

Does Jesus Teach Pacifism?

“Turn the Other Cheek” Study

Matthew 5:38-39 is the commonly used proof text. Jesus said: "You have heard not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also."

The Sermon on the Mount, from which this passage is taken; deals with righteous personal conduct. Jesus prefaces His ‘Turn other cheek’ teaching with vs. **17-19**:

“Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy (abolish) but to fulfill. For assuredly I say to you, till heaven & earth pass away, one jot (smallest letter) or one tittle (smallest stroke) will by no means pass from the Law till all is fulfilled. Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, & teaches men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of heaven. But whoever does & teaches them shall be called greatest...”

In **Matt 5:38-39**, Christ is clearing up a confusion that had led people to think that conduct proper for the civil government: (that is, taking vengeance) was also proper for an individual. This way of thinking is not correct, He teaches us.

Even the choice of words used by Jesus, indicate that He was addressing a confusion, or distortion, that was commonplace. Judaism had crashed. The religious rulers were corrupt & teaching others their corruption.***

Several times in the rest of the Sermon, He used this same "you have heard it said" figure of speech to straighten out distortions or falsehoods which were being mis-taught by the religious leaders. So much so was the false teaching, that it had culminated into actual *traditions*, suggesting being taught for a lengthy time (**Matt 15:1-9**) Contrast His corrective phrase to His other phrase of "it is written" when He was appealing to the Scriptures for authority.

(In **Matthew 4** His temptation by the devil, Christ answered each one of the devil's lies or misquotes from the Scripture with the words: "it is written" Satan's perversional quotes, although from the Bible, were being used as attempts to get the Lord to commit sin)

To further underscore the point that Jesus was *correcting* the religious leaders on their teaching that "an eye for an eye" applies to private revenge, consider that in the same teaching, Jesus strongly condemned false teaching:

"Whoever therefore breaks one of the commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven..."

(**Matthew 5:19**). Clearly, Jesus could NOT be teaching something *different* about self defense than is taught elsewhere in the Bible: (See below: Self Defense In the OT)

Otherwise, He would be contradicting Himself for He would now be teaching men to break one of the commandments.

Heb 13:8, Mal 3:6 -The Lord does not change; so neither does His Moral Law that is supposed to be written on our hearts.

Heb 10:16 There are no new commands, as some are saying..

See beginning paragraph of: **Self Defense in NT below for more scriptures that prove no new commands.**

The Bible distinguishes clearly between the duties of the (the government) and the duties of an individual. Namely, God has delegated to the governmental rulers:

The administration of justice. Rom 13.

But it is the Individual's responsibility of protecting their lives & dependants from attackers. (Rom 13 doesn't say that is the purpose of the rulers.) Christ was also referring to this same distinction in the Matthew 5 passage. So what Scriptures give us insight into the roles of government and of individuals?

***** The level of corruption of the religious leaders can be clearly seen in a related issue. Blood Of Innocents. Which is an enormous OT study & worth doing as it relates well. When Judas, in horror, realized the enormity of his betrayal sin; he tried to repent to the priests. Did the leaders offer sacrifice for him? Instead they told him it was on his own head. They had in essence 'hired' him for the blood of an innocent w/ 30 pcs of silver. Why? Because it is a great sin to have the Blood Of Innocents on your hands before God. They tried to get around being guilty by not committing the sin directly themselves. (Matt 27:1-8) Also the practice of banning people from the temple (John 9:22) was a common death sentence- as sacrifice could no longer be made for their sins. How wicked!**

Role of Government

Resisting an Attack is not to be confused with Taking Vengeance which is the exclusive domain of God (Romans 12:19). This has been delegated to the rulers, who are, Romans 13:4,

"God's minister to you for good. But if you do evil, be afraid; for he does not bear the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil."

Do you agree that Vengeance & Defense are 2 separate things? They are certainly not the same words or used interchangeably in the Hebrew or Greek.

Strongs H1598, G4043/H5358, G5360....

Personal Vengeance by definition means one would stalk down a criminal after one's life is no longer in danger.

This requires premeditation, & deliberate, decisive, subsequent actions- not accidental or ignorant.

