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INTRODUCTION

The war which was to end war has left the world with more fighting and more expenditures for armaments than before it started. The Assembly of the League of Nations is unable to adopt even the slightest practical step in disarmament. Naval authorities now tell us that the submarine is essential and military authorities proclaim that poison gas is humane. New and more deadly conflicts have swung within our horizon. That this nation may become involved in war in any one of three different directions is more of a possibility than it was in 1914. Yet the one American social worker who has assessed the human costs of the recent struggle soberly declares, after he has footed the totals, that war is the negation of civilization.

What then is to be the Christian teaching concerning war? Is it going to declare judgment on the basis of the principles set forth in the gospels or will it be only the expedient servant of nationalism and continue to exhort its followers to internecine slaughter? Is the American pulpit going to continue denouncing war in general and supporting wars in particular? This question must be fairly faced and answered, one way or the other. And time presses. Mr. Page has faced the issue and has found an answer that satisfies his soul. What he has written therefore deserves the thoughtful consideration of all those whose duty it is to teach the people concerning the moral and spiritual validity of modern war.

HARRY F. WARD,
Professor of Christian Ethics,
Union Theological Seminary
New York City.
PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

The Washington Conference is just drawing to a close as this preface is being written. It has been a great success or a tragic failure, depending upon the angle from which it is viewed. All Christian people should be profoundly grateful for its achievements. Just at the moment, however, it seems more important to think clearly as to the causes of its failures. Newspaper correspondents are generally agreed that France and Japan are chiefly at fault. Some are inclined to blame Great Britain. It is rarely intimated that the delegates and people of the United States are responsible for the tragic ineffectiveness of the Conference, and still less is there a tendency to attribute responsibility for its failures to the churches.

The real cause of the failures at Washington is to be found not so much in the nationalistic and imperialistic policies of the French, Japanese or British governments as in the attitudes of the peoples of the earth, and especially in the attitudes of members of the different churches. The delegates at Washington have not dared to mention one of the most fundamental issues of all, namely, the immediate outlawing of war itself. They have been limited by public sentiment in the various countries. Public opinion is not yet ready to place the ban on war. This is not surprising when it is remembered that only recently the churches in all of the nations were used as recruiting stations and conscientious objectors were imprisoned for remaining loyal to their conviction that participation in war involves a fundamental violation of the principles and spirit of Jesus. For a thousand years the churches have given their blessing and cooperation to the wars of the respective countries.

Just as the time came in the course of human history when the churches withdrew their sanction from the torture of heretics, the fighting of duels and the holding of slaves, the time will surely come when Christian people will withdraw their sanction from war. How much longer must we wait? How many more millions of our young men must be slaughtered before we reach the conviction that, as a weapon of justice and democracy, war is a ghastly
failure and an absolute denial of the spirit and teaching of Jesus? If the churches are not willing to outlaw war, how can we expect statesmen to do so? Well did General Bliss say: “If another war like the last one should come, the professing Christians will be responsible for every drop of blood that will be shed.”

Is not this the time for individuals and churches to act? If we wait until another war is imminent, will not prejudice and passion be so fanned by propaganda that we will be unable to think clearly or act wisely? Should not every follower of Jesus go on record now as refusing absolutely to sanction or participate in any war between nations?

To the end that the utmost light may be obtained concerning the ethics of war and violence, there should be the widest possible discussion of this vital theme in the religious press, in the pulpit, in the classroom, and in the private conversations of Christian people. The hope of the present writer is that the following chapters may, in some small way, stimulate discussion of this important subject. He admits freely that it is possible he may be mistaken in some of his conclusions. The convictions herein recorded are, however, the result of several years continuous thought and study and represent an almost complete reversal of opinions held prior to his experience overseas.

This volume is reprinted in the Christianity and Industry Series because the fundamental principles of Jesus’ way of life apply equally to war between nations and war between classes.

Kirby Page.

February 1, 1922.
811 Division Avenue,
Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.
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THE SWORD OR THE CROSS
Since August, 1914, countless speeches have been made and
millions of pages written on the subject of war. Throughout the
whole of this discussion there has been a tendency to emphasize
the facts on one side and to ignore or suppress the facts on the
other side. While the war lasted this attitude was quite natural
and almost inevitable. Morale depended upon it.

In the Allied countries the emphasis was: This is the war to
destroy autocracy, to make the world safe for democracy, to restore
the sanctity of treaties, to redeem Belgium, to right ancient wrongs,
to save civilization; words are inadequate to describe the wond-
erful spirit of our fighting men, their courage, their endurance, their
devotion, their cheerfulness, their unselfishness, their willingness
to make the supreme sacrifice.

Little was said about the other side of war. Vigilant censors
saw to it that no emphasis was placed here. Letters were delivered
with paragraphs deleted, objectionable newspapers and periodicals
were suppressed, books were confiscated, speakers were warned,
silenced or imprisoned. Morale had to be sustained.

By the time the armistice was signed and the censorship relaxed,
people were tired of war news of any sort. The prevalent attitude
has been: Now that the war is over, let us forget about it as soon
as we can. Newspapers and periodicals sensed the situation and
printed less and less war news.

The homecoming of the victorious troops increased this emphasis
of one side of war. Triumphal arches were erected. Mobs lined
the boulevards and cheered themselves speechless as the scarred
veterans marched by. The glory of war was at its height. Vet-
erans home from the front, in their public addresses and private
conversations, very naturally placed chief emphasis upon the nobler
phases of the war. They hesitated to say much about the other
side of war. The War Department and defense societies have
continued their propaganda to emphasize one side of war. They
have said little about the other side.
A noticeable result of this one-sided emphasis is to be observed in the present attitude of children and young people toward war. In the minds of the youth of this country there is no horror of war. War to them is grand and glorious. They incorporate it into their games. They revel in it.

Sufficient emphasis has not been placed upon the other side of war. There is another side to war. And what is the other side? Ask the man who knows—the man who went over the top, the machine gunner, the heavy artillery-man, the bombing pilot, the spy, the diplomat, the surgeon, the nurse, the chaplain. Now that the war is over these persons who know the other side from personal experience should tell the whole story. The present writer can only pass on certain impressions that came to him during the experience of eight months overseas.

II

The true story of the other side of war will include an emphasis upon the following:

The immediate objective in battle is to kill and destroy. The weapons of war are bayonets, machine guns, siege guns, poison gas, boiling oil, bombing planes, battleships, submarines, blockades.

Certain of these weapons are so new that their use is questioned by some of the more timid folk. War Departments, however, with more discernment, have seen that there are no essential differences among them.

Since the objective in war is to kill and destroy, why quibble over the mere detail as to whether a man is to be suffocated by asphyxiation or by drowning? What difference does it make to the victim whether he is bayonetted or boiled? Wherein is drowning less painful because the boat was sunk by a battleship rather than by a submarine? Do little children die a more horrible death from a Zeppelin’s bomb than from starvation as a result of a blockade?

The War Departments, at least, have faced the facts. No faint-heartedness has prevented them from making use of any available weapon of destruction. If poison gas and boiling oil are more efficacious at times than bayonets and grenades, use them. What difference does it make to the victim?

Let us take a closer look at these weapons.

Bayonets have long been recognized as a standard weapon of

1 When this was written the realistic portrayal of war by Will Irwin, Philip Gibbs and Frederick Palmer had not appeared.
warfare. The purpose of a bayonet is to kill or cripple. Sometimes
the victim is plunged through the abdomen and his bowels come
gushing out; sometimes it is his lung or his heart that is punctu-
tured; it may be his eye that is gouged out; or perhaps he is only
stunned and falls unconscious to the earth, to be trampled to death
under the avalanche of oncoming feet.

Machine guns and siege guns are likewise old and highly honored
weapons. Their purpose is to kill, cripple or destroy. Machine
guns are most effective when the enemy attacks in mass forma-
tion. Under favorable circumstances a machine gun crew may
kill or cripple several hundred men a minute. Siege guns have
a range up to seventy miles. At this distance, or even at five miles,
the gunners cannot be accurate. They are just as likely to hit a
cathedral as an arsenal, a hospital as a barracks, a school house as
a railway station. Siege guns are also effective in terrifying the
inhabitants.

Boiling oil and poison gas are new weapons, but soon after their
introduction by Germany, they were in general use by the Allies.
Thousands of the enemy may be asphyxiated in a few moments.
Sometimes the victim dies immediately; in other cases, he is blind-
ed for life.

The possibilities of the use of boiling oil are less extensive, but
under certain conditions it is a highly successful instrument.
Let an eyewitness describe its effects: “The enemy in dense
formation, believing themselves safe, gave battle as was expected.
Then there occurred the very event which was anticipated. Over
one thousand gallons of boiling oil burst forth from special en-
gines and enclosed in its circle of fire the wily and terrified Ger-
mans. Yells of despair rose for a moment from the sunken road,
but the barrage fire redoubling made all action impossible. A
deadly silence soon fell upon the heap of carbonized humanity,
coupled with an odor of roasted flesh which marked the German
charnel house.”

III

Air raids over cities removed from the fighting front are now
a regular feature of warfare. Terrible destruction is wrought;
men, women and children are slaughtered indiscriminately. The
present writer has witnessed at close range many such raids over
London and Folkestone. It is hellish business!
The blockade has long been an important feature of warfare.
Its advantages are that it not only deprives the enemy of muni-
tions of warfare, it weakens the whole population by lack of proper food. If continued sufficiently long it may cause the death of thousands through malnutrition and starvation. It reaches the whole population. In the recent war more people were starved to death through the blockade than were drowned by all the submarines or blown to pieces in all of the air raids. The blockade is also effective in that it leaves a permanent mark on the enemy, through vast numbers of emaciated, anemic and tubercular children and young people.

Before our moral and intellectual faculties were benumbed by the vast losses of the recent war, we were unanimous in denouncing air raids over defenseless cities and unrestricted submarine warfare as terrible atrocities. Our first judgment was sound. They are atrocities. And so are the other acts of warfare. War itself is the mother atrocity. These individual acts are only the natural offspring of a prolific parent.

That the end justifies the means is the fundamental philosophy of war. No sane man denies the horrors and brutalities of war. Plunging a bayonet of steel into quivering human flesh, mowing men down with a machine gun as wheat before a scythe, blinding men with gas, boiling men with oil, mangling women and children with bombs, drowning the helpless, starving the innocent, these are everywhere recognized as unspeakably horrible.

