

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

to full or communicant membership of the United Church, and persons so admitted shall be recognized as communicant throughout the whole Church.'

These are the main features of the South India scheme, a notable and (from any point of view) courageous effort to embody the aspirations after reunion which are in the hearts of men of goodwill in all the churches. It will be obvious that the scheme is vulnerable at certain points. And Dr. Sparrow SIMPSON does not shrink from the task of exposing this. But the most momentous feature of the proposals is the challenge they present to the Church of England, and especially to the Lambeth Conference. It is not any weakness in the scheme itself as a basis of reunion that is serious. The really serious thing is that the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England will have nothing to do with it. This is made abundantly clear by Dr. SIMPSON in his book. He has many criticisms to offer, but the only one that matters essentially is that, if these proposals were accepted, the Anglican Church would be committing itself to the 'Protestant' theory of the ministry. To allow a non-episcopally ordained minister to

celebrate the Eucharist—one, that is, who is not a priest, and who has not received his commission by Apostolic Succession from the Lord—would be an intolerable thing. The one thing that gives a priest authority to minister the Holy Supper is that he has received it by orderly succession from the Apostles, who received it from Christ Himself.

It is true that scholars like Dr. Streeter and Dr. A. C. Headlam assert that there is no evidence whatever in the New Testament for the theory of Apostolic Succession. And Dr. SIMPSON knows this, and deals with them, not very convincingly we fear, but still very honestly and fairly. He is, however, quite unmoved by their arguments. And whether they are right or not matters nothing for the present point, which is that not obscurely he hints that the acceptance of the South India scheme here may lead to a serious disruption of the Church of England. That is the issue that faces the Bishops at Lambeth. They have a difficult task set them. The whole world will watch with interest how they deal with it. And, we add very sincerely, all good men will wait and watch (and pray) with sympathy and goodwill.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of Today.

VI.

War.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND E. A. BURROUGHS, D.D.,
BISHOP OF RIPON.

THE difficulty of determining the mind of our Lord on any problem of a social or political nature is sufficiently indicated by the way such topics as this are discussed again and again, without even the most earnest and best-informed Christians having yet arrived at one mind. Part, at least, of this difficulty arises out of what seems to have been an aim of the whole teaching of Jesus, viz. to leave the particular application of general

principles to the individual conscience. In this certainly He is followed by St. Paul, *e.g.*, in his discussion of 'meats offered to idols.' Again, the issue is always complicated by the extraordinarily different social and political conditions under which both our Lord and His early followers lived; not the least baffling difference being the fact that, under the Roman Empire, there was no such thing as public opinion in politics. The re-

sponsibility of the individual citizen for the government of his country, which to us is an axiom, would have seemed a paradox then.

No subject, perhaps, suffers so much from these limits set to modern inquiry into the mind of Jesus as that now before us—His teaching about war. Yet few are more urgently practical at the moment, when the sentiment (for it is hardly yet the conscience) of humanity is more generally alive to the importance of exorcising war than it ever has been, when the hope of success in this effort is still vivid, and when the penalties of failing to take this tide at the flood are so terrible, so certain, and so clear. The liveness of sentiment on the subject is illustrated by the immense output of 'war books,' after a period during which the late war was almost taboo to those who went through it. The absence of a real conscience about it is reflected (*e.g.*) in the vicissitudes of the Naval Disarmament Conference, and the contrast between the promise of its beginning and the very limited performance at its close. To substitute conscience for mere sentiment in such matters is the task of religious faith. Hence the urgent practical importance of any inquiry that may help to put behind our wavering pacific forces the pressure of definitely Christian conviction rather than merely humanitarian desire. It would, therefore, be immensely valuable if now at last the churches could arrive at a unanimous verdict as to the mind of our Master about war, and the consequent duty of the individual Christian.