This is not to be confused with Defending oneself during an Attack. The deciding factor between the 2- Motive & Intention. (Mini study in the beginning of the Turn Other Cheek video...God judges us in this way)

Vengeance shows an evil motive to repay evil for evil (Rom 12:17) when it is not our right to do so, but God's alone.(Rom 12:19) It is this very point that has been confused (some ignorantly, some deliberately) by Christian pacifists who take the passage in the Sermon on the Mount about turning the other cheek (which prohibits private vengeance/retaliation) into a new Command to lie down before the wicked. They make no distinction between Vengeance & Defense- yet our own laws here & more importantly The Bible- does:

6th Commandment tells us "Thou shall not murder." BUT the chapters following, God gave to Moses many of the situations which ironically require a death penalty.

If Murder/Kill are the same, who could be the executioner without condemning himself?

Well God clearly has not told us never to kill. He has told us not to Murder (distinction) which means we are not to take an innocent life. Even the Hebrew words are different, for each bears distinction from another; some definitions including the intent*...

An assailant is not innocent. The Lord says He will not justify the wicked **Ex 23:7**, Consider also that the rulers are to be a terror to those who practice evil. This passage does not imply that the role of law enforcement is to protect individuals from those criminals. It states only that the Ruler is a minister to serve as "an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil." Not preventer. The FEAR of the Ruler's God given power (to deliver the death penalty)- *THAT* is the preventer. (**Romans 13:4**) So who is the protector in this equation? With the grace & power of the Lord - YOU.

This point is reflected in legal doctrine of the United States. Repeatedly, courts have held that the government has no responsibility to provide individual security....Thus laws mandating persons to provide for their own protections such as: Car Insurance...

*Strong's Hebrew : 5221 nakah 2026 harag 4191 muwth 7819 shachat 7523 ratsach 2873 tabach

Consequences for Wicked Behavior

Sending someone to Hell before their time is not really a solid argument for never acting in Defense. We know that no one goes to Hell on accident. If someone is acting in a wicked

manner (which is the reason of this whole topic)... they are already on their way. Again **Romans 13:3-4**,

“Rulers are not a terror to good works but to evil” The Lord has placed that authority, & **“if you do evil be afraid – for he does not bear the sword in vain.”**

Peter 2:14- Rulers, **“are for the punishment of evil doers”**...

Reaping what you sow (**Gal 6**) bears meaning through those verses above in **Romans 13 & Peter 2** along with these others below:

Job 4:8 **“Those who plow iniquity & sow trouble; reap the same”.**

Hosea 10:3 **“You have plowed wickedness & reaped iniquity”**

Prov 22:8 **“He who sows iniquity will reap trouble”**

Psalms 7:14-16 **“Behold the wicked brings forth iniquity; Yes he conceives trouble & brings forth falsehood. He made a pit, dug it out & has fallen into it. His trouble shall return upon his own head & his violence shall come upon his own head.”**

Both the Old and New Testaments teach Defense. Most Christians do not deny it is in OT, but have a difficult time recognizing it in the NT:

Self Defense in the Old Testament

Defense cannot be found in scripture as something abhorred by God. Instead we read:

Exodus 22:2-3 **"If the thief is found breaking in, and he is struck so that he dies, there shall be no guilt for his bloodshed. If the sun has risen on him, there shall be guilt for his bloodshed. He should make full restitution; if he has nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft."**

One immediate conclusion we can draw from this command is that lethal force in the instance of night time assault was permitted. Why?

Because you cannot discern the intent of the attack. Its dark- you were sleeping- you have NO IDEA what this wicked person's intentions are...

During the day, we can discern whether he is merely a kid, or has a deadly weapon, & we can also identify his person or likeness in our witness, in the case that later he can be apprehended if he escapes. We also have more clarity of mind- not dulled by sleep. We are not to kill him in non life-threatening circumstances, but in the case of darkness the victim was guiltless.

Self Defense in the New Testament

The argument that God has changed His mind & has now given a new command: falls flat.

The only “new command” Jesus gives (**John 13:38**) is to love one another- which is not new (“**love thy neighbor**”... **Lev 19:18**) but taken to the next level...So He repeats it again in **John 15:12-13** “love one another as I have loved you”. How was Jesus loving? By sacrificing himself for us...“**No greater love is there than this: that a man lay his life down for his friends**”

John also reiterates the same ‘new command’ expanded in **1 John 2:7-11** & **2 John 5-6**. He calls it new, yet says it's not new at all. The writer of Hebrews makes it clear that, “**Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever**” (**Heb 13:8**). Malachi records God's Words this way: “**For I am the Lord, I**

do not change" (**Mal 3:6**). Paul referred to the unchangeability of God's Word when he wrote Timothy that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work" (**2 Timothy 3:16-17**). Clearly, Paul viewed all Scripture, including the OT, as useful for training Christians in every area of life.