And yet they are an essential part of war. Men abhor these practices. They sanction and participate in them because the end justifies the means. The law of military necessity holds sway. Do whatever is necessary in order to win.

Obedience to superiors is the cornerstone of military efficiency. The soldier is not free to make choices in the light of his own moral judgment; his primary duty is to execute the decisions of his superiors. He cannot question the judgment of his superior officers, nor can he follow his own conscience with regard to any practice. Compunctions of conscience must not be allowed to interfere with the most explicit obedience of orders. The command given may involve the use of poison gas, the sinking of the Lusitania, the bombing of London or Cologne, or the shooting down of relatives upon the streets of Dublin. The military authorities are the sole judges as to the morality of these acts; the soldier simply executes their decision.

When a soldier does that which he is commanded to do, in direct opposition to his own moral judgment, he surrenders his moral freedom. This surrender is necessary to success in war.

No one doubts that war makes human life very cheap. But, as Fosdick points out, there is a great difference between physical
life and personality. The charge against war is that it tends to destroy the value of both physical life and personality.

A soldier not only loses his individuality, he is lost sight of as a person. He becomes a mere cog in the great war machine. When the General Staff calmly vote to spend a quarter or a half million lives in order to capture a given point, they do so because they do not look upon their soldiers as persons. Soldiers are pawns to be moved about or sacrificed at the option of the commander.

This fact is brought out in a letter from an officer, which Fosdick quotes: "An enemy mine exploded here a few days ago and buried our brigade. Many of the men were killed, but some were not much hurt, so we dug them out and used them over again." Fosdick then remarks, "Sons of God and brothers of Jesus Christ—'dug them out and used them over again!' That is war."

Not only does the soldier become a mere cog in the war machine, he in turn loses the sense of the value of the enemy's personality. Coningsby Dawson, who writes of the war from a high moral and spiritual viewpoint, bears eloquent testimony at this point: "It seems brutal to say it, but taking potshots at the enemy when they present themselves is rather fun. When you watch them scattering like ants before the shell whose direction you have ordered, you somehow forget to think of them as individuals."

When a man fires fifty thousand rounds from a heavy gun into the ranks of the enemy, as was the case with one man of whom the present writer knew, he ceases to regard Germans as persons; they become mere targets.

How can a man keep his reverence for personality in the midst of such a scene as this? "Every weapon for the slaughter of men, from the heaviest of high explosives to boiling oil and gas shells, was let loose upon them in one great tempest of destruction, which blew them out of the earth, and frizzled them, and blinded them, and choked them."

To round out the picture, we quote the words of a young officer: "It is hideously exasperating to hear people talking the glib commonplaces about the war and distributing cheap sympathy to its victims. Perhaps you are tempted to give them a picture of a leprous earth, scattered with the swollen and blackening corpses of hundreds of young men. The appalling stench of rotting car- rion, mingled with the sickening smell of exploded lyddite and ammonal. Mud like porridge, trenches like shallow and sloping
cracks in the porridge—porridge that stinks in the sun. Swarms of flies and blue-bottles clustering on pits of offal. Wounded men lying in the shell holes among the decaying corpses, helpless under the scorching sun and bitter nights, under repeated shelling. Men with bowels dropping out, lungs shot away, with blinded, smashed faces, or limbs blown into space. Men screaming and gibbering. Wounded men hanging in agony on the barbed wire, until a friendly spout of liquid fire shrivels them up like a fly in the candle."

This is the other side of war.
This is not what some may think war ought to be. This is what war actually is. In the recent war, as in all others, the charge was made that the enemy waged inhuman and uncivilized warfare. The humanization and civilization of war! One might as well speak of the virtue of vice, the tenderness of atrocity, the reverence of sacrilege, the innocence of guilt, the truth of falsehood, the freedom of slavery!

"O war," exclaims Harry Emerson Fosdick, "I hate you most of all because you lay your hands upon the finest qualities in human life, qualities that rightly used would make a heaven on earth, and you use them to make a hell on earth instead. You take our spirit of courage and devotion, and instead of letting it be a benediction in the world, you use it to burn cities and sack cathedrals and slay men. You take our loyalty that well used would redeem the world, and you harness it to a movement that inevitably means the rape of women, the murder of children, and the starvation of whole populations. You take our religion, and to help your deadly work you rend our God in pieces and make of him a score of tribal deities to whom men pray, as old barbarians, before our Lord had come, prayed to their idols as the gods of war. You take our science, the fruit of our dedicated intelligence, and you make even of that an effective minister of hate. This is the deepest charge against you, that you take our noblest powers and prostitute them to destructive ends."
II: IS THE JUDGEMENT OF THE MAJORITY INFAILLIBLE?

I

Eight years ago it was generally supposed that the church was opposed to war. It was—in theory. It remained so, until Kaiser and Czar, King and President, made declarations of war and mobilized their fighting men. Then it did what it has consistently done for a thousand years. It threw itself unreservedly into the struggle on the side of the nation in which it was operating.

Protestants in Germany were loyal to Kaiser and Fatherland, Protestants in England were loyal to King and Empire, Roman Catholics in Austria willingly gave possessions and life for country, Roman Catholics in France counted no sacrifice too great to make for the homeland.

As a noted English divine points out: “On the eve of the greatest European war, organized Christianity lifted hardly a finger to avert it. On the outbreak of it, it was at once ready to assure every country concerned that its participation in it was right. War in general may be wrong, perhaps; but this particular war, so long as it lasts, is always right and always equally so for both sides.”

It is no less an authority than Lecky who reminds us: “In looking back with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that not only has ecclesiastical influence had no appreciable influence in diminishing the number of wars, but that it has actually and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine, in which the clergy as a whole, as a body, exerted themselves to repress the military spirit or to prevent or abridge a particular war... With the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries.”

In similar tone is the testimony of Westermarck: “As a matter of fact, it would be impossible to find a single instance of a war waged by a Protestant country, from any motive, to which the bulk of its clergy have not given their sanction and support. The
opposition has generally come from other quarters. The orthodox are still of the same opinion as Sir James Turner, who declared that "those who condemn the profession or art of soldiery, smell rank of Anabaptism or Quakery"; and war is in our days, as it was in those of Erasmus, so much sanctioned by authority and custom that it is deemed impious to bear testimony against it."

Thus we find a good precedent for the bitter persecution and imprisonment of men, who, on grounds of religion and conscience, refused to participate in the Great World War.

With a unanimity rarely equaled on any subject, the members of the various branches of the church in all lands and in all centuries since the days of Constantine, have sanctioned and participated in war. This is the fact. The query we desire to raise is this: Can it be that the church has been wrong in holding this attitude toward war?

Almost instinctively we are inclined to answer in the negative. Surely the vast majority of Christian people, including the most learned and the most devout, cannot be mistaken on so vital a moral issue. This seems to be almost inconceivable.

It may be of help to us in considering this question if we review briefly the historic record of the church on certain great moral issues.

II

Let us consider the historic attitude of the church toward freedom of thought and expression. The record is most distressing. For a thousand years the church tried by every conceivable means to compel men to adhere to the teaching and doctrines of the ecclesiastical authorities. This teaching was not confined to specifically religious questions, but sought to cover the whole of life. Theologians were as dogmatic in matters of astronomy, geology, geography, chemistry, physics, medicine and history, as in matters of church doctrine and polity.

The Roman Catholic church and all branches of the Protestant church vied with each other in denouncing the Copernican theory as contrary to Scripture. It was declared that "this pretended discovery vitiates the whole Christian plan of salvation." Father Leczee insisted that "it casts suspicion on the doctrines of the incarnation." Father Melchior Inchofer declared that "the opinion of the earth's motion is of all heresies the most abominable, the most pernicious, the most scandalous; the immovability of the earth is thrice sacred; arguments against the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and the incarnation, should be tolerated sooner than an argument to prove that the earth moves."
Because he persisted in his belief in and proclamation of this hated heresy, Giordana Bruno was driven from land to land, imprisoned for six years in the horrible dungeons of the Inquisition at Rome, and finally burned alive. The late President Andrew D. White of Cornell filled two large volumes with instances where men of science were persecuted by the church because they dared to differ with the ecclesiastical authorities.

Ecclesiastical persecution was not confined to men of science. Heresy of any sort whatsoever was persecuted with relentless zeal. A single historian has devoted nine massive volumes to an enumeration of instances of the persecution of heretics by the church in various lands throughout many centuries.

For several hundred years the church resorted to every known means of torture in the punishment of heretics. Henry Charles Lea has described the lightest of penalties allowed by the Councils of Narvonne, Beziers, and Tarragona, in the thirteenth century: "It was no light matter. Stripped as much as decency and the inclemency of the weather would permit, the penitent presented himself every Sunday, with a rod in his hand, to the priest engaged in celebrating mass, who soundly scourged him in the presence of the congregation, as a fitting interlude in the mysteries of divine service."

A heavier penalty was imprisonment. Darkness, silence, loneliness, starvation and torture often worked wonders in saving heretics from the error of their ways. Speed was not a characteristic of ecclesiastical trials. We are told that "three, five or ten years are common enough as intervals between the first audience of a prisoner and his final conviction, nor are instances wanting of even greater delays. Bernalde, wife of Guillem de Montaigu, was imprisoned at Toulouse in 1297, and made a confession the same year, yet she was not formally sentenced to imprisonment until 1310. Guillem Garric was brought to confess at Carcassonne in 1321, after a detention of nearly thirty years."

If all other means failed, there was only one further thing to do, to burn the heretic at the stake. This was done with dreadful frequency. Even if we discount heavily the figures given by Llorente, the toll still remains at an appalling figure. Llorente gives the number of executions by the Inquisition as 341,042.

It was not until 1834 that the Inquisition was finally abolished in Spain.

This persecution of heretics was not confined to the Roman Catholic church. Almost every branch of the Protestant church
had its share in putting to death those who differed from the accepted doctrines of that church. As late as 1659, when two Quakers, Wm. Robinson and Marmaduke Stevenson, were hanged for heresy, the New England clergyman, John Wilson, stood by the gallows and railed at them.

In 1643, Sir Wm. Berkeley, Royal Governor of Virginia, strove by whippings and brandings to make the inhabitants of that colony conform to the Established Church.

The Protestant persecution of those accused of witchcraft is well known. On the continent, in England and Scotland, in New England, thousands of men and women were burned at the stake or put to death in some other manner on this charge. In Scotland an execution for witchcraft took place as late as 1722. In 1687 an eighteen-year-old boy named Hikenhead was accused of heresy and hanged in Edinburgh.