Yet quite obviously that point, however desirable, has not yet been reached. In a recent important discussion on 'Christianity and War' by leading members of the Congregational Union, an address on 'The Teaching of Jesus' was followed immediately by two others, discussing the application of that teaching. They were described as 'the pacifist' and 'the non-pacifist' positions, and each speaker was arguing against the other. Thus even within a single denomination, and that one where, perhaps, pacifist leanings might be expected more than, say, in the Church of England, representative leaders still look different ways. So what Professor C. H. Dodd says, in opening his discussion of our Lord's teaching on that occasion, is the necessary starting-point for us as well:

'It is useless to look in the Gospels for such explicit teaching of our Lord about war as would set the question at rest for His followers. . . . Our study of the Gospels will not solve our concrete problems directly, but

will supply a background of religious and moral principles for the discussion of these problems.'¹

With so many other subjects before the Churches on which opinion is divided, and on which Christians are increasingly learning to agree to differ, I shall not, I hope, be expected to come down definitely myself on either the pacifist or the non-pacifist side. If I may roughly indicate my own position, as still a seeker, it is that, when I read the New Testament, it inclines me strongly to pacifism, but when I turn to the pleas of modern pacifists, I am driven rather violently the other way. Such a book, for instance, as Dr. C. J. Cadoux's admirably complete and well-documented survey of the whole field, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (Headley Bros.), the date of which (1919) accounts largely for its predominant colour, seems to me positively dangerous to the cause which the writer has at heart. To me at least he seems to worry his evidence to death as he gives it, and to discount the surely relevant fact that some of the best and most thoughtful Christians in all ages, including our own, have been soldiers of untroubled conscience as well.

I.

To determine our Lord's mind on the subject of war is, as we have seen, peculiarly difficult because of the circumstances of His age.

On the one hand the problem as we envisage it simply does not arise. For us the question which matters is whether in any circumstances a Christian may rightly (*a*) adopt the profession of a soldier, (*b*) submit to the demands which his country may make upon any citizen for military service during a war. The second part of the question is the more serious, seeing that, as in the last war, it is almost certain that the whole able-bodied population will be involved. But our Lord lived under the *Pax Romana*—a political situation, within the Roman Empire, very like that which a successful and all-embracing League of Nations would produce in the civilized world to-day. The Roman army had virtually none but police duties (*cf.* the various contacts with it recorded in the New Testament), apart from those of defending the frontiers against

¹ *Christianity and War*. Six Addresses delivered at the Autumn Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, October 1929, p. 33. (London: Congregational Union, Inc.; price 1s.) I am much indebted to this timely booklet for help in focussing my own thought.

Barbary beyond. Augustus had advised his successors not to attempt to extend those frontiers, and this advice (Tacitus tells us) hardened into a rule. Aggression, even against barbarians, was simply not contemplated. It may have been unfortunate that soldiers and police had not yet come to be distinguished, so that society seemed to be organized on a military basis, as indeed it was. That was the meaning of 'the Empire.' But the Empire meant not war but peace; and that was why men accepted it so thankfully. If to the Jews, a recently conquered people, the presence of the Roman forces spelt repression, yet, on the other hand, the peculiar position of Judæa was recognized by the exemption of Jews, as such, from military service. Thus for the first generation of Christians our modern problem simply did not exist.

On the other hand, a specialized form of this problem touched our Lord's Jewish contemporaries closely. For in that pacified cosmopolitan world the Jews were about the only 'nationalists' in the modern sense. Hence their special privileges, accorded them by Rome, which recognized the need of peculiar treatment for a peculiar people. Incidentally, through this treatment the principle *Divide et impera* was brought to bear. For there emerged two main political parties not dissimilar to those which confront Great Britain in India to-day. The majority, including the Pharisees, accepted the *modus vivendi* with the suzerain power; but a spirit of 'non-co-operation' was endemic in the populace, and every now and then blazed into revolt. To many it was a matter of religion as well as of patriotism to have nothing to do with their Gentile rulers. Hence the interest displayed in our Lord's attitude to the question of paying tribute to Rome, and the recurrent desire of the populace to 'make him a king'—*i.e.* the leader of a nationalist revolt. (It was on the tribute question that Judas of Galilee had raised his standard some years before.) The famous reply, 'Render to Cæsar,' etc., was not just an inspired evasion and rebuke in one; it was an expression of our Lord's philosophy which at the same time gave His political views. He ranged Himself with the Pharisees on the side of non-resistance to and recognition of Roman sovereignty. But He did so in terms which showed how secondary, in His eyes, were all merely political arrangements and even grievances compared with the concerns of the Kingdom of Heaven. He would not touch on politics without bringing in religion. The same point emerges from the curious reference to the