Sword Confusion

Lets consider the specifics of what Jesus told the disciples in his last hours: "...But now, he who has a money bag, let him take it, and likewise a sack; and he who has no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one" **Luke 22:36**. Keep in mind that the sword was the finest offensive weapon available to an individual soldier at that time...

Some will object at this point that only a few hours later, Jesus rebuked Peter who used a sword on Malchus, a servant of the high priest in the company of a band of soldiers. Lets look at it: **Matt 26:52-54**: "Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. Or do you think that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He will provide Me with more than twelve legions of angels? How then could the Scriptures be fulfilled, that it must happen thus?"

This was not the first time that Christ had to explain to the disciples why He had come to earth. And to ask why He didn't defend himself at this time is along the same lines... (**Matt 16:21**) In order to fulfill the Scriptures, the Son of God had to die for the sin of man since man was incapable of paying for his own sin. Jesus could have saved His life, but there would

be no salvation. These things only became clear to the disciples after Jesus had died and been raised from the dead and the Spirit had come into the world at Pentecost (**John 14:26, Luke 24:45-49**)

While Jesus figuratively was telling Peter, put your “butter knife” back in its place: (By His legions of angels declaration); He clearly did not say to get rid of it forever. He actually said **put it back “in ITS PLACE..”** (where it belonged). To now command Peter to throw it away would have contradicted what he clearly told the disciples only hours before. Peter's sword was to protect his own mortal life from danger. The Lord would no longer be with them.

No man could have part in the road to the cross whatsoever - Jesus had to be taken completely unjustly & Peter was on the verge of ruining a fulfillment of scripture. **Isaiah 53**

Satan would've had accusation against the Lord, had the Lord not fixed Peter's mistake. 'He didn't go so quietly to the slaughter after all did he?'...

After all, Peter's “butter knife” was not necessary to protect the Creator of the universe and the King of kings; who by His Word can generate life & by His Word life will disintegrate.

The ROYAL LAW (called so by **James 2:8**)

Consider what Jesus taught in Luke. Summarizes all the laws of the OT Bible into 2 great commandments:

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself" (Lk 10:27)

When asked who was a neighbor, Jesus gave the parable of the Good Samaritan (**Lk 10:30-37**). It was the Good Samaritan who took **action** to assist the needs of the robbery victim who was a neighbor to him. The others who took no **action** yet saw the helpless victim's plight were not neighbors to him.

The Lord commanded we love our neighbor as ourself. How do we love ourself? **“No man has ever hated his own flesh, but rather nourishes & cherishes it” Eph 5:29.**

How would it be possible to nourish or cherish our neighbor by watching them be assaulted or raped & do nothing? Furthermore on the part of taking **action**; **James 1:22- 2:26** gives more insight also. If we see someone in need (**vs 2:15-17**) yet do nothing about it (take no **action**)- what good is that? The summation of this whole exhortation of James is Rahab.(also commended in the faith ch **11 Hebrews**) What faith did she possess? Faith with **deeds**. Rahab feared the God of Israel & by her **actions** did not allow His people to be captured & killed.

1 John 3:14-19... vs 17&18 **“Whoever has worldly goods & sees his brother in need, and shuts up his heart from him; how does the love of God abide in him? Let us not love in word or tongue- but in deed & in truth. Action.**

Role of Head of House (Husband/Father)

Years after Pentecost, Paul wrote in a letter to Timothy **“But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever” (1 Tim. 5:8).** This passage applies to our subject because it would be absurd to buy a house, furnish it with

food and facilities for one's family, but then refuse to install locks to provide the means to protect the family and the property. Likewise it would be absurd not to subdue or last resort even take, if necessary, the life of a night-time thief to protect the members of the family (**Exodus 22:2-3**). Eph 5:23-32 Jesus Christ gave His life for the church. We are to have the same *kind* of love for our wives. We can't hang ourselves on crosses for sin. So what does this mean?

“For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the church; & He is the Savior of the body.....vs.28
“love as own bodies nourish & cherish” We are Commanded to love both wives & neighbors as self; and in the above passages proof of that love, required **action**.

