 We shall find all kinds of precious possessions,
We shall fill our houses with spoil;
14 Cast in your lot among us,
Let us all have one purse—
15 My son, do not walk in the way with them,
Keep your foot from their path;
16 For their feet run to evil,
And they make haste to shed blood.
17 Surely, in vain the net is spread
In the sight of any bird;
18 But they lie in wait for their own blood,
They lurk secretly for their own lives.
19 So are the ways of everyone who is greedy for gain;
It takes away the life of its owners.

For those who obey God, we are not to cast our lots in with those who run to evil...

Deut. 9:4 "Do not think in your heart, after the LORD your God has cast them out before you, saying, 'Because of my righteousness the LORD has brought me in to possess this land'; but it is because of the wickedness of these nations that the LORD is driving them out from before you. 5 It is not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your heart that you go in to possess their land, but because of the wickedness of these nations that the LORD your God drives them out from before you, and that He may fulfill the word which the LORD swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. 6 Therefore understand that the LORD your God is not giving you this good land to possess because of your righteousness, for you are a stiff-necked people.

War is a result of wickedness. And all nations suffer because of that wickedness. None are righteous no not one...they all turn their backs to the Creator.

In Scripture we find that 78 % of the kings of Judah and Israel were judged wicked.

Are we to cast our lots among the wicked?

In Christ
Jeff

Re:, on: 2007/3/8 0:50

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----Would someone please answer the question that I asked?

The reason I have not provided an answer to the question is that I think it starts from a false premise. The question is not "Was it wrong for good people (many who were born again Christians) to use military might to defeat the Nazis?" but rather "Would it be wrong for ME to use military might to defeat the Nazis?"

No one can answer that question for ME, and I cannot ask it of another. Let each be persuaded in his own mind and give freedom of conscience to another's conscience too.

The other unanswered question is "Would Jesus have gone to war against the Nazis?"

In ancient Israel it was a capital crime, punishable by stoning, not to become a soldier when men reached the age of 22.

News and Current Events :: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin."

I wonder how long the moral relativism of today, that is taught in our schools and universities would have lasted in ancient Israel? Probably after 1 or 2 young men (conscientious objectors, you refused to serve their country) were stoned to death before the entire congregation.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

For an answer to this dilemma, the Word of God should be the only source. Christ said there would be wars, and rumors of wars until His second coming. At His second coming He comes with His Saints (us) to separate the sheep from the goats. The sheep enter in with Him to the thousand year reign on the earth. The lost (the Goats) are killed by the Word from His mouth (Christ KILLS them, Himself), and will go to hell, awaiting the Great White Throne Judgment.

Jesus Christ sounds nothing like a "conscientious objector" or a "Pacifist" to me. How can the "Lord of Armies" ever be mistaken for a pacifist or anyone like that?

God bless,

Stever 8-)

P.S. wikipedia provides this definition of "moral relativism":

Moral relativism
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

This article attempts to confine itself to discussion of relativism in morality and ethics. For other manifestations of relativism, see relativism.

In philosophy, moral relativism is the position that moral or ethical propositions do not reflect absolute and universal moral truths, but instead make claims relative to social, cultural, historical or personal circumstances. Moral relativists hold that no universal standard exists by which to assess an ethical proposition's truth. Relativistic positions often see moral values as applicable only within certain cultural boundaries or in the context of individual preferences. An extreme relativist position might suggest that judging the moral or ethical judgments or acts of another person or group has no meaning, though most relativists propound a more limited version of the theory.

Some moral relativists— for example, the existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre— hold that a personal and subjective moral core lies or ought to lie at the foundation of individuals' moral acts. In this view public morality reflects social convention, and only personal, subjective morality expresses true authenticity.

Moral relativism differs from moral pluralism— which acknowledges the co-existence of opposing ideas and practices, but accepts limits to differences, such as when vital human needs get violated. Moral relativism, in contrast, grants the possibility of moral judgments that do not accept such limits.

Portal:Philosophy
Philosophy Portal

In popular culture people often describe themselves as "morally relativist," meaning that they are accepting of other people's values and agree that there is no one "right" way of doing some things. However, this actually has little to do with the philosophical idea of relativism; relativism does not necessarily imply tolerance, just as moral absolutism does not imply intolerance. These people's moral outlook can be explained from both theoretical frameworks. Christ KILLS them, Himself

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/8 2:34

Brother Stever asked:

Quote:
-----I wonder how long the moral relativism of today, that is taught in our schools and universities would have lasted in ancient Israel?

If we hold that the United States shares with ancient Israel the same position with God, then I wonder how many Americans should be stoned because they worship another god?

Scripture however distinguishes between Israel and all other heathen nations.

Is war a blessing or a curse?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/8 4:15

Quote:
-----I believe He did... I believe God brought His wrath down on the Nazi's for the treatment of the Jews, while at the same time using that horrible situation to accomplish His will for the end times. Chiefly bringing the Jews back into the land.

Christ sits as a priest upon the throne of grace not as a Warrior.

BTW I have a son who is a major in the British Army! I did not encourage him in that choice but he knows he has always had my love and genuine support.

Re: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin", on: 2007/3/8 6:42

Compton said (p4)

Quote:
-----This world has its kingdom Gospel too. "Caesars" face is on all its coins, mile markers, monuments, battle banners and even religions. The world's Gospel is a thesis that permeates all the actions of men,

I was surprised some years ago, to learn that Christianity is the only religion in which there is no monetary payment *required* for whatever salvation that religion offers to be able to be purchased. For me, that brought into sharp relief Peter's words

1 Peter 1:18, 19

knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, *like* silver or gold, from your aimless conduct *received* by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.

This is flanked before, by 15 - 17

but as He who called you *is* holy, you also be holy in all conduct, because it is written, "Be holy, for I am holy."

And if you call on the Father, who without partiality judges according to each one's work, conduct yourselves throughout the time of your stay *here* in fear;

and 20 - 25

He indeed was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you who through Him believe in God, who raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory, so that your faith and hope are in God.

Since you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit in sincere love of the brethren, love one another fervently with a pure heart, having been born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, through the word of God which lives and abides forever, because

"All flesh *is* as grass,
And all the glory of man as the flower of the grass.
The grass withers,
And its flower falls away,

But the word of the LORD endures forever."

Now this is the word which by the gospel was preached to you.

philologos said (p3)

Quote:

-----When Christianity degenerated into Christendom it quickly acquired a territorial aspect to its theology

It is always interesting here at SI, to see how discussion in SI's forums find the same answers making a profound impact on different manifestations of what appear to be the same issue. (This, about territory, arises in a comparison of the Old and New Covenants.)

Maybe we need to pick up on this aspect of SI (as much as possible), to see how the consistency of God's word *should* be hitting our understanding repetitively with the same Truth.... and receive to ourselves as much of it as possible.

Re: I got a confession Ian - posted by seanjol (), on: 2007/3/8 8:12

great post! One thing that I struggle with in the "war" issue is where do we say that we are under the new covenant. In the old, David was commanded to take up arms, Joshua to lay waste the inhabitants, etc. In the new covenant, we are told to love our enemies, lay down the sword, etc. Not on jot or tittle was done away as our Lord said, so where do we live?

All of this said questioning and searching, not even attempting to give the illusion of instructing.