Galileans 'whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices.' The political and the speculative aspects of the incident are alike swept aside. They are nothing compared with the one real issue, as He saw it: would God's people repent towards God in time? (Lk 13¹⁻²).¹

The Jews thus had their own problem of 'non-resistance.' But clearly such incidents cannot be pressed into service as evidence bearing on that problem as it faces us. For such 'non-resistance' is wholly on another plane from that which the modern pacifist recommends. It represents political common sense rather than political idealism. It is the same attitude as St. Paul expounds more fully in Ro 13: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . For this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually to this very thing.' Note that 'this very thing' is the avenging of evil *with violence*—'he beareth not *the sword* to no purpose.' If our Lord is to be claimed as, in the full modern sense, a 'non-resister,' He was at least inconsistent in recommending the support, by tax-paying, of a system quite openly dependent on military force. But, of course, the real point is that both He and His first followers are relatively uninterested in issues of that sort. As Lecky says, and Dr. Cadoux admits in quoting him: 'The opinions of the Christians of the first three centuries were usually formed without any regard to the necessities of civil or political life.'² This may partly arise from the notion that only an 'Interimsethik' was needed, instead of a complete adjustment to their social context. For the apocalyptic outlook long survived the change of emphasis revealed in the later writings of St. Paul. More likely it is due to the detachment of the plane of our Lord's thought from that on which matter-of-fact human thought was moving. 'My kingdom is not of this world.' And this detachment was encouraged in His followers by the almost complete severance, under the Empire, between the average citizen and the machinery of government. There is therefore the maximum reason for caution in converting our Lord's words to His first followers into political precepts binding on ourselves.

¹ Dr. Cadoux's effort to use the Pilate episode is characteristic. Our Lord, he says, 'is not anxious to exact from Pilate a penalty' for this political outrage—and this is added support for 'non-resistance'! Incidentally, it is not Pilate's guilt but that of his victims that is referred to and brushed aside.

² *European Morals*, ii. 39.

II.

Yet, when all this has been said, His own ideal of human relationships is unmistakable; and it is one incapable either of being realized by 'violent' means or of coexisting with a state of society based, however disguisedly, on force. Our Lord came to establish a society in which one universally valid set of human relationships would supersede all the various other groupings which complicate the world of to-day. In His divine society everything would hinge on the equal relation of all men to God as their Father in heaven. So, as St. Paul was quick to see, in the Christian society 'there can be (ὅτι ἐν) no such distinctions as Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female' (Gal 3²⁸); and so, with this new spiritual kinship as the social goal, nothing can be right in the process of getting there which would hinder the growth of the spirit on which success depends.

Briefly, as the goal is what Harnack calls 'infinite love in ordinary intercourse,' love, not force, must be the uniform means of approach. 'The kingdom of heaven' may have to be 'taken by storm' by the moral earnestness of those who desire to enter it: but it cannot be brought nearer by force; nor can force be used to bring others into it. For force, more than anything, banishes love and stirs up antagonism and fear together. Part at least of the meaning of the third Temptation (Mt 4) is the refusal of our Lord at the very outset to use any means to win His kingdom which were inconsistent with its being the kingdom of God—that is, of infinite and holy love. War, therefore, can never be a Christian method of promoting any Christian cause; the chief objection to it lying not so much in the horrors and cruelties involved (cf., again, the incident of Pilate and the Galileans), but in the fact that the use of force produces psychological reactions (fear and resentment, especially) which impel to the further use of force. And this works cumulatively, leading both aggressor and victim further from the true human goal, which is love, until the process is stopped by some one who refuses to meet force with force.