Other interesting related passages to Defense NT & OT:

Matt 12:29/ Mk 3:27 Binding the Strongman of the House

The Watchman of **Ezekiel 18 & 33**

Not only is this accurately applied to the sinners soul in the open air; But ALSO was of LITERAL meaning to the Jews in regards to defense of city & peoples within. Notice blood required (you'll find this in an Innocents study too)

Nehemiah 4 – rebuilding temple under hostility of enemies
Verse 14: **“Do not be afraid of them. Remember the Lord; great & awesome & FIGHT for your brethren, your sons, daughters, wives & your houses”**. Note that this was not a Theocratical command- & they all carried weapons at their sides. Their conclusion- **verse 20**

“Our God will fight for us.” did not have the meaning that God would ‘just take care of it’... but rather that He would deliver the outcome of any actual ensuing battle to them; just as He had in so many instances before. They would still be physically fighting (*action* required) that battle with those weapons...

1 Samuel 29 & 30

David rescues (*action*) women & children Again, not by Theocractical command but by request to God. And kills 400 wicked ppl who attacked a DEFENSELESS city full of women & children.

God did not bring them back by miracle, or answered prayer... Some scripture examples about God’s feelings about the defenseless are also given in my video: like **1 Sam 15:1-3**

Trusting God; or Praying the Bad Guy Away?

Another question by Christians is "Doesn't self defense imply a lack of trust that God will take care of us?" Indeed, God will take care of us. But He has also told us that if we love Him, we will keep His commandments. (John 14:15**) *action*.**

Those who TRUST God, must still work to earn a living, knowing that **1 Timothy 5:8 command tells us "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse that an unbeliever."**

For a man not to work, yet expect to eat because he was "trusting God" would actually be to defy God. So for a man to refuse to provide adequately for his/his family's defense (ie:

refuse to install lock & windows in their house because 'God will protect') is along the lines of tempting/defying God.

Consider again, that at one point, when Satan was tempting Jesus in the wilderness, he challenged Jesus to throw himself off the top of the temple. Satan reasoned that God's angels would protect him... (eerily similar way of thought) Why didn't Jesus just do it? Jesus responded: **"It is written again, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.'" (Matthew 4:7)**

It may seem humble to say that one is trusting in God for protection, and we all must, but it is also tempting God if we do not take any measures to protect ourselves. He gave us common sensibilities.

King David wrote of trusting God *and* God's help many times. I guess someone forgot to tell him that he just wasn't trusting God enough, & that he did not need to go fight Goliath.

Instead we read about David's understanding of God. **Psalms 46:1** **"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."** Yet, David's trust in God does not conflict with the God **"Who trains my hand for war and my fingers for battle"** (**Psalms 144:1**) sorry, but that requires **action**. **The doctrine of Scripture is that we prepare and work, but we always trust the outcome to God.** In this truest sense; David himself said **"...the LORD does not save with sword & spear; for the battle IS the LORD'S & He will give you into our hands."** **1 Sam 17:47** Yet David used sling & sword; & then swords, shields & spears for all kinds of other battles.

So, Christian, do you know what these things mean?

Again, the doctrine of Scripture is that we both prepare and work, but we always trust the outcome to God.

Christians who would like to say they're "trusting God" in this fashion need to be consistent. Cancel their homeowners insurance & let the car insurance run out, stop taking your children to the doctors -- that would at least be consistent...

Those who fully trust God are not sinning or showing lack of faith by making provision for themselves or others: by food, home, medical attention, or even Defense.

A great NT example would be the various times servants of the Lord were helped by others to escape death. Were these sins? Paul certainly trusted God even in the utmost of distressing times (Acts 27:25**) Yet Paul was let down by basket over the city wall to escape certain death (**Acts 9:23-25**) Paul was warned about the murder plot of the Jews & had it revealed (**Acts 23:16-31**) Aquila & Priscila risked their own lives for Paul (**Rom 16:3-4**)... Why weren't they just "trusting God" to poof it away?**

Again, the doctrine of Scripture is that we prepare & work, (action**) but we trust the outcome to God.**

The same way we are saved by GRACE can be a mirror to this very point.