Let us remember that the leaders in this persecution of men of science, witches and heretics in general, were not, for the most part, rogues and scoundrels. They were often the most learned and most devout leaders in the various branches of the church.

Concerning the bull of Pope Innocent VIII., ordering the slaying of all witches, President White says: "Of all documents ever issued from Rome, imperial or papal, this has doubtless, first and last, cost the greatest shedding of innocent blood. Yet no document was ever more clearly dictated by conscience. It was based upon various texts of Scripture, especially upon the famous statement, 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.'"

John Wesley is universally recognized as one of the greatest Christians of all time, yet he gave his sanction to the persecution of witches, saying: "Unless witchcraft is true, nothing in the Bible is true."

Cotton Mather was the outstanding persecutor of witches in the American colonies, yet his biographer tells us: "Cotton Mather had on the whole a noble character. He believed strongly in the power of prayer; his spiritual nature was high strung and delicate. He was remarkable for his godliness, his enthusiasm for knowledge and his prodigious memory. He published more than four hundred works."

Francis Xavier, the Apostle to the Indies, once replied to a friend who sought to dissuade him from entering the Eastern Archipelago, "They will kill me by poison, you say. I dare to say whatever form of torture awaits me, I am ready to suffer it ten thousand times for the salvation of a single soul." Yet it was this same saint who wrote to the King of Portugal: "The second need which India has in order that those who live in it
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may be good Christians is that your Highness should send the Holy Inquisition.

After having made a lifelong study of the Inquisition and the persecution of heretics, the historian Lea expresses himself in these words: "There is no doubt that men of the kindliest tempers, the profoundest intelligence, the noblest aspirations, the purest zeal for righteousness, professing a religion founded on love and charity, were ruthless when heresy was concerned, and were ready to trample it out at the cost of any suffering."

IV

Now let us consider the attitude of the church toward human slavery. The testimony at this point is not consistent. There are periods when the church was overwhelmingly opposed to slavery. There are other periods when great branches of the church were united in upholding it. Let us consider one of these latter periods.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the churches of the South were united in defending slavery. Wm. Goodell, in his "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," fills seventy-two pages with resolutions by various church bodies and statements from outstanding leaders in all denominations upholding the institution of slavery.

In 1840, the Rev. James Smylie said: "If the buying, selling and holding of a slave for the sake of gain is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily three-fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven States of the Union, are of the devil. They hold, if they do not buy and sell, slaves."

The attitude of church leaders toward slavery is reflected in the following notice which appeared in a South Carolina paper: "On the first day of February next will be put up at public auction, before the court-house, the following property, belonging to the estate of the late Rev. Dr. Furman, viz.: A plantation or tract of land on and in Wateree Swamp; a tract of the first quality of fine land on the waters of Black River; a lot of land on the town of Camden; a library of miscellaneous character, chiefly theological; 27 Negroes, some of them very prime, two mules, one horse, and an old wagon."

The following quotation from a letter written by J. Cable, appearing in The Mercier Luminary, sheds still further light upon the attitude of the church toward slavery: "The worst kind of slavery is jobbing slavery, that is, the hiring out of slaves from year to year. What shocked me more than anything else was
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that the church engaged in this jobbing business. The college
church which I attended, and which was attended by all the
students of Hamilton Sydney College and Union Theological
Seminary (Va.) held slaves enough to pay their pastor, Mr. Stan-
ton, one thousand dollars a year. The slaves, who had been left
to the church by some pious mother in Israel, had increased so
as to be a large and still increasing fund. They were hired out
on Christmas day of each year, the day in which they celebrate
the birth of our blessed Saviour, to the highest bidder. There
were four other churches near the college church that supported
the pastor, in whole or in part, in the same way.”

As incredible as it may sound to modern ears, missionaries in
the home field and abroad were numbered among the slaveholders.
Mr. and Mrs. Davenport, missionaries to Siam, were not the only
foreign missionaries who were slaveholders. “The American Bap-
tist Home Missionary Society had in its employ as missionaries
twenty-six slaveholders. As the missionary of this society, Mr.
Tryon, entered Texas, he drove his slaves before him.”

The following statement reveals the extremes to which certain
clergymen went: “In 1841, the Rev. Jonathan Davis, a Baptist
clergyman from Georgia, boasted that he was the owner of thirty
human beings, and that he would wade knee-deep in blood to
defend his rights to hold them.”

Even the most learned and the most devout of Christian leaders
joined in the chorus of approval of human slavery. The famous
evangelist Whitefield said: “As to the lawfulness of keeping
slaves, I have no doubt. I should think myself highly favored
if I could purchase a goodly number of them, in order to make
their lives comfortable, and lay a foundation for breeding up
their posterity in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

One of the greatest leaders of the church during the first half
of the nineteenth century was Alexander Campbell. In a letter
to the editor of the Edinburgh Journal, dated Dundee, 21st
August, 1847, he said: “I could as soon become a Socialist, or
Free Thinker, or a Skeptic, as say or think that it is immoral
or unChristian to hold a bond-servant in any case whatever. I
therefore dare not, with my Bible in my hand, join in the anti-
slavery crusade against the relation of master and slave.”

A pamphlet circulated among the members of the Presbyterian
General Assembly, said to have been written by Professor Hodge
of Princeton, says: "At the time of the advent of Jesus Christ, slavery in its worst forms prevailed over the world. The Saviour found it around him in Judea, the Apostles met with it in Asia, Greece and Italy. How did they treat it? Not by the denunciation of slaveholding as necessarily sinful. The assumption that slaveholding is in itself a crime, is not only an error, but it is an error fraught with evil consequences.

As to the sincerity and conscientiousness of those who upheld slavery, the eminent church historian, Leonard W. Bacon says: "The common sentiment of southern Christianity was expressed in that serious declaration of the Southern Presbyterian church during the war, of its 'deep conviction of the divine appointment of domestic servitude' and of the 'peculiar mission of the southern church to conserve the institution of slavery.'"

VI

Next, let us consider the historic attitude of the church toward the liquor traffic. Concerning the New England Puritans of the eighteenth century, Daniel Dorchester says: "The drinking habits of all classes, ministers included, hung like a dead-weight upon the churches. Ordinations were seasons of festivity, in which copious drinking had a large share. Not very far from the Revolution, several councils were held in one of the towns of Massachusetts, where the people were trying to get rid of a minister who was often the worse for liquor, even in the pulpit, and once, at least, at the communion table; but some of the neighboring ministers stood by him, and the people had to endure him till his death."

Theodore Parker bears similar testimony: "It is recorded in the probate office that, in 1678, at the funeral of Mrs. Mary Norton, widow of the celebrated John Norton, one of the ministers of the First Church in Boston, fifty-one gallons and a half of the best Malago wine were consumed by the mourners. Affairs came to such a pass that, in 1742, the general court of Massachusetts forbade the use of wine and rum at funerals."

The Rev. Leonard Wood, D.D., gives us this startling information: "I remember when I could reckon up among my acquaintances forty ministers, and none of them at a great distance, who were either drunkards or far addicted to drinking. I could mention an ordination which took place about twenty years ago (1816) at which I myself was ashamed and grieved to see two aged ministers literally drunk, and a third indecently excited."
A correspondent of a Boston newspaper wrote: "A great many deacons in New England die drunkards. I have a list of 123 intemperate deacons in Massachusetts, 43 of whom became sots."

During the early days of the temperance movement in the United States the bulk of the clergy were bitterly opposed to it. Sermons were preached, books and pamphlets written, proving that the liquor traffic was sanctioned by the Bible and Jesus Christ.

After seventeen years of vigorous opposition to the temperance movement, the Rev. Joseph C. Lovejoy wrote a book entitled, "Prohibition Ground to Powder," in which he said: "I have never flinched nor doubted; not one pang of remorse or regret. I told the truth in vindication of God's word and Christ's example; and in defense of the personal rights of every human being. The assailants are at war with God and man."

Surely there is no need to summon further witnesses. The facts are too numerous and unmistakable to leave any doubt as to the errors of judgment on the part of the Church. Let us keep clearly in mind that many of the leaders of the Inquisition, the defenders of human slavery and the liquor traffic, were entirely conscientious in their attitude and conduct. In his "History of Civilization in England," Buckle says: "It is an undoubted fact that an overwhelming majority of religious persecutors have been men of the purest intentions, of the most admirably unsullied morals. Such men as these are not bad, they are only ignorant."

The errors of the Church in the past are not proof that the Church is wrong in its present attitude toward war. The facts in the case and the arguments advanced are, however, sufficient to cause us to raise the question: Is the Church wrong in sanctioning and participating in war?

Is it possible that the historian of another century will look back upon the present attitude of the Church toward war with the same degree of amazement that we look back upon the defense, upon Biblical grounds, of human slavery, the liquor traffic and the persecution of heretics?

To guard against any possible misunderstanding of the present writer's attitude toward the Church, it should be stated that he believes heartily in the Church. It is his conviction that the Church, having once become aware of its errors concerning freedom of thought, human slavery and the liquor traffic, has been
one of the mightiest factors in extending education and making possible freedom of thought, in the abolition of human slavery, and in the destruction of the liquor traffic.

The writer of these paragraphs has gone through the painful process of reviewing certain glaring errors of the Church in the past because he is profoundly convinced that the Church is making a similar error in its present defense of war as a means of achieving a righteous end, and because he believes that once the Church sees its error in this regard and turns resolutely away from war as a method, it will be the mightiest factor in destroying war and in substituting really Christian ways of settling international differences.

The present writer is grieved at what he believes to be the error of the Church in defending war because without the aid of the Church he sees no hope whatever of abolishing war.
III: DID JESUS EVER FACE A WAR SITUATION?

I

The answer to this very important question will enable us better to understand the attitude of Jesus toward war. What are the facts in the case?

In the time of Jesus, Palestine was a conquered province of the Roman Empire. Jerusalem was the chief defense of a strategic system of fortifications which extended throughout the country. Roman soldiers and mercenaries from Galatia, Germany and Thrace were placed in all fortresses, and foreign ministers and retainers were constantly coming and going from the royal residence. Roman centurions are often mentioned in the New Testament.

The Roman authorities were entrusted with full military and judicial powers, and heavy taxes were imposed upon the people. The representatives of Rome also had full power over the Jewish Sanhedrin, and one procurator, Valerius Gratus, changed the High Priest four times within four years. In the year A. D. 19, Tiberius, after drafting four thousand Jews of the dispersion into the Roman Army, banished the entire Jewish colony from the Imperial City.