Blessings,

Sean

Ron Bailey, on: 2007/3/8 9:13

May God always bless and protect your son.

I know you are proud of him, and I join you in praying for him, this man, this leader, and I know you still see him in your heart's eye when he was a wee lad. May God bless you all.

In Jesus' love, neil

ps....by the by, I am an anglophile, I love the UK, I feel very very comfortable being in that land. Just so you know. xo.

Re: Who is our enemy? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/8 9:13

In a recent conversation with my mom (who lived during brutal Nazi occupation in Holland) she pointed out that most of those Germans didn't even know what was going on. They didn't understand. In fact most of them had no clue about the mass graves being created at Auschwitz, etc. They were simply being loyal to their civil authorities. They thought they were doing what was right - just as they were raised to believe: absolute obedience to authority. That's one reason why they made good fodder for the Nazi war machine. After all, you can't have a reliable army without absolute loyalty. You can't have people questioning the tactics, or deserting willy-nilly. You can't have people think too much.

Didn't Constantine demand loyalty to HIS kingdom? And being that it was a "Christian" kingdom then it was a virtue to defend it. Isn't loyalty what all nations expect of their soldiers? Many would view that as a biblical virtue based on:

Quote:

----- Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.

At what point can we view those loyal to their nations as also in need of extermination: Is it not when OUR kingdom is t

threatened. Yet those enemies are simply deceived and brainwashed. If they were raised in our culture and our values, they would be loyal to our society. And they would be our allies.

At what point does someone become an enemy? At what point do our neighbors become our enemy? Surely most of those in our society are loyal to deception, and are indeed our enemies. They are brainwashing our children and drawing them away from God. Why don't we kill them - even if they are our relatives? After all, eventually their false philosophies WILL destroy our nations.

We are not being consistent.

Why do so many, even Christians, see such little value in the spiritual armor of God - viewing it, essentially as impotent - just a form of pacifism. Is it because of unbelief? Our God is too small? We want to take matters into our own hands? Maybe we don't understand the power of the invisible enemy - who tempts mankind to self-destruct.

It so happens that our history is written by the victors - and their beliefs come through their writings: namely: unbelief in God and belief in nationhood. Is that not a form of brain washing, a tool of the devil?

I have a question regarding WW2: Why were the enemies not thwarted long before war broke out? After all, the danger was evident, was it not? Was the need for the war not a reflection of man's failure (including the Allies) to apply the Biblical teachings long before the problem got out of hand - when it was too late. Should we not admit our FAILURE rather than emphasize our VICTORY?

No one has addressed my question yet: "What is the armor of God, and how does it protect us? If it worked for David, why not for us? Perhaps, in using scripture to justify killing, many do not see that whenever ancient Israel did NOT obey God, they did NOT have victory. It wasn't about their weapons but about their hearts.

Why did Jesus say, "Those who live by the sword will perish by the sword?"

Do we God's children not have something far better to offer our world - which should be occupying our entire lives - which can save a lot more people than the sword - for eternity?

Diane

Ruach34, on: 2007/3/8 9:16

(btw, I love your moniker, good choice.)

war is hell, and may God protect and shield you.

neil

Re: - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2007/3/8 9:25

Quote:
-----Why do so many, even Christians, see such little value in the spiritual armor of God - viewing it, essentially as impotent - just a form of pacifism.

Is it because of unbelief?

Our God is too small?

We want to take matters into our own hands?

Maybe we don't understand the power of the invisible enemy - who tempts mankind to self-destruct.

It so happens that our history is written by the victors - and their beliefs come through their writings: namely: **unbelief** in God and belief in nationhood.

Is that not a form of brain washing, a tool of the devil?

Quote:
-----Perhaps, in using scripture to justify killing, many do not see that whenever ancient Isreal did NOT obey God, they did NOT have vi
ctory. **It wasn't about their weapons but about their hearts.**

This can be proven by the Scriptures:

Quote:
-----2Ch 14:2 **And Asa did that which was good and right in the eyes of the LORD his God:**
2Ch 14:3 For he took away the altars of the strange gods, and the high places, and brake down the images, and cut down the groves:
2Ch 14:4 **And commanded Judah to seek the LORD God** of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandment.
2Ch 14:5 Also he took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places and the images: **and the kingdom was quiet before him.**
2Ch 14:6 And he built fenced cities in Judah: for the land had rest, **and he had no war in those years; because the LORD had given him rest.**
2Ch 14:7 Therefore he said unto Judah, Let us build these cities, and make about them walls, and towers, gates, and bars, while the land is yet before us; **because we have sought the LORD our God, we have sought him, and he hath given us rest on every side.** So they built and prospered.

Thank you sister Diane for your thoughts.

Re:, on: 2007/3/8 19:47

Dear Tears of Joy:

God is the one who prophesized that Abraham would be the father of many nations. The concept of Nations is God's idea. The concept of Nations being a bad thing is consistent with the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trialateral Commission, the United Nations, and other socialist, one world leaning groups that do not believe in the God of the Bible.

Genesis 17

1. And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.
 2. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.
 3. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying,
 4. As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, AND THOU SHALT BE A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS.
 5. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.
 6. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.
 7. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.
-
15. And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be.
 16. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.

In the Book of Daniel, we see God's plan for the "One World" Governments ("Nations" that will control the known world) that will control the earth for all of human history- 1) Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, represented by the head of Gold. 2) The Meads & the Persians, represented by breast and arms of silver 3) Alexander the Great, represented by the belly and thighs of brass 4) Rome, represented by the legs of iron 5) The Revived Roman empire, represented by feet of iron mixed with clay. All of these are history & have already taken place except the last prophecy of the feet of iron mixed with clay--this is future and refers to the Revived Roman Empire that is already in it's birth pangs- the European Union.

God is very much in the Nation business. God is in control of History, and knows the end from the beginning. He proves this by Bible Prophecy, prophesized thousands of years in advance as proof of his majesty and power and control of world events.

God bless,

Stever 8-)

Quote:

Tears_of_joy wrote:

Quote:
-----Why do so many, even Christians, see such little value in the spiritual armor of God -- viewing it, essentially as impotent -- just a form of pacifism.

Is it because of unbelief?

Our God is too small?

We want to take matters into our own hands?

Maybe we don't understand the power of the invisible enemy - who tempts mankind to self-destruct.

It so happens that our history is written by the victors -- and their beliefs come through their writings: namely: **unbelief** in God and belief in nationhood.

Is that not a form of brain washing, a tool of the devil?

Quote:

-----Perhaps, in using scripture to justify killing, many do not see that whenever ancient Israel did NOT obey God, they did NOT have victory. **It wasn't about their weapons but about their hearts.**

This can be proven by the Scriptures:

Quote:

-----2Ch 14:2 **And Asa did that which was good and right in the eyes of the LORD his God:**

2Ch 14:3 For he took away the altars of the strange gods, and the high places, and brake down the images, and cut down the groves:

2Ch 14:4 **And commanded Judah to seek the LORD God of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandment.**

2Ch 14:5 Also he took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places and the images: **and the kingdom was quiet before him.**

2Ch 14:6 And he built fenced cities in Judah: for the land had rest, **and he had no war in those years; because the LORD had given him rest.**

2Ch 14:7 Therefore he said unto Judah, Let us build these cities, and make about them walls, and towers, gates, and bars, while the land is yet before us; **because we have sought the LORD our God, we have sought him, and he hath given us rest on every side.** So they built and prospered.