We do not believe ETERNAL SECURITY. We do not name it & claim it. *Personal responsibility & **action coincides.***

Though we are saved by GRACE; "It is still a hope, yet to be reaped, in the age to come & that by much tribulation we enter the Kingdom, & that the violent (or better translated strivers)

take it by force” (or striving) Not war striving, but agonizing spiritual battle against *sin* striving.... (**Titus 3:7, Gal 6:8-9, Mk 10:30, Acts 14:22, Matt 11:12**)

Likewise, the Promised Land was given to the Israelites through God's hand under Joshua's leadership- YET he still had to go & take it through battles. **Action.** (**Josh 1:1-11**)

Prayer is not answered for all things. So a sole reliance on prayer is not the universal answer. Amount of faith, reason for request & God's own will are all factors. (**1 John 5:14, James 1:5-8 & 4:3**)

Jesus didn't perform all His miracles by prayer alone. Neither did the disciples use prayer for every situation. (Jesus' prayer in the garden was not answered to **“remove this cup from Me”**(**Lk 22:42**) as it was NOT the will of God the Father.)

Consider God's own will: There are countless instances in Scripture where His judgment was executed by the hand of His saints. (**1 Sam 15:32-33**) It may be that an assailant has reached his end by God's will at the hand of a righteous Saint.

Binding Things

Some may say that if they or a loved one were attacked they would just “bind the attacker in the name of the Lord”.

There are only 2 references to “Binding”. **Matt 16:19** was directed solely to Peter alone. So we're left with **Matt 18:18**, which has been used to build a doctrine that we cannot prove by *any* other scriptures that Christians have some mystical power to ‘bind’ things.

There are *no other* verses in the Bible to help build a doctrine around this one verse. We know this is the way false teachers work- exalting one Scripture to the exclusion of others in order to make something from nothing. My most humble suggestion to other Christians is to leave it alone.

Popular False Teachers like Junita Bynum & Benny Hinn love this verse & use it frequently to prove their “power” over things (if false teachers like- there’s good reason to be wary) & it’s almost always used in combination with the prideful doctrine of ‘**Name It & Claim It**’ & the twisted doctrine of ‘**Spiritual Warfare**’ against Satan; where people are running around casting out demons from walls & car tires among other UnBiblical & ridiculous things.

If “Binding” were an actuality in this sense - Christian’s could take turns pronouncing their daily “Bind” on Satan & we ourselves could banish evil from the earth to let peace rein instead of the Prince of the Power of the Air! No? There are no instances in the Bible (NT or OT) where we can see the use of this “Binding”.

The next verse, **Matt 18:19** also tells us “**That if two agree on earth concerning anything that they ask, it will be done for them by My Father in heaven.**” Yet again, we must consider that some prayers are NOT answered no matter how many people are asking because of: motive, God’s will, amt of faith, or even mistreatment of a spouse.**(1 John 5:14, James 1:5-8 & 4:3, 1 Pet 3:7)** A lot of False Teachers “pride teach”: Because God promised something –you can demand from Him to receive your promise. Sorry, but God’s promises have **conditions**, & humility would always be the first.

Martyr = Victim?

Are not the same. Period. The Bible does not use them interchangeably, So why are some making such an attempt to confuse them?

Strong's H 2026,5221,/G 443,5406....

**Dying for Christ is the HIGHEST HONOR
a Servant of the Lord could be allowed by God.**

If it were presented to me, my wife, or the Brothers I know-- we would joyfully die for Him. No hesitation. But how could we be so naïve, to even think, that every evil ever brought upon us is for Christ? There are plenty of situations that a Christian deals with that are NOT related to Christ. I am not an IDOLATER by choosing my children over Jesus when Jesus is NOT even one of the choices!

Jesus Christ has nothing to do with the evil intentions of a pedophile seeking to kidnap children!

Jesus Christ has nothing to do with a man breaking in to steal your electronics!

Jesus Christ has nothing to do with the intentions of a serial murderer!

Those who cannot discern between martyrdom & victimization- please wake up!

If you are mugged & then killed in the parking lot of Walmart did you die for CHRIST – or your WALLET!?

We don't expect our children to die as martyrs yet; can't say they even have reached the age of accountability... the oldest is 3 & shows clear confusion still about why some things are wrong to do. They don't know Christ by association w/us, & if they were killed by a pedophile or kidnapper they would not be martyrs for Jesus. They would die as innocents.

Not everything is Martyrdom. Dave Wilkerson wasn't martyred by a truck... John Edwards wasn't a martyr by small pox... & there are Pastors in the news who've been killed by robbers that wanted no witnesses- AFTER they got the money! The intent wasn't to kill a Christian FOR THEIR FAITH. (Martyrdom) It was \$ with no witness!