Every effort was put forth to impart Roman ideals and culture to the Jews. Splendid heathen temples were erected. Roman theaters and amphitheaters were built; military roads were studded with Roman monuments; towns and public edifices received Roman names; chariot races, gladiatorial combats and wild beast fights could be witnessed in the very heart of Judaism.

Pontius Pilate was procurator in Judæa during the active ministry of Jesus. Concerning his rule, the historian, Professor Graetz, says: "As soon as Pontius Pilate was in power he showed determination to subject the Judeans to further humiliation and to convince them that they must drink the cup of suffering to the dregs. He certainly went beyond any of his predecessors in wound-
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ing the susceptibilities of the Judean nation. He attacked their religious scruples by endeavoring to induce them to pay homage to the emblem and insignia of imperialism.”

In this connection, Dr. Lyman Abbott says: “The throne of David was occupied by the creature of a foreign country, sustained by the arms of a foreign soldiery. The guards against monarchial usurpation which the Mosaic constitution had provided were swept away. The popular right of suffrage was long since lost in the universal wreck, and with it the popular representative bodies which Moses had constituted. A military despotism was substituted for the free commonwealth. Even the form of national life did not survive the Herodian dynasty. At Herod’s death, while Christ was still an infant, Palestine was divided into petty provinces and placed under the control of Roman governors, who under different names fulfilled substantially the same function. The whole civil government was administered by them. All capital cases were brought before them for adjudication. The high-priest was appointed and removed at their pleasure. Their will was absolute law. From their decisions there was, except in the case of Roman citizens, no appeal. At the command of Herod, the infant children of Bethlehem were slain without reason and without resistance (Matt. 2:16-18). At the command of Pontius Pilate the Galileans gathered for the sacrifice were massacred on their own altars (Luke 13:1). In every principal town the Roman soldiery were quartered and the Roman centurion, answering to our captain of infantry, reigned, a petty and therefore intolerable despot. Some ruins of the Mosaic tribunals indeed remained. In every synagogue was a local court; in every city a larger tribunal; while at Jerusalem the Sanhedrin, instituted in the wilderness and reinstated under the Maccabees, continued to hold its sessions. Very little jurisdiction, however, was left to them, save in ecclesiastical questions. They were powerless to protect the people from the exactions and oppressions of the foreigners. For the most part all important cases of a civil and criminal nature were determined by the Roman military authorities, who, irresponsible save to their superior officers, meted out, as may be supposed, a very irregular kind of justice. They were flagrantly corrupt.”

II

During the days of Jesus there was peace in Palestine—the kind of peace which comes when a powerful nation has completely conquered a weaker one, and then condescends to grant to it a
greater or lesser measure of freedom and self-government under paternal imperial supervision. At any moment Rome could have taken away Israel's remnant of political freedom. The Roman rule was much sternier and more galling during the days just before Jesus was born and just after he died than during his lifetime. But the cruel persecution of the Roman conquerors immediately preceding and succeeding the ministry of Jesus is a clear indication of the summary punishment that would have been meted out to any who should have resisted Roman authority. So long as the Jews were willing to submit to the Roman yoke they could have peace.

If Germany had conquered Belgium, and some years later, while retaining the power of taxation and the appointing of political and ecclesiastical officials in Belgium, had granted a liberal measure of local self-government, political conditions would have been similar to those of Palestine in the days of Jesus.

Restless under this tyranny, the Jewish people were eagerly awaiting the coming of the Messiah, who should overthrow the conqueror and bring about freedom. "Son of David is the most characteristic, as it is the most traditional and historic, designation of the Jewish Messiah. It expressed the most representative type of the Messianic expectation. Palestine was ready to respond to any bold or able adventurer like Judas, Theudas or Bar Cochba, the last of whom was supported even by the distinguished Rabbi Akiba."

"This indirect evidence afforded by the Psalms of Solomon," says Professor E. F. Scott, "is borne out by the express words of Philo in a passage which evidently reflects the prevailing Jewish belief in his time. 'According to the prophets a man will appear who wages war and conquers powerful nations, while God sends the needed help to his saint.' Above all, we have unmistakable testimony in the numerous popular tumults, half-religious and half-political, which took place in the time of the Roman procurators. Our chief authority for the state of popular feeling in the time of Christ is the New Testament itself. We can gather from every page of the Gospels that the period was one of intense excitement. The religious leaders found it impossible to restrain the ardor of the people, who were waiting everywhere for the appearance of the promised Deliverer. This mood of expectancy had no doubt been heightened by the events of recent history. For more than a generation past the Romans had been encroaching on Jewish freedom and their measures of repression had stirred the spirit of patriotism to fiercer life. To the people at large the Messiah remained what he had been to Isaiah and his
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contemporaries—the Son of David who would bring victory and prosperity to the Jewish nation.”

In this connection, Dean Shailer Mathews says: “The term ‘Son of David’ had become expressive of the entire Messianic idea as held by all Jews, whether scribes or common people. It indicated that the new kingdom was to be essentially Jewish, just as its king was to be representative of the most typical royal family of Hebrew history. More than that, it declared the new kingdom to be essentially military, for to the Jew, David was essentially a man of war, a conqueror of the enemies of Israel. To describe the Messianic King as his son was to ascribe to him the same military prowess.”

III

“What business had the Roman in Palestine,” asks Dr. Alfred Edersheim, “how dared the idolater profane by his presence the sacred soil that was God’s; how could he claim to rule the people whose sole king was Jehovah of the mighty arm and outstretched hand? Even to admit it as a fact, nay to tolerate it, was an act of unfaithfulness to God, of deep unbelief, of apostasy. So patriotism and religion—both in abnormal forms—mingled. They whetted their daggers to the sound of psalms, and sharpened their swords to the martial music of the prophetic utterances, which to them seemed only denunciations and imprecations on the enemy.”

In like tenor, Dr. Burris A. Jenkins says: “The cry ‘The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand!’ was as startling to Jerusalem as ‘The Revolution is here!’ was to Paris in 1793. The Hebrew people were as ready to unsheathe swords, pull up paving-stones, and build barricades in behalf of the new Kingdom, as the French were in behalf of liberty, equality and fraternity. It was no new word, this ‘Kingdom of Heaven.’ It had long been on the lips of peasant and prophet, herdsmen and statesmen, fishermen and rabbis. It was electric with preparation, dynamic with memories, charged with desperation, longing, hope deferred.”

It was this expectation that caused them to flock around John the Baptist and to listen so eagerly to his message concerning the imminent coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. It was this same hope that later caused them to spread their garments in the path of Jesus and to cry out: “Hosanna to the Son of David.” Surely Israel was about to be restored to her former freedom and magnificence; yes, even the glories of David and Solomon were to be surpassed under the leadership of the Messiah.
It was into this atmosphere that Jesus came. His country was in disgraceful bondage to imperialistic and militaristic Rome. His countrymen were waiting with intense eagerness for the Messiah, who should lead them to victory and freedom and glory. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. Multitudes crowded about him and applauded him as the long expected One, the Son of David, the Deliverer.

IV

In the presence of this need, under the pressure of this demand, impelled by his own inner call, what should he do? Yes, Jesus faced the question of war. He faced it with a degree of earnestness and intensity never surpassed.

One of the great temptations of his life came at this point. Concerning the third temptation of Jesus, when "the devil taketh him to a high mountain," Dr. Lyman Abbott says: "This last temptation was the subtlest, and therefore the most dangerous of all. In the midst of a ruined world stands Jesus, the mournful spectator of its woes. His pure soul is disgusted by the heartless ritualism of a degenerate religion. His patriotism is wounded and grieved by his nation's present decay and impending doom. He feels the weight of the Roman yoke. He shudders at the impiety of Roman polytheism. He loathes and detests the odious oppression which is wearing out the life of his people. He has felt himself irresistibly to be the ransom first of his own nation, then also the oppressed nationalities of the earth. He has proposed within himself to found a kingdom whose law shall be liberty, whose fruit shall be peace. He recognized that in the Jewish nation and in the Jewish religion are the elements out of which this kingdom is to be constructed. He finds a religious party expectant of a Messiah, anxious for a Messiah, and ready to cast the whole weight of their prestige and influence in with any one who gives promise of restoring to the nation its ancient glory and will suffer them to be sharers in it.

"For the establishment of such a kingdom, Christ had many advantages. He had the grace which attracts men, the eloquence which arouses their courage and which inspires them. A picture of a nation long enslaved, now disenthralled, restored, reformed, purified by his power—this is the picture the wily tempter presented to his imagination. Nor this alone. Alexander going forth from the little kingdom of Macedon, had vanquished the world. Already Greece had lost its vitality; already the power of Rome was passing away, although its apparent dominion was
at its height. To a devoutly enkindled imagination it would not seem impossible that the conditions of the present might be reversed in the future. The kingdoms of the earth might yet be subject to a redeemed and ransomed Israel. The Jewish people expected it. The prophets seemed to most of their readers to promise it. The kingdoms of the earth and all their glories were seen as in a vision.”

What George D. Herron says in this connection is undoubtedly true: “There are indications that Jesus met, in temptations beyond our power of sympathy to interpret, the question of revolution. Civilization was a Roman dominion, making one vast, splendid, slave- pen of the earth, with suicide the only escape for fettered, crushed and despairing lives. Roman virtues had been terrible. But when these virtues were dissolving in still more terrible vices, the earth became the arena of unmitigated suffering, seeming like the creation of devils. Could anything prevail against this exhausted system, save the attack of forces of its own kind—forces it could understand?”

Jesus was face to face with a concrete situation similar in principle to that of Belgium in 1914. Germany invaded Belgium, Rome overran Palestine; Germany imposed heavy taxes on the Belgians, Rome did the same with the Jews; Germany shelled the great cathedral, Rome defiled the holy temple; the Germans murdered innocent Belgians, in this they were only following the example of Herod and Pilate. The issues at stake in Palestine in the days of Jesus and in Belgium in 1914 were similar in principle, namely, freedom versus bondage.

Shall I not respond to the appeal of my countrymen that I take up the sword and lead them against the Roman conqueror? Under the circumstances, are not violence and war the only available means of obtaining freedom? In what other way can the chosen people of God be delivered from bondage? Why not follow the warlike example of Joshua and David and Judas Maccabeus? Does not the end justify the means?