This is what lies behind the whole of our Lord's familiar teaching about 'non-resistance,' in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere. And though, in the nature of things, He could only speak of the relations of individuals—of Christians to non-Christians, especially, in a hostile social environment—the pacifist is surely right in rejecting the plea that such teaching affects men only in their private capacity. On the one hand, 'we are all

members one of another,' under whatever political conditions; and it is through the relations of individuals that society itself is gradually changed. ('Ye are the salt of the earth,' etc.) On the other hand, what reverses progress when personal relationships only are infected must do so still more seriously when communities take up the wrong mutual attitude, as in war. For to the hardening of distinctions (e.g. of race or class) which 'the kingdom of heaven' overrides there are added the embitterment and poisoning of masses of individual lives. If the distinctive task of the Christian is to reverse what seems to be the natural process,—'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good,'—*a fortiori* he must not do anything to intensify that process. And it is because 'resisting' evil, in the sense of meeting force with force, only multiplies it, while 'non-resistance' may, and often does, undermine and check it, that non-resistance is central in the programme of Christ. So far from 'doing evil that good may come,' we are to accept injury to ourselves, if need be, with a view to 'short-circuiting,' so to speak, the sway of evil in the world.

Here it is important to note the great difference between our Lord's conception of 'non-resistance' and that of the Pharisees, with whose political programme in one sense He agrees. Their acceptance of the inevitable was only political opportunism. Had successful rebellion become practical politics, they would no doubt have joined the Zealots. They shared to the full the traditional 'rancorous nationalism' of the Jew. 'This was indeed,' says Professor Dodd, 'the weakness of the Pharisees as religious guides of the nation during the last fatal half-century.' Seeing the fatal consequences of Zealotry, they 'preached non-resistance; but they did nothing to correct the inward passions which gave Zealotry its appeal.'¹ But Jesus not only differentiates His type of non-resistance by turning it into generosity: 'If your shirt is claimed by a litigant, give him your cloak too; if an official claims you as guide or porter, go with him twice as far as you are obliged.' He demands that such generosity shall have love as its source—the same indiscriminate love as God shows towards men. 'Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that you may become sons of your Father which is in heaven. . . .' Only so can His kingdom come 'as in heaven, so on earth.'

In the face of this whole underlying philosophy of love, it seems pointless to discuss the few passages which are regularly quoted to rebut the full-

¹ *Christianity and War*, p. 36.

blooded pacifist interpretation of our Lord's teaching. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' 'But now (after the Last Supper: Lk 22³⁶) let him that hath none sell his cloak and buy a sword,' etc. The words which seem to sweep all such counterblasts aside are those spoken to Peter still later on the night of the betrayal: 'Put back thy sword into its place, for all who take the sword shall perish by the sword' (Mt 22⁵²). This is true both to human nature and to military history. 'Militarism' in any form sooner or later defeats itself, and 'the meek' do in the end 'inherit the earth.' Tertullian's comment on the passage shows that, as early as A.D. 200, when the problem of military service was already a live and growing one for Christians, some Christians at any rate saw in it a condemnation of all war: 'the Lord, in disarming Peter, ungirded every soldier' (Tert. *Idol.* 19). Dr. Cadoux is right in his claim that the growth of the Christian community depends on 'two gradual processes,' which have to 'go on *pari passu*: firstly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who use violence to restrain wrong, and, secondly, a gradual diminution in the number of those who seem to them to need forcible restraint.'¹

And each generation proves more clearly that, man being what he is, the child of God, moral influences can do more and better things with him than force. It is the truth dimly foreshadowed in Æsop's fable of the sun and the wind, and clearly stated in an Eastern proverb: 'Hatred ceaseth not by hatred at any time, hatred ceaseth only by love.'