Thank you sister Diane for your thoughts.

Re: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin." - posted by Pilgrimsway (), on: 2007/3/8 22:02

"3. 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: 4. For he is the 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. 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing."

This is the verse that answers the question, and its also why almost everyone is wrong.

When an individual wears the uniform of the armed forces of his/her country, this verse applies to them...but in REVERSE. The person in uniform becomes the minister of God who bears the sword. If necessary, while in the employ of your government, then it is your obligation to act as God's agent for that purpose.

If you do not actively serve in a function that meets this criteria, then the point is moot. It only applies to those who actually hold that position of authority.

I served in the Army for 21 years. I was there because of the direct leading of God. Because I was obedient and went,

many American soldiers heard the Gospel and were given a godly example to follow. I also took this verse, again in reverse, to mean that since I had been placed in a leadership position over other people, then I had an obligation to do the greatest good for them. I took care of my soldiers and was the best I could be because I owed my performance to God, not to man (Col. 3:22-24). And yes, if my superiors told me to do what I was trained for (which was to shoot artillery at an armed enemy) I would have done it in a heartbeat. Why? Because as a man in my position, I was subject to those over me. If I failed to do my duty, I would have been guilty of dereliction, and of violating the contract that I freely signed.

If you don't want to serve in the military, fine, don't. And like George Fox, that may be God's leading for you. But because of the fallen world we live in, and the nature of real life, it will be necessary at times to be in the military, police, corrections, judges...whatever occupation that has the legal authority from the government to act as the enforcement of rules.

I doubt highly that George Fox would have EVER suggested that Christians were to disregard law or the rules of society. I saw over and over people who were "Christians" and who claimed they did not have to follow regulation or the commands of superiors because they were Christians. The Army had a different view of these individuals: disobedient, failing to obey lawful orders, and criminal.

Being a Christian does not make you exempt from the laws of man. It is actually the opposite...we of all people are the ones who must obey the laws because we have a Scriptural mandate to do so, unless those laws require us to deny Jesus or to bow to another deity. Following the instruction of a supervisor does not meet either criteria.

Beware teaching personal preferences for the Word of God. They certainly are not edifying. Pacifist arguments cannot be supported from Scripture. To prove one point, you must nullify the Bible in another. And that is not allowed.

Also, you cannot use the Bible to support your own personal rebellious nature. Yes, you heard that right. Examine yourself as to WHY you have these attitudes. You may be unpleasantly surprised to find out that you have unknowingly accepted the ideas of the world...and these ideas are based on leftover 60s rebellion (which is another topic all together).

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/3/11 17:55

Pilgrim wrote:

Quote:
----- Examine yourself as to WHY you have these attitudes. You may be unpleasantly surprised to find out that you have unknowingly accepted the ideas of the world...and these ideas are based on leftover 60s rebellion (which is another topic all together).

Sir, this is the motivation many will not participate in the military:

Matt. 5:43: 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 OT commandment Jesus was referring to was the one where people were required to hate their enemies, the ones they went to battle to kill. Now he is replacing it with another one, quite the opposite: love your enemy.

This concept of refusing to participate in the military is as old as the NT church. It is not of recent origin.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/11 18:30

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
Was it wrong for good people (many who were born again Christians) to use military might to defeat the Nazis? Whether or not it was a miracle of God that Nazi Germany was defeated is not the issue... was it wrong to use military might to defeat them, and put a stop to the atrocities?

One side comment on this question is to say that many of these soldiers that the allied forces were fighting were not Nazis. This is the equivalent to questioning whether or not it is okay for Iraqis to fight the republicans in the Iraqi war. I can cite one man, and that is enough, who surrendered the moment he came into contact with British forces. His name was Jürgen Moltmann, and while in the POW camp, he came to Christ.

People who say that fighting against Hitler was justified miss this point. There were many under his regime who were not in agreement with him, and were forced onto the battlefield under conscription, who didn't have the courage of Moltmann, and fought for a cause that they didn't believe in, just because they were following orders. These are often the ones who are dying, and not the "evil dictators".

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/3/11 19:16

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
Ian... also, was it wrong for the Allies to fight against Nazi Germany? I challenge anyone to say that it was wrong. That we should have just let Hitler run amuck and done nothing.

Krispy

Krispy,

I'd say it was wrong for the Christians to fight. The early church didn't have a problem with the non-Christians fighting, they had a problem with the Christians killing even in war. They believed that it was their job to fight on their knees and when they did Rome wasn't in war, but when they started fighting with the sword Rome started to crumble.

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

Jordan

Re: The Death of a Christian Soldier - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/3/11 19:37

Saints, while reading this thread I was impressed to interject this account of the dying of Stonewall Jackson, an American Civil War Confederate General who was killed by friendly fire. Stonewall Jackson was a man of God, a man of deep prayer, and very much loved by his troops. He would often spend all night in the woods in fervent prayer, pacing among the trees, shouting to the Lord. It grieves me to hear brothers and sisters argue whether or not a Christian can or should be in the armed forces. I myself spent 10 years in the United States Army, and know that there are genuine God-fearing, Spirit-baptized men and women serving in uniform. E.M. Bounds was a Civil War chaplain, and Ira Sankey served also. Stonewall Jackson, though not very well known by a younger generation of Christians, is a unique man of God to study. He saw the Lord move over the troops, and there are many, *many* incredible war testimonies circa mid-1860's where God moved in opposite ranks to save both Union *and* Confederate brethren.

In any case, I hope you enjoy this eye-witness account on how General Stonewall Jackson died:

"In the full tide of his splendid career, just as he (General Stonewall Jackson) was completing what he regarded as the most successful military movement of his life - with high ambition and bright hopes for the future - he was shot down by the fire of his own men, who would gladly have yielded up their own lives to have saved their loved chieftain one single pang.

He bore his sufferings, and the amputation of his arm with the utmost Christian fortitude, saying repeatedly that he was perfectly resigned to God's will and would not, if he could, restore the arm, unless assured that it was his Heavenly Father's will.

When he seemed better and expected to recover, he spoke freely of being so near death when first wounded, and expecting fully to die before a surgeon could reach him, and said that he "gave himself up to the hands of his Heavenly Father, and was in the possession of perfect peace."

Rev. Dr. B. T. Lacy relates that, alluding to this period of expected death, he said: "It has been a precious experience to me that I was brought face to face with death, and found all was well. I then learned an important lesson: that one who has been the subject of converting grace and is the child of God can, in the midst of the severest sufferings, fix his thoughts upon God and heavenly things, and derive great comfort and peace; but that one who had never made his peace with God would be unable to control his mind, under such sufferings, so as to understand properly the way of salvation, and repent and believe on Christ. I felt that if I had neglected the salvation of my soul before, it would have been too late then."

He dictated a letter to General Robert E. Lee, in which he congratulated him on "the great victory which God has vouchsafed to your arms." But before this note was sent, the following came to him from General Lee, in response to a previous note which had been sent by Jackson :

"General: I have just received your note informing me that you were wounded. I cannot express my regret at the occurrence. Could I have directed events, I should have chosen, for the good of the country, to have been disabled in your stead. I congratulate you upon the victory which is due to your skill and energy.