These are questions that Jesus faced.
IV: WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING WAR

I

We are in a better position than ever before to discuss this question. We now know something about the realities of war. No longer do we have to theorize about it. Our war experiences are still vividly impressed upon our minds. Yet we are far enough removed from the actual struggle to reach a much truer judgment concerning the relation of war and the teaching of Jesus.

In such a study, it is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that the proof-text method offers little or no proof at all. It is only as we take the teaching of Jesus as a whole and observe its application in his own life, that we can catch his spirit and know his attitude toward war.

It should not be necessary to say that the Old Testament is not the final authority for the Christian. No one can read the two Testaments without noting the striking differences in spirit and attitude. As Dr. George H. Gilbert says: "When we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we leave war and battlefields behind us. Of Yahweh mighty in battle, Yahweh who is a 'man of war,' who strikes through kings in the day of his wrath; of Yahweh clad in warlike array, drawing out the spear, whetting the sword, and marching before the hosts of Israel to discomfit their enemies and his, we hear no more."

The Bible is a progressive revelation of God, and war must be judged by the higher revelation of Jesus and the New Testament, rather than by the former conception of David and the Old Testament.

II

Let us now note the specific passages which have a bearing upon our problem, noting first those verses which seem to show that Jesus sanctions war, and later the verses which show his condemnation of war.
WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING WAR

The incident in the temple when Jesus used the scourge of small cords (John 2:13-17) is often cited as indicating Jesus' sanction of war. The very most that can be said in this regard is that Jesus sanctions the use of force. To say this is not proof that Jesus sanctions war. War involves many other factors than the mere use of force. If Jesus had used force in such a way as to give supremacy to military necessity, to destroy human life, to break down reverence for personality, to retaliate with evil for evil, to compel the surrender of his moral freedom, we might then well believe that he sanctions war. The use of force is one problem, the morality of war as a means to an end involves so many additional factors as to be quite a different problem. Each should be judged on its own merits.

In the second place, we find the verses, "I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34), and "Let him sell his cloak and buy a sword" (Luke 22:36), which are used as proof that Jesus wanted his disciples to be prepared for war. To understand these verses, we must notice their context. If we turn to the verse in Matthew, we find that the very next verse reads: "For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." If we take one verse literally, we should also take literally the verse which follows it. If one means that Jesus came to bring a literal sword, then the next means that he came as a great home-wrecker, setting the members thereof one against the other. Such a literal interpretation prevents any clear understanding of the words of Jesus. Surely his words, "I came not to send peace, but a sword," mean that he came to bring about a sharp division between those who do right and those who do wrong. In Kent's translation of the New Testament, these words read: "I did not come to bring peace, but a struggle. For I came to make a man disagree with his father, a daughter with her mother, and a daughter-in-law with her mother-in-law." It is to be doubted if a single reputable Biblical scholar can be found who will interpret these words to mean that Jesus had reference to a literal sword as a means of accomplishing a desired end.

With reference to the passage in Luke, one has only to read the verses that follow to see that Jesus could not have meant these words as a sanction of war. "It was the last evening of Jesus' life—the hour of sharp crisis, both for him and for his disciples.
At an earlier day, in Galilee, he had sent them out on a gracious mission, without purse, or wallet, or shoes, and yet they had lacked nothing, for they found friends to supply all their needs. The case was soon to be greatly changed. He himself was about to be reckoned with transgressors, and surely his disciples would have to encounter bitter opposition. They must therefore be prepared, must be armed, must have 'swords.' Were there the slightest doubt regarding the correctness of this interpretation, it would be entirely dispelled by the sequel, for the disciples, promptly misunderstanding Jesus' reference to a sword, reminded him that they had two, and he replied, 'It is enough' (or according to Moffatt's translation, 'Enough! Enough!'). But, obviously, two swords were not enough to defend his life from his strong and determined foes; two swords were not enough for war. They were, however, enough, and even one was enough, to convey his thought of being prepared for the time of stress that was approaching."

Professor Hastings Rashdall, the eminent theologian and philosopher, says, in this connection: "More probably the words were 'a piece of ironical foreboding,' which the disciples took literally. The 'it is enough' will then mean, 'Drop that idea: my words were not meant seriously.'"

The third reference is to Matthew 22:21 and to the 13th chapter of Romans. It is said that Jesus and St. Paul accepted the authority of the state, and since the state rests upon force and war, the Christian must likewise accept these. 'It is quite true that Jesus recognized the sphere of the state, in the statement, "Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar." He paid taxes and never renounced the authority of the state. But this is only a half-truth. He likewise said, "Give God what belongs to God," and "Seek ye first the kingdom of God."

St. Paul also upholds the state, especially in the thirteenth chapter of Romans. Upon close inspection of the teaching of St. Paul, however, the most that can be said in this connection is that the authority of the state is to be recognized and obeyed in so far as it does not conflict with the higher law of God. What are we to gather from the following words by St. Paul? 'Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is
evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil."

IV

Let us remember that it was the emperor and officials of the Roman Empire of whom St. Paul was speaking. Can any one believe that St. Paul meant literally that all of these Roman officials were ministers of God for the benefit of the Christians and were to be obeyed as agents of divine vengeance? The officials of that empire, where there were three slaves for every citizen? That country in which slaves could not be legally married, unions between slaves being framed and dissolved at the will of the master? That empire which officially sanctioned gladiatorial combats, and pitted man against beast?

With this literal interpretation in mind, would we not be compelled to say that a later emperor of this same Roman Empire, Diocletian, was "a minister of God" when he issued an edict that he was to be worshipped as God, and when he not only burned the books of Holy Scripture and Christian houses of worship, but killed by slow torture many thousands of Christians who refused to worship him? Should St. Paul's words: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God" have been taken literally by these Christians and should they have worshipped Diocletian as God? By this same literal interpretation, should not the Christians in Germany have obeyed the Kaiser, since "there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God," and have participated in the deporting and slaying of the innocent Belgians?

Such a strict and literal interpretation of this passage furnished in past days adequate grounds for the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and the theory, "the king can do no wrong."

If St. Paul meant his words to be taken thus literally, he and the other disciples failed utterly to live up to their own teaching. The New Testament is filled with instances where the disciples refused to obey the government authorities, and many times they were imprisoned for disobedience. When commanded by the officials to cease their Christian activity, they replied, "We must obey God rather than man."

As interpreted by the life of St. Paul and the other disciples, these verses in Romans mean that rulers and laws are necessary, and in so far as they are instruments of God they are to be obeyed. But when their commands are contrary to the spirit and
teaching of the Master, they are to be resisted even if it means the death of the disciple.

None of us believes that rulers are infallible or that their commands should constitute our highest standard of right and wrong. Quite apart from the belief of the ruler, the method of war is either Christian or un-Christian, and his command does not determine whether our participation in it is moral or immoral. Therefore, the Christian citizen must come to his decision on a basis of the spirit and teaching of Jesus, quite independently of the command of the ruler. To say that Jesus and St. Paul recognize the function of the state is not to say that they command the Christian to participate in war when ordered to do so by the ruler of the nation; any more than their recognition of the state meant that they sanctioned human slavery, polygamy, extortion and the other evil practices which were approved by the state.

V

We now turn to the positive teaching of Jesus against war. Although his teaching makes no direct reference to war as such, as it does not to human slavery and many notorious evils of his day, it does contain much that applies to the method of war. Some of the realities of war are: the law of military necessity, the end justifies the means, the wholesale destruction of life, the losing of reverence for personality, retaliation of evil for evil, the surrender of moral freedom. About these things the teaching of Jesus has much to say.

Under certain conditions, military necessity compels the adoption of methods of warfare without consideration of law or morality. The final defence of war must always be that the end justifies the means. No one denies the horrors of dropping bombs on cities and towns, the starving of civilian populations or the plunging of bayonet steel into human flesh. All Christian men freely admit that war is a survival of savagery and barbarism and is essentially unchristian. Men hate war, men use it—the end justifies the means.

The spirit and teaching of Jesus give us clear light regarding the validity of this conclusion for the Christian. Tertullian well says: "The life of faith knows no plea of necessity, for how can there be a necessity to sin, in a life the one necessity of which is that it does not sin."

To seek a noble end by improper means is to try to cast out satan by using satan's weapons. It seems impossible to conceive
of Jesus adopting war, which is universally acknowledged as a thing thoroughly bad in itself, as a means to an end, however noble that end might be. It is equally certain that he does not ask his followers to do a thing which he himself cannot do. The law of military necessity and the doctrine that the end justifies the means are clearly in violation of the whole spirit and teaching of Jesus.

War inevitably involves retaliation—evil for evil, battle for battle, poison gas for poison gas, liquid fire for liquid fire, air raid for air raid, starvation for starvation. No one can deny that this practice of returning evil for evil is directly opposed to the fundamental teaching of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount is emphatic in its protest against retaliation. Jesus shows clearly that while retaliation was sanctioned in the former time—“an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth”—it is no longer permissible for his disciples. It is not necessary to be literalistic in interpreting his teaching about not resisting, turning the other cheek or going two miles, to discover the principle which he is setting forth. The Apostle Paul well summed up our Lord’s teaching in this regard in the words: “Never pay back evil for evil to anyone.”

VI

War decreases reverence for personality, it tears down what Christianity builds up. One of the outstanding differences between Christianity and other religions is the emphasis placed upon the value of human beings. More valuable than sparrows or sheep, more precious than the sum total of material possessions, are human beings. War makes life cheap. Jesus gives it priceless value.

War means that the individual must surrender his moral freedom. The soldier does not control his own actions, he must obey orders without regard to his own standard of ethics or morals. And this is clearly opposed to the teaching and spirit of Jesus. No military command can justify the setting aside of moral law. If a given act or practice is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus it is wrong, and no military command can make it right. A man cannot surrender his moral freedom, pursue a course of action that is unchristian and at the same time be following the way of Jesus.

It is in the cross that we find the key of Christianity. Here we find Jesus’ way of life, here we see love and vicarious service in the highest degree. Jesus calls his followers to live in this spirit and it is by this means that evil-doers are to be overcome. Jesus recognized that there would be a struggle between the wicked and the
righteous and he warned his disciples that lives would be lost. Whose lives? those of the wicked or of the righteous? Shall the guilty die at the hands of the innocent, or shall the innocent die for the guilty? It is at this point that the sword and the cross differ. The sword, used defensively, means the attempt to kill the guilty for the sake of the innocent. The cross symbolizes the willingness of the innocent to die for the guilty.