Admittedly, then, no Christian as such, and no Christian society as such, could ever consistently resort to war as a means to any Christian end; and, if an end is not Christian, it is not for the Christian, as such, to seek it. It is difficult in these days to imagine any Church, except possibly the one which has so often done so in the past, and which has lately regained its 'temporal sovereignty,' using again the weapons of the world or the 'secular arm' in the supposed interest of the Kingdom of God. When Dr. Cadoux criticises non-pacifist Christians as 'realizing the impossibility of finding any sanction for war in the Gospels' and yet 'clinging to the belief that war is *in these days a Christian duty*'² he simply confuses the issue, if indeed he realizes what it is.

No modern Christian, especially with the experience of the last fifteen years before him, could think of 'war in these days as a Christian duty.'

¹ Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

But many Christians realize that, the world being still what it is, the admittedly sub-Christian society to which, as citizens, they belong, may, as part of the entail of evil from the past, find itself involved in a situation in which *its* duty, in the sense of the least objectionable of the courses open to it, might once more seem to be to take up arms, as Belgium and Great Britain did in 1914. And then the Christian individual would have to ask himself whether by co-operation or abstention he could best promote his Master's interests: a point which, as we have seen, cannot be settled simply by his Master's recorded words. If he decided to serve as a soldier, he would not be 'clinging to the belief that war is a Christian duty': he would (assuming his decision to be honest and conscientious) be merely taking up his own cross and bearing his own share of the piled-up sin of the world. And so, too, would the truly conscientious objector be doing.

III.

So we come to the burning practical problem which so exercises the world to-day, and which every Christian has to be ready to solve in practice for himself if another war comes. Has the time arrived for the ideal which shines out from our Lord's whole philosophy to be treated as every Christian's hard-and-fast rule? And if we cannot lay down the law for every Christian in every situation, how is the individual to decide for himself, as Christ apparently wills him to do?

The application of the Christian ideal in particular circumstances would appear to depend mainly on three things:

- (1) the stage of ethical development at which the whole society concerned has arrived;
- (2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian whose decision is called for; and
- (3) the interests of the Christian cause, viewed as objectively as, in the circumstances, an individual can, and (that it may be so) looked at in company with the Christian body itself.

Brief comment on these three principles must suffice.

(1) What is admittedly an absolute rule for and within the Christian community may be one which, in a sub-Christian society, Christians cannot literally apply without failing in their equally admitted duty to the larger community to which they also belong. There will always be the question, which

in fact was asked in first-century Rome, 'Can a good Christian be a good citizen as well?' And here our Lord, with His 'Render unto Cæsar . . .,' brings, not the peace of a ready-made answer, but the sword of repeated personal decisions.

It is true that in A.D. 66, when the Jews did at last revolt from Cæsar, the Jewish Christians, acting, as they believed, on our Lord's advice to 'flee to the mountains,' withdrew to a Gentile city and took no part in the campaign (cf. Lk 21²⁰⁻²⁴). For some it must have been very hard to become 'conscientious objectors' in this way; but others must equally have realized that already the centre of gravity of the Christian world had shifted from Jerusalem to Rome, and that to identify themselves still with Jewish nationalism would have been not merely suicidal but unfaithful to Christ. And anyhow 'Submit yourselves . . . unto the king (the emperor) as supreme' (1 P 2) was an apostolic injunction. Thus the attitude of the Jewish Christians towards the invasion of Vespasian offers no guidance relevant, say, to the problem that faced Belgian Christians in August 1914.

It is equally true that, by the end of the second century, it was becoming increasingly usual for Christians to enter the imperial forces, quite apart from the conversion of soldiers: which proves that, so far, military service had not come to be regarded by the Church as *ipso facto* inconsistent with the Christian profession. Tertullian, who (as we have seen) was himself anti-militarist, tells the story of the 'Thundering Legion' in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and shows that many were taking up soldiering in his day. What put him against the practice seems rather to have been the pagan incidentals of service than the essential conditions of army life; and so again his testimony decides nothing. In the course of the third century the number of Christian soldiers must have multiplied greatly, to judge by the number of military martyrs. And these martyrdoms themselves attest that it was no slackness of conscience or inconsistency that led such men to serve. More probably, in view of the dangers threatening the Empire and all that it stood for in the world, their presence in the armies represents a conscientious attempt to go on 'rendering unto Cæsar' in so far as Cæsar would at the same time let them 'render unto God.'