Most truly yours,
R. E. LEE, General."

Jackson seemed deeply touched at the generous letter from his chief, but said, after a brief pause: "General Lee is very kind: but he should give the glory to God."

Afterwards, in talking about this great victory, he said: "Our movement yesterday was a great success; I think the most successful military movement of my life. But I expect to receive far more credit for it than I deserve. Most men will think I had planned it all from the first; but it was not so -- I simply took advantage of circumstances as they were presented to me in the Providence of God. I feel that His hand led me: let us give Him all the glory."

When he had been removed to the house of Mr. Chandler, near Guinea's Station, and had so far rallied as to feel confident of his recovery, he talked very freely on his favorite religious topics. Dr. Dabney says (in his admirable biography of Jackson, to which I am indebted for several incidents given above):

"He requested his chaplain to visit him at 10 o'clock each morning for reading the Scriptures and prayer. These seasons were the occasions of much religious conversation, in which he unbosomed himself with unusual freedom and candor. He declared that his faith and hope in his Redeemer were clear. He said he was perfectly willing to die at that time; *but believed that his time was not yet come, that his Heavenly Father still had a work for him to do in defense of his beloved country*, and that until that was completed he should be spared. During these morning hours he delighted to enlarge on his favorite topics of practical religion, which were such as these: *The Christian should carry his religion into everything. Christianity makes man better in any lawful calling; it equally makes the general a better commander, and the shoemaker a better mechanic.* In the case of the cobbler, or the tailor, for instance, religion will produce more care in promising work, more punctuality, and more fidelity in executing it, from conscientious motives; and these homely examples were fair illustrations of its value in more exalted functions. So prayer aids any man, in any lawful business, not only by bringing down the Divine blessing, which is its direct and prime object, but by harmonizing his own mind and heart. In the commander of an army at the critical hour it calmed his perplexities, moderated his anxieties, steadied the scales of judgment, and thus preserved him from exaggerated and rash conclusions. Again he urged that every act of man's life should be a religious act. He recited with much pleasure the ideas of Doddridge, where he pictured himself as spiritualizing every act of his

daily life; as thinking when he washed himself, of the cleansing blood of Calvary; as praying while he put on his garments, that he might be clothed with the righteousness of the saints; as endeavoring, while he was eating, to feed upon the Bread of heaven. General Jackson now also enforced his favorite dogma, that the Bible furnished men with rules for every thing. If they would search, he said, they would find a precept, an example, or a general principle, applicable to every possible emergency of duty, no matter what was a man's calling. There the military man might find guidance for every exigency. Then, turning to Lieutenant Smith, he asked him, smiling:

"Can you tell me where the Bible gives generals a model for their official reports of battles?"

Smith answered, laughing, that it never entered his mind to think of looking for such a thing in the Scriptures.

"Nevertheless," said the general, "there are such, and excellent models, too. Look, for instance, at the narrative of Joshua's battle with the Amalekites; there you have one. It has clearness, brevity, fairness, modesty; and it traces the victory to its right source, the blessing of God."

As he gradually grew worse, and his physicians and friends became alarmed about his condition, he was calm, resigned, even joyous, at the prospect.

Noticing the sadness of his loving wife, he said to her, tenderly: "I know you would gladly give your life for me, but I am perfectly resigned. Do not be sad. I hope I may yet recover. Pray for me, but always remember in your prayers to use the petition, 'Thy will be done.'"

When he saw the number of surgeons who were called in, he said to his medical director, Dr. Hunter McGuire: "I see from the number of physicians that you consider my condition dangerous, but I thank God that, if it is His will, I am ready to go."

When his wife informed him that the doctors thought his recovery very doubtful, he was silent for a moment, and then said: "It will be infinite gain to be translated to heaven." When later, on that beautiful Sabbath day, he was informed that he could scarcely live till night, he engaged for a moment in intense thought, and then replied: "Very good, very good; it is all right."

Dr. McGuire thus concludes a deeply interesting paper on the wounding and death of Jackson:

He tried to comfort his almost heart-broken wife, and told her he had a good deal to say to her, but he was too weak. Colonel Pendleton came into the room about 1 o'clock, and he asked him: "Who is preaching at headquarters to-day?" When told that the whole army was praying for him, he replied: "Thank God! They are very kind." He said, "It is the Lord's day; my wish is fulfilled. I have always desired to die on Sunday."

His mind now began to fail and wander, and he frequently talked as if in command upon the field, giving orders in his old way; then the scene shifted, and he was at the mess-table in conversation with members of his staff; now with his wife and child; now at prayers with his military family. Occasionally intervals of return of his mind would appear, and during one of them I offered him some brandy and water; but he declined it, saying: "It will only delay my departure and do no good; I want to preserve my mind, if possible, to the last."

About halfpast one he was told that he had but two hours to live, and he answered again feebly, but firmly: "Very good; it is all right."

A few moments before he died he cried out, in his delirium:

"Order A. P. Hill to prepare for action! Pass the infantry to the front rapidly! Tell Major Hawks --"

Then he stopped, leaving the sentence unfinished. Presently a smile of ineffable sweetness spread over his pale face, and he said quietly, and with an expression as if of relief, "Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the tree..." and then, without pain, or the least struggle, his spirit passed from earth to the God who gave it.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/3/11 19:40

I forgot to say that I'm very grateful for our troops and I'm glad they are protecting us. I just don't think that Christians should be killing others.

Jordan

Re: - posted by pastorfrin, on: 2007/3/11 22:28

Pilgrim wrote:

"Also, you cannot use the Bible to support your own personal rebellious nature. Yes, you heard that right. Examine yourself as to WHY you have these attitudes. You may be unpleasantly surprised to find out that you have unknowingly accepted the ideas of the world...and these ideas are based on leftover 60s rebellion (which is another topic all together)"

I am going to break my own rule here, may the Lord forgive me.

Pilgrim, I have a question for you, have you looked at any history that goes back farther than the 60s? You say you watched protest against the Vietnam war, well good for you. I left my blood there and many of my buddies lost their lives there. But history goes back much farther than the 1960s. May I suggest you study the writings of say the first, second, and third century.

Maybe this can help you get started.

Historical research on nonresistance is embodied in the monograph of Professor C. J. Cadoux of Oxford (The Early Christian Attitude to War, published by Headly Brothers, London, 1919; also in his later work, The Early Church and the World, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1925; compare Professor C. J. Heering of the University of Leiden, The Fall of Christianity, A Study of Christianity, The State and War, Allen & Unwin, London, 1930). The material relating to the early church, as well as to the Reformation era of the sixteenth century, is dealt with briefly by John Horsch in his two monographs (Die biblische Lehre von der Wehrlosigkeit, Scottdale, Pa., 1920, and The Principle of Nonresistance as Held by the Mennonite Church, Scottdale, Pa., Fourth Printing, 1951) and more comprehensively by Professor Guy F. Hershberger in two of his major books (War, Peace, and Nonresistance, Herald Press, Scottdale, Pa., Revised Edition, 1953; and The Way of the Cross in Human Relations, Herald Press, 1958).