Jesus was compelled to refuse the sword and to follow the way of the cross because they represent two opposing principles of life. The sword produces brutality, the cross brings tenderness; the sword destroys the sanctity of the personality, the cross gives it priceless value; the sword deadens conscience, the cross deepens spiritual perception; the sword causes hatred, the cross compels love; the sword means the attempt to kill your foe, the cross your willingness to die in seeking to save your enemy. "The sacrifice of innocence for guilt is the profoundest truth which God has ever exemplified in a human life."

It is to be doubted if there is to be found a Christian man who has had actual experience with the realities of war who will deny that war is in itself thoroughly unchristian. As an editorial in The Christian Century expresses it: "Than war nothing more antithetical to Christianity can be imagined. It is a denial in the baldest possible form of the very life principle of the religion of Jesus. It is anti-Christian in the rawest, nakedest form."

Our major conclusion, then is: War is inherently unchristian and necessarily involves the violation of or the going contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ.
V: THE SUPREMACY AND PRATICABILITY OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS

I

Jesus faced a war situation and refused to take up arms in seeking to free his country from Roman bondage. His teaching is unmistakably opposed to the practices that are inevitably involved in war.

In the light of these facts, what should be the attitude of the present day Christian toward war?

That Jesus claims absolute supremacy cannot be denied. "Follow me" is his summons. He calls men to his way of life, to live for the same ends for which he lives, to be dominated by the same principles which control him. "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me." "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; he who will not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me." Nothing whatever must be allowed to come between Jesus and his disciples, not even loved ones or nation.

In the cross we see the culmination of the great principle of vicarious sacrifice which enters so deeply into human life. It is the climax of a particular way of and outlook upon life, and is the supreme illustration of a principle that applies to all. "If we are to get our fellows to believe in the redemptive virtue of Christ's cross," says Professor George Adam Smith, "it will be by proving to them that vicarious suffering and its ethical value are no arbitrary enactments of God, but natural to life and inevitable wherever sin and holiness, guilt and love, encounter and contend." In the principle of the cross is to be found the supreme ideal of all life.

II

It is often said that Jesus would not go to war because of his mission and purpose in life—as the founder of a purely spiritual
Kingdom he could use only spiritual weapons. But while he devoted himself exclusively to the founding of a spiritual kingdom, he sent forth his disciples to win other followers and to change the earthly conditions and environment so that it would be possible for the Father's will to be done "on earth as it is in heaven." To the statement that we cannot conceive of Jesus as a soldier, it is replied, neither can we conceive of Him as a street scavenger, a judge or a President. Jesus had a particular work to do and he devoted himself exclusively to that work.

When Jesus called men to follow him, he did not mean that they were to become carpenters because he was a carpenter, to wear sandals and robes because he wore sandals and a robe, or to copy him externally. He desires his disciples to follow exactly the same principles which he follows, to have absolutely the same attitude, disposition and purpose which he has, and to live for the same end for which he lives. The true Christian must be guided by the same ideals and principles which guide Jesus.

If a thing is wrong in principle for Jesus, it is wrong for a Christian. If there is something about the occupation of a street scavenger that is contrary to the principles of Jesus, then a Christian should not follow that occupation. If there is something about the office of a judge, a governor, or a President, that necessitates the violation of the spirit of Jesus, then a Christian should not hold such an office. If being a soldier and participating in war involves the violation of the teaching and spirit of Jesus, a Christian should not be a soldier. Personally, I am unable to discover anything in the profession of a street scavenger that is contrary to the principles of Jesus, whereas the fundamental contention of this discussion is that participation in war involves a direct violation of the teaching and spirit of Jesus.

III

Recently two eminent Christian men were discussing the ethics of war. Both of these men justified and sanctioned a righteous war of self defense, but they based their convictions on different grounds. One man said, "Frankly, I cannot under any conceivable circumstances imagine Jesus using a machine gun to shoot down his enemies." The other man, who was engaged in war work and who was wholeheartedly backing the efforts of the Allies, said: "Now if that is true, I don't care anything about your argument. What is the use of trying to persuade a man to do what Christ wouldn't be willing to do? If Christ wouldn't use a rifle, bayonet
or machine gun under existing conditions if he were in America today, then obviously if I am a Christian I must follow him. I wouldn't go into this war work till I could see Jesus sighting down a gun barrel and running a bayonet through a man. It was very clear to me at the start that it is one thing or the other. You can't take a half-way position and evade the issue."

It is my own conviction that both of these statements are true. I cannot possibly conceive of Jesus doing the things which are inevitably involved in war. Nor can I conceive of him asking or desiring that his followers do those things which he himself could not do. If his example, teaching and claims are supreme, then his followers should not adopt and follow a method which is so obviously unchristian.

To say that the way of the cross must be supreme in our lives does not mean that we shall cease to be patriotic or be released from service to the nation. We need a new definition of patriotism and a new scale of values by means of which a man's loyalty and service to his country may be gauged. "Patriotism," says Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, "is love of one's country—a desire to make one's country true and strong—a loyalty to its ideals and institutions—a fidelity to the principles which exalt a nation—a strenuous determination so to live and act as to maintain one's country's ideals and hand them down unimpaired to future generations. This love of country will sometimes lead a citizen to resist the authority of Caesar. No government is given authority by God to force men to do what they believe is wrong. The apostles at the very start had to face the question whether they were to hearken to the civil rulers rather than to God. They settled it then and there and they settled it right."

We must recognize that it is only by giving supreme allegiance to the way of the cross that we become the most loyal citizens of the state. If, as Mazzini says, "no impure man can be a true patriot," it is equally true that no man with wrong ideals and wrong methods can be a true patriot. Who was the truest patriot, Jesus or the Zealot? Who had the welfare of his country most at heart, Jesus or the fanatic with dreams of Israel as a world-empire? Who made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the nation, Jesus or the most victorious captain? Every true patriot must have as his goal: "Above all nations is humanity."

The Christian citizen is under obligation to serve the state, but his supreme obligation is to serve the Kingdom of God, and the call is for men to follow the way of Jesus with utter abandon—men who will enter with him into the great adventure of life, risking all on the redeeming power of the way of the cross.
Is the teaching of Jesus practicable for today? In the face of a war situation, invasion and threatened oppression, is it possible for a Christian to remain true to the spirit and principles of Jesus?

Dr. Robert E. Speer, in his recent book, "The Christian Man, the Church and the War," deals with this point in these words: "Can war ever be right, or is war, in moral principle, always wrong? That question will be alive until at last a day comes when the whole world will answer against war. When that day comes, men will look back upon what we say about war now as we look back upon what men used to say about slavery. This book that I am writing, if a copy should remain until that future day of peace, will seem a sad and pitiful thing to any one of its happy citizens who may chance upon it." A few pages further on he makes this statement: "Yes, war is contrary to the teaching and spirit of Jesus."

In his book, "The Challenge of the Present Crisis," Professor Harry Emerson Fosdick uses these emphatic words: "From the standpoint of every high ideal, war is unchristian—essentially, hideously unchristian."

And yet these eminent Christian leaders united in defending the participation of the United States in the Great War, and both books were written to urge Christians to take up arms against Prussian militarism and to aid in winning the war. In one breath they say, War is hideously unchristian and contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus; in the next they say, Go to war, take up the sword and destroy German militarism. They confess that in the world as it now is it is not possible always to follow the teaching of Jesus or always to live in accordance with his spirit. Professor Forsyth expresses this conviction in so many words: "To offer the esoteric Christian ethic for public use when national passion is rising or loose is to stroke a crocodile or tickle a tiger. The right and fit thing to do then is to fall back on an inferior ethic and make the best of it."

But is this the attitude of Jesus himself? Did he intend that his teaching should be fully applied only when the Kingdom had fully come to pass, or did he intend it to be the means of bringing in the Kingdom? "If it is not true," says W. Dunlop Robinson, "that the teaching of Jesus is the only road to a successful and satis-
factory life in this present world and under present conditions, it is
difficult to understand why one should attempt to follow it at all.”
And Professor Scott says: “It would be easy to review the precepts
of the Sermon on the Mount, one by one, and show that they would
be meaningless in a perfect world.”

“When he called upon men to follow him, to share his baptism
and drink his cup,” says W. E. Orchard, “he was not mocking them
with impossible ideals. He was asking them to be as he was, to
live for the same ends, to undertake the same task. Jesus invited
men to his ethical and spiritual level. The blunting of this call
by the declaration that Jesus can never be followed by mortal men
is responsible for the low state of Christian discipleship.”

Another Christian man bases his defense of war upon the state-
ment that there are times when “Christianity does not function
rapidly enough.” But if visible temporary results are the basis of
our judgment, surely we must confess that Jesus’ own life was a
failure. As he was hanging there on the cross, what were the
visible successes of his efforts? What had he done to overthrow
Roman militarism? What had he done to abolish human slavery?
What had he done to protect the weak and helpless from the
exploitation of the powerful? What had he done to remove the
grievous burdens imposed upon his countrymen by the foreign con-
querror and despot? Judging by outward appearances, surely his
contemporaries could turn from his principles because they did
not “function rapidly enough.” No wonder men preferred the
blood and thunder method of the Zealots—they were men of action,
they were doing something!

VI

“We look
But at the surface of things; we hear
Of towns in flames, fields ravaged, young and old
Driven out in troops to want and nakedness;
Then grasp our swords and rush upon a cure
That flatters us, because it asks not thought:
The deeper malady is better hid,
The world is poisoned at the heart.”

It is when we examine more closely the ultimate effects of Jesus’
life that we recognize more clearly the wide gulf between temporary
and permanent results. And it is when we examine his method
that we see the futility of attempting to overthrow evil by adopting
the weapons of Satan. “In measuring utility,” says John Morley,
“you have to take into account not merely the service rendered
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to the objects of the present hour, but the contribution of growth, progress and the future. A principle, if it be sound, represents one of the larger expediencies. To abandon that for the sake of some seeming expediency of the hour, is to sacrifice the greater good for the less, on no more creditable ground than that the less is nearer."

"It is true," says J. C. Murray, "that spiritual weapons will not always secure what is commonly understood by success; that is, success in external life. But no man is under obligation to be successful in this sense. Such success depends not only on the voluntary efforts of individuals, but on the operation also of vast and complicated forces which are beyond individual control. The utmost therefore that can be required of any man is to will what is right and leave the issue to the Ruler of the Universe, by whom all its agencies are controlled. It requires no unusual keenness of spiritual insight to discern that a success, won by violating the eternal principles on which the universe is governed, is a defeat in the most tragic sense of the term. It is all the more tragic because of the illusion of victory by which its real character is concealed. On that Good Friday in the history of our race, the cause which was more closely identified with the cause of righteousness for the world than any other can ever be, seemed to go down in disaster more irretrievable than any cause has ever sustained. And yet it is a sober historical fact that that defeat was the most triumphant victory in the moral welfare of the world."