When one remembers how St. Paul accepts without question the institution of slavery, even in Christian households—merely premising that the Christian slave of a Christian owner (like Onesimus after his return) will be treated as a

brother beloved, and will act in the same way by his master; when one finds him apparently indifferent as to whether a slave, on his conversion, shall or shall not try to become free, though he deprecates a freeman selling himself into slavery (cf. 1 Co 7²⁰⁻²⁴); it is difficult not to picture him, *in the then state and organization of society*, saying much the same of military service. 'Wast thou called as a soldier? Do not worry about it. And even if thou hast a chance of escaping, it may be better to use the opportunities of that state of life.' (The Greek of v.²¹ is, of course, ambiguous.)

But is the same attitude *still* consistent with Christianity now? That is the real point. There came a time when slavery stood self-condemned before a gradually awakened and educated Christian conscience; and then slavery had to go. The abolitionists had to fight for their principles; but those principles are now taken for granted by the civilized world. Some day war will be in the same position. And some of the abolitionists in this field—the pacifists of to-day—will have to assert their convictions and gradually drive out what they regard as the opportunism of the rest. But has that time come? Could the abolition of slavery have been effected even in England before the Evangelical Revival? If public opinion had not been fairly ripe for conversion, would the abolitionists have effected anything by merely manumitting all their own slaves, and refusing dividends earned in part by slave labour? If public opinion is not yet ripe for a complete renunciation of war in any circumstances whatsoever—and that is what pacificism involves—are the convinced Christians of our own generation a strong enough force to convert it merely by refusing *en masse* (supposing that we could all come to one mind and conscience on the subject) to take up arms in any circumstances themselves? Unquestionably a *really united* Christian refusal would have an effect out of all proportion to the numbers involved. But is there any present prospect of a united protest—which, in this case above all, means an international as well as a pandenominational one? And if not, would the Church really be wise to preach pacifism, in the professional sense, as part of the duty of every Christian, when she cannot prove that either our Lord or the New Testament writers, or those of the first Christian centuries, went so far?

What we all can do and must do is (a) to live right up to the stage of enlightenment actually reached, and part with the world at once if it tries to move backwards, and (b) to use every means to

press on unto perfection' and lead the community to the next higher stage, with the Mind of Christ as the test and goal of progress. And here it should be obvious that what was consistent with Christian duty in 1914-18 need not necessarily be so in the case of 'the next war.' For one thing, the world has learned much about the futility of war, of its inevitably debasing effects on character except when there is the saving grace of Christ, and of its incalculable by-products in the form of both economic and psychological dislocation and misery. We also know now that war in the twentieth century is infinitely more terrible and less capable of idealization, as well as vaster in its sweep, than war in any previous age, and that the next war, if it comes, will be immeasurably worse than the last. And we know that, if 'the war to end war' does have a successor, human nature will go into it ashamed and humiliated and paralysed by self-despair, so that such a war will have even less chance of doing good indirectly than the last war, of which so much was hoped at the time.

Above all, we know that, through the only good by-product of that war so far apparent in the moral and political sphere—the recognition of all-round international obligations, limiting the sovereignty of every self-respecting state, enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Pact for the Renunciation of War as an instrument of policy—no new war can break out under at all the same conditions as the old. Practically every possible belligerent is a signatory of the Covenant or of the Pact, or of both. It will be the duty of Christian citizens of such countries to inquire whether their Government of that day is faithfully fulfilling its obligations. Precipitate action of any sort will be *prima facie* evidence of bad faith. And here, so far from evading responsibility with the old immoral yet intelligible cry, 'My country right or wrong,' it will (I submit) be the duty not of Christians only but of every patriot, for the sake of his country's political honour as well as of the principles of Jesus Christ, to refuse his support of or acquiescence in any warlike act which has not been preceded by an honest and patient effort to use all the existing machinery for peaceful settlement. In other words, there is a far greater likelihood of the Churches having to point and follow the way of 'conscientious objection' in any future war than ever in the past.