It is a shallow answer to reply that the only reason the early Christians refused the military was that emperor worship was involved. Adolf Hamack, a most eminent authority on the history of the church, lists three major reasons beyond emperor worship for the nonparticipation of Christians in the military forces of the Roman Empire: (1) Christians absolutely renounced war and the shedding of human blood. (2) Military officers sometimes imposed death sentences, and soldiers were called upon to execute these sentences. (3) The soldier's oath of absolute obedience was offensive to Christians who felt that such obedience was owed to God alone. Harnack also mentions involvement with pagan cults, as well as the behavior of soldiers in times of peace. (See his book, Militia Christi, Tübingen, 1905. The later research of Cadoux went even beyond that of Harnack.)

Christian church is adequate and clear. One need here but consult the writings of Harnack, Cadoux, Heering, and Hershberger, where the evidence is summarized. Polycarp (c. A. D. 155) called the Philippians to obey the word of Peter, "not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, or blow for blow, or cursing for cursing." Justin Martyr, also writing in the middle of the second century, refers to the pre-conversion participation of Christians in warfare, but he testifies that "we . . . have . . . changed our warlike weapons, our swords into plowshares, and our spears into implements of tillage." About 180 Athenagoras reported: "We have learned not only not to return blow for blow, nor to go to law with those who plunder and rob us, but to those who smite us on the one side of the face to offer the other side also, and to those who take away our coat to give likewise our cloak." The very first evidence of a partial breakdown of nonresistance came in the year A.D. 174, when Tertullian issued a loud and bitter cry against the participation of certain Christians in army service. "Shall it be held lawful," demanded Tertullian, "to make an occupation of the sword when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? And shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law?" On the contrary, insisted Tertullian, if a soldier gets converted, he must immediately abandon the military (which he says many have done) or he must be ready to die as a martyr.

Celsus and Origen

In the latter part of the second century the pagan critic of Christianity, Celsus, was keenly aware of the nonresistance of the Christians, and he did not hesitate to point out to them their duty to fight for the king. Celsus stated that if everybody followed this ethic of nonresistance the empire would be ruined. In the next century, Origen, the learned church father,

attempted to reply to Celsus. It was about the middle of the third century when he admitted to Celsus, "We have come in accordance with the counsels of Jesus to cut down our warlike and arrogant swords of argument into plowshares, and we convert into sickles the spears we formerly used in fighting. For we no longer take sword against a nation, nor do we learn anymore to make war, having become sons of peace for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader." But what about the fear of Celsus that if everyone were nonresistant the empire would be ruined?

In the course of his exposition Origen also got around to that charge. Origen's only security was in God. It was God who delivered helpless Israel from the pursuing Egyptians at the Red Sea. The same God is still mighty to deliver any nation who would put its trust in Him. Far from being parasites on the empire, Christians make a tremendous contribution to it. "For the men of God are assuredly the salt of the earth; they preserve the order of the world; and society is held together as long as the salt is uncorrupted. . . . And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings, than those who go into the fields to fight for them. . . . We do not indeed fight under him, although he requires it; but we 'fight' on his behalf, forming a special 'army'-an army of piety-by offering our prayers to God. . . . Christians are benefactors of their country more than others. For they train up citizens, and inculcate piety to the Supreme Being; and they promote those whose lives in the smallest cities have been good and worthy, to a divine and heavenly city. . . . And it is not for the purpose of escaping public duties that Christians decline public offices, but that they may reserve themselves for a divine and more necessary service in the church of God-for the salvation of men."

Further Evidence

The godly and influential bishop, Cyprian, who died as a martyr in A.D. 258, commented rather bitterly that "if a murder is committed privately it is a crime, but if it happens with state authority, courage is the name for it.", Cyprian insisted that Christians "are not allowed to kill, but they must be ready to be put to death themselves." He held that "it is not permitted the guiltless to put even the guilty to death." Early in the fourth century, Lactantius of Bithynia, in commenting on the divine command, "Thou shalt not kill," insisted that it was not lawful for a just man to engage in warfare.

Therefore, with regard to this precept of God, there ought to be no exception at all. It is," he declared, "always unlawful to put a man to death." About the year 310 a writer named Arnobius implied that nonresistance had been the position of Christians from the beginning of the church. He added, "If all without exception . . . would lend an ear for a little to His salutary and peaceful rules . . . the whole world, having turned the use of steel into more peaceful occupations, would now be living in the most placid tranquillity, and would unite in blessed harmony, maintaining inviolate the sanctity of treaties."

In addition to the writings of various church fathers, we may also observe that a number of local church regulations-ancient church orders and canons -- officially forbade military service. The soldier, and the magistrate "with the sword," "let him leave off or be rejected." "Let a catechumen or a believer of the people, if he desires to be a soldier, either cease from his intention, or if not, let him be rejected." Actual cases of withdrawal or of refusal of induction are on record. Eusebius, the fourth-century historian, tells us, for example, of a youth of 21 from Numidia, Maximilian by name, who appeared before an African proconsul named Dion for induction into the army. Maximilian refused induction, however, stating simply, "I cannot serve, for I am a Christian." Dion replied sharply, "Get into the service, or it will cost you your life." Maximilian replied, "I do this age no war-service, but I do 'war-service' for my God." No amount of threatening could budge him from his simple confession, "I am a Christian and I cannot do evil. . . . I shall not perish, but when I have forsaken this world, my soul shall live, with Christ my Lord." The outcome was that on March 12, 295, this young "soldier" of Christ was put to death. Maximilian's father returned home, "giving thanks to God that he had been able to bring such a present to the Lord." Professor Cadoux reports that there were numerous cases like that of Maximilian, and ventures the suggestion that this may have contributed to the onset of the severe persecution which broke out in 303 and raged for a decade.

Fourth - Century About-Face

The climate of the church on the subject of peace and nonresistance changed extremely rapidly after the conversion of Constantine (312), and after he gave Christianity legal status in the empire (313). The amazing fact of Constantine being a Christian emperor and soldier caused the church to do a swift about-face. It is of course also true that from A.D. 174, there had been some soldiers in the Roman army who professed to be Christians. Yet as late as 374 Basil the Great still counseled that those who had killed in war should abstain from communion for three years, "for they were unclean of hand." On the other hand, incredible as it appears historically, the Council of Arles in 314 threatened nonresistants with excommunication! This action seems unbelievable! Harnack comments: "By this decision the church completely revised her attitude to the army and war, the attitude that had prevailed until now, at least in theory. The church had longed to win the emperor, and now flung herself into his arms. . . . She . . . relegated to the monastic orders her old views about war and the military calling." By the latter fourth century outstanding leaders were giving assent to the new position formulated at Arles. Athanasius (about 350) could write, "Murder is not permitted, but to kill one's adversary in war is both lawful and praiseworthy." And twenty-five years later, Ambrose could declare, "And that course which either protects the homeland against barbarians, in war, or defends the weak at home, or saves one's comrades from brigands, is full of righteousness."

s." It only remained for Augustine (354-430) fully and systematically to defend the right of Christians to participate in a just war.

Augustine lived in the age when the barbarian Goths took Rome, and later he was to see the Vandals penetrate even into North Africa. War, therefore, tended to become for him the struggle of a good state against malicious evildoers. He, therefore, held that "authority and power to wage war shall be in the hands of the ruler, and in carrying out war-decrees the soldiers really serve the cause of peace and the common good." Augustine could appeal to John the Baptist who recognized that soldiers were not murderous, but authorized by law, and that the soldiers did not thus avenge themselves, but defended the public safety." Augustine had to write a letter of counsel to a Roman commander named Boniface who contemplated laying down his command because he was a Christian. Augustine assured Boniface. "Do not think that no one can please God who serves with arms." He went on to state that it is indeed fine that some Christians withdraw from the world into the ascetic life, "yet everyone ... has his own gift from God. . . . Others, therefore, 'fight' against unseen foes by praying for you, and you work for them by fighting against the visible barbarians."