Undoubtedly the Christian is confronted with situations from which there is no escape save at the cost of great suffering and perhaps the loss of life. In this respect he is only following in the steps of the Master. Jesus frankly warned his disciples of the dangers that would come because of their following his teaching and example. He knew that they would suffer persecution and death because of their allegiance to him and his spirit of love. He told them that the day would come when men would imagine they were serving God by killing them.

VII

If in 1914 the Christian people of the various nations had refused to compromise by taking up the sword, if they had shown the same spirit of loyalty, sacrifice and utter disregard of consequences which was displayed by the soldiers in the recent conflict, if they had staked everything upon the redeeming power of sacrificial and unconquerable love, if they had followed the way of the
cross, it would have meant the death of many—but it would have proved to be the most powerful factor in the healing of the nations and in hastening the coming of the Kingdom of God.

"The ages when the church has made vast conquests," says George D. Herron, "have been the ages of persecution, when the church was bearing away the sin of the world in its body and shedding its blood for the world's cleaning; when devotion to Christ was the passion of life; when the disciples rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer with the blows aimed at their Lord, and gave their bodies to be the dust of the highway over which the redeemed should walk into his kingdom."

In the face of the actual historical fact that the greatest progress of the human race has come by the way of the cross, shall we still maintain that it is not practicable to solve the problems of our day? Rather, let us say with E. A. Burroughs: "The nature of the universe being what it is, the thorough-going idealist is also the most thoroughly practical man. We have scorned idealism, and we have failed to be practical."

The example and teaching of Jesus are supreme for the Christian. His principle of redeeming love is the great ideal of all ages. The way of the cross is the most practicable way of serving mankind and of advancing the Kingdom of God.
VI: THE ONLY SURE WAY TO ABOLISH WAR

I

Has the Great War ended war? We would like to believe that it has. We are not so sure of it as we were during those hours of delirious joy on Armistice Day. We are afraid that it has not. The international situation does not permit any easy optimism.

The one bright ray of light seems to be the League of Nations. In it we place our hope. Without it we are sure to be plunged into another war. And yet many voices tell us that the League itself is a source of danger. We are reminded of the words of Colonel Roosevelt: "Let us never forget that any promise that such a league of nations or any other piece of machinery will definitely do away with war, is either sheer nonsense or rank hypocrisy."

Our own judgment tells us that the League cannot prevent war unless the nations enter it in the right spirit. And yet it is just this matter of the spirit of the nations that troubles us the most. Everywhere there are unmistakable evidences of a rising tide of jealousy, rivalry, suspicion, fear, hatred and enmity. If this tide continues to advance it will overwhelm us with another war. Until it recedes no League can ultimately prevent war.

In the face of such an international situation, what can the militant Christian do to prevent war?

For the follower of Jesus, the test of the morality of any procedure is, Is it Christian? Is it in harmony with the spirit and teaching of Jesus? The test is not, Is it the lesser of two wrongs? Is it sanctioned or commanded by the state or church? Is it in accordance with international law or the accepted code of morals of the majority? Is it sanctioned in the Old Testament? The supreme test is, Is it Christian?

In the effort to overcome dangerous heresies, is it right to torture men until they die in agony? In seeking to protect one's family from malignant evil spirits, is it right to burn witches at the stake? In endeavoring to overthrow corrupt politicians and in the interest
of an honest and patriotic candidate, is it right to outbid your corrupt opponent and purchase enough votes to win the election? In attempting to defend your country from the onslaught of a murderous autocratic militarism, is it right to make use of unchristian weapons?

For a disciple of Jesus, in each case the decision hinges upon the answer to the question, Is it Christian? Is it a thing that Jesus could do without sin? Is it in harmony with his teaching and desires? Can it be followed without violating his way of life? Is it such that he can use it, sanction it and bless it? If the devout monk had decided the question solely upon these grounds, he should not have used torture to conquer the heretic, the judges should not have used the stake to silence witches, the politician should not adopt the evil practices of his opponent, and if the Christian citizen uses this same test, he should not, in my opinion, use the sword in resisting the military despot.

Not even in seeking to protect his family is the follower of Jesus justified in doing a thing that is unchristian. As great and solemn as is the obligation to defend one's family, it is not the supreme duty of the Christian. All will admit that there are times when a man has a higher loyalty than to his family. A concrete case may help to make this clear. When in wartime a man who possesses information essential to the enemy has been taken prisoner with his family, and is faced with the alternative of yielding to his captors, divulging the desired information and betraying his country, or having his wife killed before his own eyes, loyalty to country takes precedence over loyalty to family. No man is ever justified in betraying his country even to save his family.

II

If this is true with regard to the citizen and the state, how much the more is it true with regard to the Christian and the Kingdom of God. Again and again the followers of Jesus have had to decide which was the higher loyalty, to him and his principles, or to family. The early Christians faced these alternatives, and gladly offered themselves and their loved ones as living sacrifices in the arena with the lion and the tiger, rather than forsake his way of life. The reformers faced these alternatives and together with their families were burned at the stake, rather than recant and deny the Christian truth. Christians in the heart of Africa have given Christ supreme loyalty and have seen their loved ones carried into a slavery worse than death, rather than betray him
and adopt the Moslem religion. The proud Brahmin in India faces these alternatives and gives up father and mother, wife and daughter, for the sake of Jesus Christ. The Christian in every age has had to decide to whom supreme loyalty should be rendered: to self, to family, to tribe, to nation, or to the Kingdom of God.

It is infinitely more important that a man should be true to Jesus and His principles than to protect his family at the expense of the Kingdom. A Christian is never justified in following a course of action that is utterly opposed to the principles of the Kingdom, not even to serve the temporal well-being of family or nation.

And the case against war is made doubly strong when we examine the evidence as to how it actually defends women and children. Take the recent war, for example. Has the sword protected the women and children of any belligerent nation? Call the roll. Belgium! Brave little Belgium! Has the sacrificial death of her sons sufficed to protect her women and children? Alas, it has not, and history records few instances of greater suffering by the helpless of any land. Indeed, we have heard a hundred times more of the outraging of women and the killing of little children in Belgium than in Luxemburg, where the husbands and fathers offered no armed resistance.

Perhaps no higher authority could be quoted in this connection than Brand Whitlock, the American Minister to Belgium. Listen to what he says: "In all those regions where the Germans could pass without resistance from the Belgian or French or English troops, there were no massacres and no incendiarism in the grand style. There were many isolated cases of individual outrages and atrocity, of course, but no systematic organized annihilation of cities, no massacre of peoples as at Louvain, Dinant, Aerschot, Tamines, Visé."

Has war protected the women and children of Serbia, of Roumania, of Poland, of Armenia? Millions in these lands have suffered and died in agony as the direct result of this war. Has war protected the women of France, Italy, Russia, Germany, England? Travel through these lands and see the results of the war and be convinced of the fact that it has done anything else other than protect them. Think of the increased immorality and crime caused by the war, of the tens of thousands of men who have returned from the war to blast their wives and children with foul diseases. Think of the awful suspense of these four years of anxious waiting, the agony of soul at the news of the loss of the loved one, the vacant chairs at the fireside, the crippled heroes who will limp through life, a heavy burden upon their wives and children, think of the shattered dreams, blasted hopes and broken
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hearts, caused by the war. War protects women and children! It is tragic mockery, war is the arch-enemy of womanhood and childhood!

The use of the sword as a weapon of defense has resulted in the death of ten millions of soldiers and non-combatants, and in the mutilation of millions more. Can any sane man believe that Germany would have deliberately slaughtered in cold blood ten millions of people had she been met with the spirit of the cross rather than with the sword? We must admit that as a means of defending women and children, war is a ghastly failure.

III

The use of the sword may preserve political freedom and liberty of thought and action. And it is here, in the final analysis, that the ethics of war must be determined. Is war justifiable as a means of preserving political liberty?

Jesus had little to say about political freedom, he had much to say about moral and spiritual freedom. When confronted with the question of human freedom, he saw that unless men's hearts were changed, freedom from Rome would simply mean an exchange of masters. To destroy the oppressors of a nation is not Jesus' way of bringing freedom to its citizens. Real freedom is not a racial, national or international problem; it is personal. Caesar, exercising authority over tens of thousands and dining in royal style, is shackled by many passions; Paul, loaded with chains and eating his prison fare, knows no master, save One. Pilate with his diadem of gold and glass of wine, is slave; Jesus, with his crown of thorns and cup of gall, is free. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

Not even when the political freedom of a nation is at stake should the Christian militant make use of an unchristian weapon. The following of Jesus Christ is infinitely more important than the maintenance of political liberty at the expense of his principles.

IV

It is not enough to hold a negative attitude and to say that the Christian militant should never sanction any practice which is opposed to the spirit and teaching of Jesus. He must also be prepared to deal in a positive way with the actual situations in every day life. "One great obstacle to world-peace," says President Faunce, "is the passive and flabby conception of peace which dream-
ers and sentimentalists have set before us. Rejecting the philosophy of blood and iron, they have sometimes offered us a philosophy of milk and water. They have urged upon us a vast and permanent negative."

In the face of danger and threatened oppression, what should the follower of Jesus do? Be Christian! And what does it mean to be Christian? To be guided solely by the principles of Jesus and to live for exactly the same ends for which he lived. "When a man chooses Christ he has to do on the absolute basis that Christ is what he means by truth," says W. E. Orchard, "and that Christ's career is what he calls success."

The Christian in Belgium or in England in 1914 should not have gone to war, in my opinion, since war is violently unchristian. He should have been Christian, that is, he should have lived in the spirit of Jesus Christ, returning good for evil, love for hatred, mercy for cruelty, kindness for atrocity. Even if his country had been conquered by Germany, he would have confronted the same situation which Jesus faced, and like Jesus he should have sought to get rid of the oppressor by other means than the sword.

As to how this spirit of love and good-will should be manifested must depend upon the circumstances of each individual case. One thing at least is clear, it seems to me: no Christian should ever retaliate with war for war, no Christian should choose the sword and reject the cross. Starting with the avowed determination always to refuse any practice which is contrary to the spirit of Jesus, each Christian must determine the channel through which he can best show love for friends and enemy alike.