The stage of development reached so far, and the Christian obligations consonant with it, seem to me to be admirably registered in the unanimous Resolution passed in September 1929 at Avignon

by the International Management Committee of the 'World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches,' and since then adopted by the British Council of the Alliance. (The Alliance represents the Christian Churches, other than the Roman Church, of thirty-one nations, and the British Council has the same scope in Great Britain and Ireland.)

1. We whole-heartedly welcome the solemn declaration made by the leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another, and agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.
2. We believe that war considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and therefore incompatible with the mind and method of His Church.
3. While convinced that the time must come for the revision of existing treaties in the interests of peace, we maintain that all disputes and conflicts between nations, for which no solution can be found through diplomacy or conciliation, ought to be settled or solved through arbitration, whether by the World Court or by some other tribunal mutually agreed. For this purpose we desire the immediate completion of such organizations as will provide means for pacific settlement of every kind of international dispute and will enthrone justice among all peoples.
4. We earnestly appeal to the respective authorities of all Christian communions to declare in unmistakable terms that they will not countenance, nor assist in any way in, any war with regard to which the Government of their country has refused a *bona fide* offer to submit the dispute to arbitration.

The next step before the churches now would seem to be to make such declarations as § 4 envisages, and to start educating their members for action along such lines. Here pacifists and non-pacifists can surely join forces. It is interesting to note that, at an International Youth Conference held in Switzerland under the auspices of the World Alliance, only three weeks before the Avignon

meeting, the young people, after a preamble in caustic terms condemning the Churches for failure in their duty during the late war and since, urged them to define their attitude towards war in the terms originally adopted by the 'Copec' Conference of 1924 :

'That the Churches should unreservedly condemn, and refuse to support in any way, a war waged before the matter in dispute has been submitted to an arbitral tribunal, or in defiance of the decision of such a tribunal.'

This suggests that there is at present a risk of Christians lagging even behind the politicians, just as the politicians are apt in practice to shirk the consequences of documents to which they have set their hands. At the least it is the duty of the Christian community, as such, to refuse to fall below the existing high-water mark of political theory, and to satisfy themselves, before joining in any conflict, that their country really did use all provided means of avoiding it. Then, having got the existing high-water mark really respected, we shall have to go on to force it higher.

IV.

Much shorter treatment must suffice for the other two considerations on which, as has been previously suggested, the application of the Christian ideal must depend; viz. (2) the moral and spiritual illumination of the individual Christian called on to decide, and (3) the interests of the Christian cause itself, viewed as objectively as possible.

Under (2), the ruling principle would seem to be two-sided. First, 'let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' A really conscientious and whole-hearted acceptance of an intrinsically lower ideal may be more 'Christian' than an artificial or 'second-hand' adhesion to an intrinsically higher. No one would defend the coward who pleaded 'conscientious objection.' But it might be better for one who suspected that his own 'objection' was really cowardice to take up *the other* cross, by enlisting, rather than remain 'of doubtful mind.' Refusal to fight in a case where (*ex hypothesi*) the fighting has been forced on one's country, on the ground that one had been brought up to pacifism, would also, I think, be indefensible. One would have to be personally convinced that to fight is inevitably wrong; and in this case a man's duty would be clear—to prove his conviction by acting on it. But, secondly, 'Who art thou that

judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.' St. Paul's handling of 'conscience' in the matter of 'meats offered to idols' is apt guidance for the parallel here. Just as the real 'conscientious objector' must never be penalized, so neither must he say to his brother who fights: 'I have a Christian conscience, and you have not.' Yet, though each must be free from the other's conscience, he must perpetually bring his own to the touchstone of the mind of Christ.' 'Jesus brings us into conflict with social duties to which we all wish to cling.'¹ When the world has already moved so far towards outlawing war, it cannot but become increasingly difficult for any instructed Christian to undertake to fight with anything like 'full persuasion in his own mind': and the more he knows of the mind of Christ, the harder it is likely to be.