State Religion

As early as A.D. 380 the two emperors, Theodosius of the Eastern Empire, and Gratianus of the Western Empire, in a joint edict made Christianity the official and obligatory religion of state. The total reversal of attitude on nonresistance came in A.D. 416 when the empire required that all soldiers must be Christians. It, therefore, required only about a century for a remarkable change of climate—from the time when Constantine had nails purporting to come from the cross of Christ made into a helmet for himself, and into a bit for his horse, until the time when it was required of all soldiers that they be Christians. This reversal of attitude from primitive Christianity's nonresistance to a full-orbed acceptance of warfare was a major aspect of what Heering calls the "Fall" of Christianity.

Copyright © 1968 by Herald Press, Scottdale, Pa. 15688 Printed in the United States

From the booklet *Pacifism and Biblical Nonresistance*, by J. C. Wenger, © 1968 by Herald Press, Scottdale, Pa. 15688 Printed in the United States. All rights reserved.

<

You see your opinion and may I say it is your opinion fits right in there with the likes of Augustine and not at all with the teachings of Christ or the early Church. In your opinion the early Christians were committing sin by not following the command to be a soldier. I guess they should have been punished for their failure to obey the government. Oh that's right they were, they were martyred for obeying the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ. They loved not their lives unto death. If we would follow the teachings of Christ, which is confirmed by the faithfulness of the early Church this question would be settled once and for all. Instead we look at history following The Council of Nicea and we base our beliefs on the emotional feelings of God and country.

Hebrews 11:13-16

These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

May We All Be Led By The Love Of Jesus Christ Who Loves Us And Gave Himself For Us

pastorfrin

Re: "Killing on the battlefield is not a sin." - posted by Burn4Christ (), on: 2007/3/12 0:26

When I was in China in 2005, I remember how the missionaries there were testifying about the freedom they had to evangelize in muslim nations. How that they were so thankful of President Bush and America, because of the religious freedom. How in times past it was hard for them to enter into certain areas of Iraq and Afghanistan, but now they were training up missionaries left and right to mission to dominate Muslim Middle East. Teenagers and young adults being called of the Lord to the mission field, and willing to die for the cause of Christ. They would testify about the muslims giving their lives for Christ and also of persecution that they faced. I heard of pastors who no longer walked the streets of Iraq in fear of their lives, but now openly preach and minister the Word of God. I remember them proclaiming to us how thankful and grateful they were and how much they prayed for America. I think it's a shame and a disgrace that I here more support from the Chinese than I do from Americans. These are they who bear the marks of our Lord in their bodies, something we in America know nothing about. I wonder sometimes how many on here actually have a hearing of the Spirit of God and whether or not they are hearing and seeing what is taking shape in the Spirit. I question a lot of people's walk with God and wonder how spiritual it is.

In His Service

Christopher

Suffering: it was the way of the master, should not the servant tread it still (leonard ravenhill)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/12 0:46

Brother Christopher wrote:

Quote:

-----These are they who bear the marks of our Lord in their bodies,

These who bear the marks of our Lord...who was responsible for these marks?

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/12 1:00

Sister wrote:

Quote:

-----It so happens that our history is written by the victors — and their beliefs come through their writings: namely: unbelief in God and belief in nationhood. Is that not a form of brain washing, a tool of the devil?

I saw the movie Amazing Grace this night. At the very end, Charles Fox said something like this to Parliament...

Nepolean Bonaparte comes home in triumph through the wrath of war. When he has received his reward, all he has is the wrath of war to dream of. William Wilberforce on the other hand comes home to his wife at night with the peace that comes from sacrificing his life for the abolition of slavery.

Wilberforce trusted in God...that is the difference. Peace is the fruit.

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by MikeH, on: 2007/3/12 6:26

I am not posting this in reply to any particular point, but just some thoughts to think about. This post will probably get me into serious trouble, but it is interesting to see why both Hamas in Palestine and Hezbollah in Southern Lebanon have gained so much support. Primarily, because they provide social and health services to the population that either is not available from the legitimate government or slow in being provided. I have often wonder what would have happened if the USA had spent the \$500bn or so direct cost of the Iraqi war on something different than military hardware, soldiers and security personnel. I guess one can build a decent hospital for \$100m, so if the USA had built 500 of them across the middle east over the last few years, I wonder where their reputation would be now? While there might be a lot of overt criticism, the people that count, ie the people that vote locally, would be grateful that their children, wives, father, mothers etc could get some decent treatment. Sure some of the money would get wasted, but I guess every time a cruise missile is used that's \$1m spent and something else destroyed. Now the hospitals could be equipped with American equipment so the money would have still flowed back to the American economy, though it would also have helped the local economy with the need for staff and servicing. Of course Haliburton and KBR could have been used for the construction projects, so Cheney's old colleagues would have been happy. Oh, and by the way, that has only used up \$50bn, there would still be another \$450bn left if one wanted to spend that.

The problems with the idea; well it wouldn't sit well at home if the Middle East had free healthcare and people at home don't, and besides it would just be a waste of money, wouldn't it? Bush probably wouldn't have got a second term, if he hadn't been impeached for insanity before the end of his first term. The verses shortly after the ones about turning the other cheek, are:

You have heard that it was said, 'Love your friends, hate your enemies.' But now I tell you: love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, (Matthew 5:43-44)"

By the way if you are tempted to correct me about Hamas and Hezbollah, remember the Lord also said, "And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." (Luke 16:8). But to set your mind at rest, I do not support either Hamas or Hezbollah, nor would I wish to encourage support for them (which would probably make me a criminal in some places), but they are very wise.

On a related topic, I have no great skills as a historian, but I have thought a bit about WWII. I wondered if the Allied had not fought Hitler, what the outcome would have been. The death toll from the war is about 50m Allies dead and 12m Axis dead a total of 62m. So the winners paid a greater cost in terms of human life than for the losers. Now Hitler would have probably overrun most of Europe including the UK and the European part of the USSR. I am not sure how far the Japanese would have gone, and they may not even have expanded their territorial adventure from what they already had, if didn't need to distract the Allied Powers. So what would have happened, some deaths from the invasions, but probably fairly few. However, the holocaust might have gotten worse, and while the Jews were the main target, the infirm, both mentally and physically, and other minorities were also targets of its activities. I think a typical estimate of deaths from the holocaust are 6m, and even if it got to double that the number of deaths would still be only 20% of the deaths due to war. Even Stalin with all his purges etc is now only estimated to have killed between 10m and 20m during his reign. Mao Zedong seemed to have managed to kill between 20m and 30m of his citizens, but again half of the death toll of WWII. It is interesting to consider how long Hitler would have been allowed by the Lord to reign for, and whether the atrocities would have naturally come to end. The collapse of the Iron Curtain without bloodshed is a case in point. Both Stalin and Mao eventually died, and even they, together, had not equalled the number of dead in WWII.