The way of the cross is not primarily a program of action or a mechanism, it is an attitude, a spirit, a relationship. Jesus left no detailed code of laws and he outlined no definite program of overcoming the evils of his day. He was concerned with fundamental principles and laid emphasis upon frame of mind, attitude, relationship. He left it to each Christian to decide his own actions under given circumstances.

Christianity is not a code of laws, yet it furnishes a standard of measurement by means of which every detailed choice of life may be gauged. In the first century and in the twentieth, the individual Christian must determine his own course of action in the light of the spirit and teaching of Jesus. He gave Peter, James and John no definite program or mechanism by which they could overcome slavery, idolatry, licentiousness and militarism, and he gives the Christian of today no scheme of overcoming militarism and oppression. It is by lives lived in the spirit of human brotherhood and worship toward God that he seeks to overcome slavery
and idolatry, and it is by lives of aggressive good-will and love
at all times and under all circumstances that he seeks to overcome
militarism and oppression.

V

In this discussion, I am confining myself to a consideration of
whether or not the Christian should ever sanction or participate in
war. I am not making any attempt to deal with the mechanism
of overcoming oppression and preventing war, exceedingly impor-
tant as is a definite program of action. I am seeking simply to
discover the corner stone upon which this program may be built.

Inability to foretell the consequences of our refusal to take up
the sword in time of threatened oppression should not deter us
from following the way of the cross. The spirit of the reply of
Wendell Phillips holds true in this connection: “I will not discuss
with you the specific details of what would happen if the slaves
were freed,” he said. “I entrench myself in the principle of human
liberty and leave the results to Almighty God.” No human being
could have foretold the results that have come from the Good
Friday cross. No one can ever foretell the results that will come
when an individual resolutely follows the way of the cross. The
utmost that we can do is to sow the seed, God must give the
harvest.

That necessity is the mother of invention has been demonstrated
repeatedly in the recent war. And it will be so in discovering a
Christian substitute for war. When Christian people come to the
absolute conviction that all war is unchristian and should never
be participated in, when they withdraw their sanction from war,
when they cease to depend upon it for protection, when they set
themselves resolutely to finding means of applying Christian prin-
ciples in industrial, national and international life, we may hope
to see the abolition of war and the dawning of a new day of good-
will and human brotherhood.

The Christian militant of the present day is faced with a tre-
mendous challenge. He is challenged to a deeper faith in Jesus’
way of life, to an undying conviction that the way of the cross is
the most dynamic, powerful and compelling manner of life.
Mightier than divisions of infantry and cavalry, more powerful
than dynamite and ammonal, more irresistible than poison gas and
boiling oil, is the spirit of the cross. It is the one thing in the
world that cannot be frightened, discouraged or conquered. It is
the one sure way of overcoming personal, industrial and political
oppression. Truly it is the greatest thing in the world.
This faith should be so deep and abiding that the Christian militant would refuse to admit that Prussianism, Mohammedanism or any other militarism can conquer pure Christianity, and would refuse to allow any militarist so to intimidate him as to cause him to lose confidence in the way of the cross.

The Christian militant is challenged to a more strenuous search for ways of applying the spirit of the cross in industrial, national and international affairs, as well as in personal affairs.

He is challenged to a more intense loyalty to Jesus' way of life, to an eager willingness to follow this way in spite of all obstacles, dangers and consequences. He is challenged to adopt Jesus' standard of success and failure and his estimate of time. As was the case with him, the Christian militant should lose sight of temporary suffering and persecution in seeking to advance the ultimate well-being of mankind. He should recognize that it was this long distance view of time that compelled Jesus to refuse the sword and to make no military effort to bring about the immediate political freedom of his people, and that it was this same vision that caused him to choose the way of the cross and to go down in defeat, as the world measures success. And if the Christian militant is to be true to the Master, he must also choose the way of the cross and must follow Jesus even though the path lead to seeming defeat.

VI

The Christian militant is challenged to follow his convictions and to refuse all compromise with means and weapons that are unchristian. If he believes firmly that war is always an unchristian way of seeking to achieve a righteous end, he should be loyal to that conviction in the face of any pressure or danger, and be no less courageous than the soldier in battle. He should be loyal to his conviction even in the face of aroused public opinion and popular clamor. He should refuse to be swayed by frenzied passion or surface patriotism, but should remember that the truest patriotism is shown only by loyalty to one's highest moral convictions.

The call is for men and women who will follow the way of the cross with the same courage and abandon with which the soldier serves his country, who are willing to risk everything for the Kingdom of God, who have learned to count all things loss for Christ's sake, and who will follow his way of life without qualification or compromise.
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To increase the number of men and women in all lands who will refuse absolutely to sanction the use of any unchristian weapon, who will follow without compromise the teaching and example of Jesus Christ, and who will seek diligently by every possible means to spread abroad in the lives of individuals and of nations the spirit of Jesus, this is the only sure way to abolish war.
THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
The Fellowship of Reconciliation

After nineteen hundred years of Christian profession, all Christendom today stands reproached by the tragic evidences of its failure to establish Christian practice. The war has not simply proclaimed the violation of Christian principles between nations. It has laid bare the heart of twentieth century civilization and has disclosed widespread disregard of Christian standards in sordid commercialism, industrial strife and social injustice. In the events of the present time there are compelling reasons why the Christian conscience should be quickened to penitence and roused to discover what deep-seated misconception of the personality and principles of Christ or what fatal facility for compromise has been responsible for the failure to make His will effective in the social order.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation unites a group of Christian seekers for a better way of life. It is founded in the faith that love as revealed in the life, teachings and death of Jesus Christ is not only the fundamental basis of a true human society, but the effective power for overcoming evil, and that loyalty to humanity and to Christ calls His followers to new endeavors to practice love unswervingly at whatever cost, and to make it supreme in personal, social, industrial, national and international life.

Information as to the principles, literature and methods of the Fellowship will be given gladly on request. Inquiries should be addressed to the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 108 Lexington Ave., New York City.
In his searching little volume, "The Sword or the Cross," Mr. Kirby Page presents with force and truth the extreme position against war which must in our opinion be taken by everybody who would be a sincere and loyal follower of the teachings of Jesus. Undoubtedly this book would not have been allowed to circulate during the war, which is but another proof of the fact that all wars constitute in themselves a denial of Jesus and everything that he stood for. We wish for Mr. Page's little volume what is, alas, an impossible wish, that it be placed in the hands of every school child in this allegedly Christian nation. It would do a world of good and be a powerful weapon in the fight which is now on to save humanity from being exterminated by the very science of warfare which it has lately devised, it being today a problem whether war shall go or civilization perish.

This book is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the Christian attitude to war, coming as it does from the experience of one who went overseas with a quite different conception. Mr. Page portrays the terrible reality of war, shows how the church now defending war has often taken the wrong side on great moral questions, and makes it clear that Jesus faced a similar situation to that of 1914. In his analysis of Jesus' teachings on the subject the author avoids the doubtful proof-test method and also steers clear of side issues as to possible uses of force, and shows how the whole spirit of that teaching is a repudiation of the way of the sword, and an enthronement of its opposite, the way of the cross.

In six clear, strong, concise chapters the author presents a terrible condemnation of war and a strong argument for its complete
abandonment by those who would act fully in accordance with the
mind and spirit of Jesus. In fact, we are dared to act upon the
very obvious teachings of the Master and to risk all in the deter-
mination to be true idealists, as he was. With the war spirit still
upon us and our familiarity with the excuses which are given for
war, the author will be deemed a most pronounced pacifist, and so
he is, because he understands that nothing less is demanded of
the follower of Christ. Even many who are fully satisfied that war
is sometimes justifiable would do well to read this straightforward
little book and get the other point of view, for it reveals a kind of
heroism in the pacifist which is sometimes mistaken for cowardice.

The Christian Herald, New York:

What might have been the history of the last twenty centuries
if the church had consistently opposed war? The writer of this
book reminds us again of the teachings of Jesus, many of them
still but dimly comprehended or even wholly misunderstood. The
“sword,” of which he spoke in Matt. 10:34 and Luke 22:36, was
to mark the line of division between right and wrong, to make a
cleavage, not in the bodies of men, but in the ancient philosophies
and age-old customs, and especially in the interpretation of
religion. His teachings to his followers, his rejection of the
tempter’s lure of worldly greatness and power, his new standard
of love and kindness, of forgiveness, of brotherhood, were all
against war and bloodshed. His kingdom was not one of power
and possessions and mighty armies and wars. It is, as clearly as
his words could express it, a kingdom in the hearts of men who
place love and faith and kindness and mercy above all the prizes
of the world, with its fightings and conquests. This was the mean-
ing accepted in the early church. Has the modern church wholly
forgotten the glorious vision? This book is timely and inspira-
tional.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York:

Let me congratulate you upon a very sincere and impressive
piece of work. As you know, I do not completely agree with all
your conclusions, but your presentation of your point of view seems
to me the best statement which I have yet read of it. Even though
my method of attack on war may not be identical with yours, I
am so sure that the presence of war is the greatest outstanding
challenge to Christianity, that I sincerely trust that your book
may have a wide circulation and an earnest reading.
REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, Broadway Tabernacle, New York:

I like the style of your presentation, and also the noble Christian spirit that breathes through what you have written. You know that I am not able to go quite so far as you do, but I am always happy to have men who feel as you do express their convictions, for it is possible that you are right, and that the rest of us will have to come up where you are.

GALE SEAMAN, International Y. M. C. A. Secretary:

I wish every High School and College student in the United States could read “The Sword or the Cross.”

BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, Pittsburgh:

The book is nobly conceived and finely written and is in itself a high spiritual achievement.

PROF. HARRY F. WARD, Union Theological Seminary:

Mr. Page has faced the issue and has found an answer that satisfies his soul. What he has written, therefore, deserves the thoughtful consideration of all those whose duty it is to teach the people concerning the moral and spiritual validity of war.

PROFESSOR RUFUS M. JONES, Haverford College:

I have read your book, “The Sword or the Cross,” with deep appreciation. I feel sure it should have a very helpful mission, and I hope it will have a large circulation. It is very convincing and is written in just the right style to accomplish its purpose. I have no criticism whatever to make of it.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, New York:

The book is well done and deserves a wide reading.

NORMAN THOMAS, Associate Editor, The Nation:

My immediate reaction is one of unqualified approval.

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, of the Federal Council of Churches:

Here is a concise putting of Christianity’s case against war. The author has done a valuable piece of work.
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