(3) At the same time, even the most convinced, either way, will have to remember that 'none of us liveth unto himself.' In other words, individual conviction must still be related, if not subordinated, to the good of the Christian whole. A Christian has to consider not only the effect on his own conscience, say, of his consenting to fight, but the effect of either consent or refusal on the good name of the Christian Church. 'I do all things with an eye to the gospel,' says St. Paul; and it is at least arguable that a general outburst of Christian pacifism might do more to thwart the gospel than the continued participation of Christians in war. 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*; whether it be to the king as supreme . . .' That surely covered military service then; and, if it were in the Lord's interests for Christians not to stand apart from the rest of the nation they belong to, it would cover it now. Perhaps the maximum of self-crucifixion would be reached by the man who, himself a real conscientious objector, decided to fight after all, lest conscientious objection on his part should prejudice the appeal of his Master to his fellow-men. The Jews could afford to be known and treated as a 'peculiar people,' with special exemptions. But as such they could never have evangelized the world. The Christian, with his primary task of getting alongside and winning others, cannot afford to erect a barrier of misunderstanding between himself and them by seeming to refuse crosses which they have to bear, even though he claim to be bearing a greater.

The conclusion of the whole matter I cannot

¹ William Herrmann, *Essays on the Social Gospel*, Eng. tr., p. 163 (quoted by Cadoux).

put better than in some words of Mr. George Shillito in the booklet to which I have so often referred :

‘ Through a slowly clarifying inward vision we move to moral capacity . . . Striving towards right decisions, men and nations become great,—

“ Life’s business being just the terrible choice.”

. . .

‘ There are no short cuts out of the embarrassment created by ages of human sin, and ignorance, and catastrophe. . . .

‘ The task to which we are called is not the melodramatic and impossible performance of downing arms, but a wise, persistent, whole-hearted evangelisation of all the nations of the world.’¹

¹ *Christianity and War*, pp. 59-60.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

IV. The Contribution of Germany to Church History: Ancient Church and Reformation.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MACKINNON, PH.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

I.

GERMANY’S contribution to the literature of Church History is very extensive, and in two short articles one can only indicate its main content and characteristics. Even so, considerations of space have compelled the writer to limit this survey to the two most formative periods of Church History—those of the rise and development of the Catholic Church and of the Reformation.

In their treatment of Church History the Germans display no little initiative in the formulation of problems and theories relative to the subject-matter of the various periods. The discussion of these problems and theories has stimulated inquiry and has contributed to a fresh elucidation of a given theme or movement. The old method of the academic disputation has been transferred from the rostrum to the study and the press, and has expressed itself in the controversial tone of many works in all departments of German science, and not least in that of Church History. The contentious, doctrinaire spirit is at times unduly obtrusive. The method has thus its drawbacks inasmuch as the subjective element, as revealed in individual temperament and conviction, is apt to affect the objective treatment of the subject in question. As in other departments of scientific activity, it has left, as a memorial of misdirected effort, a bulky record of exploded or greatly modified theories. For instance, the Tübingen theory of

the early development of Christianity under the influence of the Jewish-Christian and the Pauline-Gentile antithesis, resulting in the synthesis of the Fourth Gospel, which is assigned to the second half of the second century. On the whole, however, the method has substantially contributed to the advancement of historical knowledge.

The Germans are strong in textual criticism. They have long realized the importance of correct texts, and have devoted immense learning and labour to the production of critical and competently annotated editions of the sources of the various epochs of Church History—particularly those of the Ancient Church and the Reformation. Equally admirable is their application of the critical spirit in the exposure of the unauthentic material in which certain periods of Church History abound. They have, further, grasped the fundamental truth that Church History is not an isolated phenomenon and can only be adequately elucidated in relation to the general history of the time. In the early period, for instance, the development of Christian thought and institutions was largely influenced by Hellenism and the constitution of the Roman Empire, and the more recent German historical literature shows ample evidence of the comprehension of this cardinal fact.

The German contribution to Church History in recent times also reveals the striving to apply to