A controversial view, I know, but some food for thought I hope.

Mike

Re: - posted by blinx (), on: 2007/3/12 9:26

"Oh he was a good christian man. He liked to spend time with his family, reading the bible and killing iraqis."

Re: - posted by BudTexas, on: 2007/3/13 22:23

The Lord had me go to Iraq as a convoy truck driver for KBR.

October, 2004 to April, 2006.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/14 2:12

Brother Mike wrote:

Quote:
-----On a related topic, I have no great skills as a historian, but I have thought a bit about WWII. I wondered if the Allied had not fought Hitler, what the outcome would have been.

Up until the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, men like Henry Ford and A.P. Sloan were busy drawing up business plans on how they would interact with a Hitler and his European empire. Many prominent U.S. Business leaders of that day actually supported Hitler's rise.

American banking institutions had established backdoor enterprises with Hitler's government. President Bush's grandfather also continued to promote business deals even after the U.S. government prohibited such dealings.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/14 2:21

This is a quote from the book, Back To Jerusalem, written by Paul Hattaway.

Brother Yun is quoted as saying...

"The past fifty years of suffering, persecution, and torture of the house churches in China were all part of God's training for us. He has used the government for his own purposes, molding and shaping his children as He sees fit. That is why I correct Western Christians who tell me; "I've been praying for years that the Communist government in China will collapse, so Christians can live in freedom." This is not what we pray! We never pray against our government or call down curses on it. Instead, we have learned that God is in control of both our lives and the government we live under. Isaiah prophesied about Jesus, "the government will be on his shoulders" (Isa. 9:6). Instead of focusing our prayers against any political system, we pray that regardless of what happens to us, we will be pleasing to God.

Don't pray for the persecution to stop! We shouldn't pray for a lighter load to carry, but a stronger back to endure! Then the world will see that God is with us, empowering us to live in a way that reflects his love and power.

This is true freedom!"

The ways of Christ truly turn the wisdom of this world upside down.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by SteveHale (), on: 2007/3/15 5:20

I think people are getting murder and kill mixed up. We are commanded not to MURDER not kill.

The scriptures that come to mind is Luke 3:14 (Then some soldiers asked him, " And what should we do?" He replied, " Don't extort money and don't accuse people falsely-be content with your pay."

Notice John didn't tell the soldiers to lay down their swords or find another job.

Also in Matthew 8, Jesus meets the Centurion. A lot of people forget that a Centurion is a leader in the Army. Yet Jesus said to those following him that he had not found anyone in Israel with such faith.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/15 6:27

KJV Luke 3:

14 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.

ASV Luke 3:

Luke 3:14 And soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do? And he said unto them, Extort from no man by violence, neither accuse any one wrongfully; and be content with your wages.

WEB Luke 3:

Luke 3:14 ¶ Soldiers also asked him, saying, "What about us? What must we do?" ¶ He said to them, "Extort from no one by violence, neither accuse anyone wrongfully. Be content with your wages."

Drby Luke 3:

Luke 3:14 And persons engaged in military service also asked him saying, And we, what should we do? And he said to them, Oppress no one, nor accuse falsely, and be satisfied with your pay.

Yng Luke 3:

Luke 3:14 And questioning him also were those warring, saying, 'And we, what shall we do?' and he said unto them, 'Do violence to no one, nor accuse falsely, and be content with your wages.'

In these verses John the Baptist commands that the soldiers do no violence, oppress no one, extort from no one by violence, do violence to no man...

What does it mean to do no violence?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/15 8:09

Quote:

-----The soldier's oath of absolute obedience was offensive to Christians who felt that such obedience was owed to God alone-----

It is a heart issue: "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's." And that, I believe is where we draw the two-edged sword of the word: between "soul spirit, joints and marrow"... the thoughts and attitudes of the heart." In other words the word draws the dividing line in the heart - at the point of loyalty and trust.

From reading the books of EM Bounds, I get the impression that his loyalty is to the Lord. He gave himself for the Lord in his work through his military connection, as chaplain. He had set his heart and mind on things above, and wanted to see souls saved for the eternal kingdom, not merely his earthly kingdom. He went where there were precious people who needed the Lord, and who needed encouragement - to THEIR turf.

If I would say that God called me one day to a Freemason banquet to provide music for their program, some of you would object, and say, "God would never call you there. Why, Freemasonry is evil!" But, that is where the people are who need the Lord! And should that not be the reason any follower of Christ becomes involved in any institution in this world: because there are precious souls there who need to see the salt and light?

Here's another thought:

The fact that any nation believes that it must resort to the strength of its own might is to me, a measurement of its spiritual temperature: it has turned aside the better offer of God.

It is not a case of uniform or not. After all, there is no virtue in pacifism, in itself. (As Krispy has pointed out.) That could very well merely be a copout - void of love for fellow humankind - a smug attitude. But that attitude cannot be attributed to all believers who, in a godly conscience, believe that God has called THEM into a different battle - perhaps one fought on their knees, or one fought on the home front - with faith and the sword of the Spirit.

We're in big trouble when we can only recognize one battle going in our society.

Diane

Re: Lest we forget: the real heroes! - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/15 8:29

From the net:

Rees Howells dedicated his life to be an example to all, of what can be achieved by prayer and faith alone. He taught that it is safe to trust God's Word and His promises.

During the World War Two, Rees Howells led his Bible College in intercession to see the breaking of the dictators that would hinder the work of world evangelism. They laid down their lives in intercession, just like the young men who were on the front lines of battle. Rees Howells challenged them to be living martyrs.

They prayed through the situations in Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, D-Day, and the involvement of Russia in the war and for many other situations including for the establishment of the State of Israel. The story is told in the worldwide best selling book, "Rees Howells Intercessor", by Norman Grubb, published by Lutterworth Press.

Diane

Re: Lest we forget the real heroes - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/15 8:34

also from the web:

World War II was also the setting for some of the most dramatic accounts of intercession in the twentieth century. Rees Howells founded the Bible College of Wales and during the critical days of the war, intercessors there cried out to Heaven for divine intervention. Some of their most fervent and desperate prayers came during the Battle of Britain. The German Luftwaffe pounded England in preparation for a German invasion. Outmanned and outgunned, the plucky Royal Air Force stood between the British Isle and the German onslaught. Yet as the British Spitfires went up in the air to face a foe of far superior numbers, it seemed as if an unseen hand shifted the outcome of the battle. Here's the conclusion of the battle as described in Rees Howells: Intercessor.

Mr. Churchill, in his War Memoirs, gives September 15 (1940) as 'the culminating date' in that Battle of the Air. He tells how he visited the Operations Room of the Air. He tells how he visited the Operations Room of the R.A.F. that day and watched as the enemy squadrons poured over and ours went up to meet them, until the moment came when he asked the Air Marshal, 'What other reserves have we?' 'There are none,' he answered, and reported afterwards how grave Mr. Churchill looked, 'and well I might,' added Churchill. Then another five minutes passed, and 'it appeared the enemy were going home. The shifting of the discs on the table showed a continuous eastward movement of German bombers and fighters. No new attack appeared. In another ten minutes the action was ended.' There seemed no reason why the Luftwaffe should have turned for home, just at the moment when victory was in their grasp. But we know why.

After the war, Air Chief Marshal Lord Dowding, Commander-in-Chief of Fighter Command in the Battle of Britain, made this significant comment: 'Even during the battle one realized from day to day how much external support was coming in. At the end of the battle one had the sort of feeling that there had been some special Divine intervention to alter some sequence of events which would otherwise have occurred.'

Do you believe this?

Why might the history books have left this out?

Who won the war?

Diane

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2007/3/15 8:43

Quote:

SteveHale wrote:

Also in Matthew 8, Jesus meets the Centurion. A lot of people forget that a Centurion is a leader in the Army. Yet Jesus said to those following him that he had not found anyone in Israel with such faith.

Is it possible that Jesus was emphasizing a greater point here? Consider how the illustration of faith being comprehended

d by a soldiers understanding of subordination to superiors would have broken down had he contented against the soldier's violence. After all, his violence was mostly the result of obeying orders.

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/15 10:46

Krispy said:

Quote:

-----Tell ya what... why dont we all lay down our arms and do nothing to prevent evil in this world. Lets see how long we last.

It's real easy for people to say we should be pacifists when we have never really had to face an enemy on our own soil. We've never had someone break into our homes and threaten our families.

It's all talk.

Ok, so this is going back to the beginning of this thread, but i just had a question about this and would appreciate some input.

My Great, Great Grandparents came to Canada from Russia. They were German Mennonites as were their parents for at least five generations previous. They came to Russia from Germany and Prussia, escaping the persecution of the Anabaptists in the 1700's. Around the 1860's the Russians began to persecute the Mennonites because of their religious beliefs, especially their stance on pacifism.

Krispy, They did break into their homes, they did threaten their families, they came into their homes and took the fathers and sons away during the night, never to be heard from again. Many were taken to Siberia, to the labor camps, they were overworked and underfed, dieing away from everyone they loved. The Russians went through the Mennonite communities raping the mothers and young women, they stole, and they killed.

My great great grandparents were some of the fortunate and were able to escape, only to make a dangerous journey across Europe, during which many people died, some were stopped and arrested before they ever got out.

Now my question is, was that all for nothing?

I won't take it personally if you think that they laid down their lives for a worthless cause.

Should they have taken up arms?

during WW1 and WW2 many Mennonites were sent to labor camps because they couldn't fight with a clear conscience. Was that wise?

What should they have done?

Will someone please comment.

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/3/15 20:28

Quote:

vico wrote:

Krispy said:

Quote:

-----Tell ya what... why dont we all lay down our arms and do nothing to prevent evil in this world. Lets see how long we last.

It's real easy for people to say we should be pacifists when we have never really had to face an enemy on our own soil. We've never had someone break into our homes and threaten our families.

It's all talk.

Ok, so this is going back to the beginning of this thread, but i just had a question about this and would appreciate some input.

My Great, Great Grandparents came to Canada from Russia. They were German Mennonites as were their parents for at least five generations previous. They came to Russia from Germany and Prussia, escaping the persecution of the Anabaptists in the 1700's. Around the 1860's the Russians began to persecute the Mennonites because of their religious beliefs, especially their stance on pacifism.

Krispy, They did break into their homes, they did threaten their families, they came into their homes and took the fathers and sons away during the night, never to be heard from again. Many were taken to Siberia, to the labor camps, they were overworked and underfed, dying away from everyone they loved. The Russians went through the Mennonite communities raping the mothers and young women, they stole, and they killed.

My great great grandparents were some of the fortunate and were able to escape, only to make a dangerous journey across Europe, during which many people died, some were stopped and arrested before they ever got out.

Now my question is, was that all for nothing?

I won't take it personally if you think that they laid down their lives for a worthless cause.

Should they have taken up arms?

during WW1 and WW2 many Mennonites were sent to labor camps because they couldn't fight with a clear conscience. Was that wise?

What should they have done?

Will someone please comment.

Vico,

They did what was right. The early Christians had to do what your family members did. It wasn't a waste, they were obeying Christ.

Jordan

Re: what if you are on the weaker side - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/3/15 22:34

Quote:
----- It's real easy for people to say we should be pacifists when we have never really had to face an enemy on our own soil. We've never had someone break into our homes and threaten our families

Actually, for the vast majority in the world who are being oppressed in this manner, the sword does them no good. Their tormenters are far too powerful. In fact, their sword will merely incite the wrath of their oppressor. That's what the Jews discovered in 70 AD when they tried to liberate themselves from the Romans using the sword. Not a good idea. God had a better idea: submit to the Romans, and join another kingdom: the Kingdom of God.

My parents and grandparents sure knew about having the enemy walk into their homes, take their valuables, their furniture, their food, shoot whomever they want. For them, during Nazi occupation in Holland, their sword was useless. So what could they do?

Those relatives of mine who had true faith, moved ahead, and did a lot of rescuing and hiding: shot down Canadian pilots, Jews, etc, They had to find food for them, ration tickets, clothes, etc. The ones who did not have faith were ineffective, to say the least. For them, terror, was their constant experience.

The sword can't even be considered unless one is sure of winning. You first have to make sure you have enough allies, or you are more powerful than your enemy (at least you believe so).

Admit it, when you are the most powerful nation in the world, your sword sounds reasonable. But it is not that way for most of the world.

Diane

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/15 23:08

I sense the tide is shifting...

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/3/16 12:19

Don't get me wrong, my family did not suffer in Russia exactly like the early Christians did. Their pacifistic beliefs were the religious beliefs they were persecuted for. Some may say that that is not exactly suffering for Christ's sake. But that is the way that they see it. They simply believed that taking up arms is against the teachings of Jesus, so they refused when the law required that that all eligible aged men join the army.

Did they suffer for Christ's sake? or did they suffer because they were misled and mistaken?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/3/16 21:23

Quote:

-----Did they suffer for Christ's sake? or did they suffer because they were misled and mistaken?

Was Christ glorified? Did the world see something that it feared?

In Christ
Jeff

Re:, on: 2007/3/26 16:51

These things may have been said already but this is a long thread and no real time to read it all. Just a few thoughts the n:

1. "Thou shalt not kill" actually means don't do murder. Nothing to do with killing someone in a war.
2. In the Old Testament taking vengeance for murder was the duty of the next of kin, if able. In the case of manslaughter, where someone was killed by accident, the killer could flee to the nearest city of refuge, so that the "avenger of blood" (Hebrew goel) shouldn't be able to kill him, as he hadn't meant any harm.

An example is in 2Samuel 2:18 to 3:33. In time of civil war, Asahel the brother of Joab, David's general, was killed by Abner, the enemy general.

Afterwards David made peace with Abner. But Joab killed Abner in revenge for the death of his brother.

Abner didn't want to kill Asahel, who was running after him to try and kill him, and told him to chase someone else. But Asahel was a very fast runner and wouldn't stop coming after Abner, so Abner had no choice but to kill him.

War is horrible, but it's often a case of kill or be killed, and there was no bloodguilt, or duty of revenge for a soldier who was killed in battle.

But Joab murdered Abner in peacetime, and by stealth. He justified it by thinking it was his duty as the "goel", but it was not.

I'm not sure how that principle applies today, but there is a difference between a war and a peace situation. Killing someone in battle is not the same as murder.

jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/3/26 17:49

It is a symplification, but then that is why He came, to make things simpler in a complicated and corrupt world: Jesus was a pacifist.

Bub