Some want to argue that these 'scenarios' are ridiculous – in what way? Jesus gave the Good Samaritan illustration & THAT man wasn't attacked for his FAITH either. Where in 'amish-land' could some of these people be living that they think our country is filled with nice people? Don't they know that even amish school children have been murdered by the wicked in PA without cause? Maybe a good wake up would be Bro Rueben's news article compilation "The Goodness of Man"- heinous crimes committed without rational cause against people in our land...

Saving Life...Losing It?

Matt 10:39 “He who finds his life will lose it, & he who loses his life for My sake will it”.

Matt 16:25 “For whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it”

Mk 8:35 “For whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake & the Gospel’s will find it.”

Luke 9:24 “For whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it.”

John 12:25 “He who loves his life in this world will lose it, & he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life.”

It is a bit shocking to use these in reference to Defense. All alone & out of context like I typed them, it’s very obvious that Defense isn’t even the topic being spoken of. They all talk of losing life for (MY) Jesus/Gospel sake. Martyrdom.

In context, they’re surrounded by “**take up your cross**” & “**what does it profit to gain the whole world & lose your soul**” & “**whoever is ashamed of Me..**”...Which now shows the doctrines of ‘Dying to Self’ & ‘Crucifying the Flesh & its Lusts’... In the youtube video I clearly said that Defense & Martyrdom are not the same. The Bible does not view it as the same. So why are some trying to use it interchangeably? What is the real underlying reason? Can only speculate... Could be: sheer ignorance, deception by false teaching, pride, fear, cowardice, secret sin, no Spirit...

So...Saving Life –Losing It?

Is answered only with the utmost of *irony*: (again, I am not talking about martyrdom here: but defending)

If a Christian were to take no **action** when someone else is being victimized, **THEY** would be the one seeking to **SAVE** *their* (spiritual) life at the cost of another's (physical).

Paul didn't have that same 'I want to save myself from hell, so you go ahead and die instead' attitude- **"...I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren (Jews) my countrymen, according to the flesh."** **Rom 9:1-4(3)**

This attitude is also how some Christians are viewing police. They don't want to do something that they think is **SIN** (defense) so I'll go call somebody else to come & sin for me. (also eerily similar to the Pharisee's school of thought)

Another superb Bible study: Causing Another Person To Sin **(Matt 5:32, Matt 13:41, Matt 18:6-7, Mk 9:42, Luke 17:1-3, Malachi 2:7-8, Rom 14:20-21, 1 Cor 8:11-13)**

So what are *those* ramifications?

I pose questions to those who would like to employ police for an attack (an attack outside of martyrdom- which is still the topic here).

Why?

In light of the Romans 13 passage, we have discovered *protection* is not the government's Bible mandation. Also, police cannot even stop an attack unless they are present during it. Street Preachers especially can attest that there are a higher percentage of unlawful officers pushing their unlawful agendas than there are lawful ones. We all see

it/deal with it in the open air all the time. Why do you expect a law *perverter* to enforce it? How is that not a big double standard?

NT Interactions with Soldiers

Luke 3:7-(14) Soldiers came to John Baptist and asked what they must do to be saved. John Baptist missed his perfect opportunity to tell them to quit the army. No, instead he allowed them to remain in the calling that they were called (**1 Cor 7:17-24**) by giving instruction not to extort “**anyone for money, nor accuse falsely, & be content with your wages**”.

Acts 16:30 Philippian Jailer. “**What must I do to be saved?**” Believe on Jesus AND stop being a soldier. No that’s not what Paul said. Paul through the Spirit wrote the **1 Cor 7:17-24** passage about remaining in what you are called.

Acts 10: (1)-48 Cornelius a Centurion Soldier... Peter must have forgot to tell him to quit his soldiership too?

So, ... Defending “Our Country” ?

There would be no issue with being in military forces IF we were a God serving, God fearing nation. Fact is we aren’t. Maybe we were in the past (debatable) but our past does not define what we are at present. (I was wicked in the past; but not now.) Our nation is evil at present.

If God had a problem with armed forces, naturally He *never* would have commanded His nation of Israelites to be militant. All enemies would have been destroyed by His Word or miracles- NEVER would His special people have been defiled by picking up a weapon to battle. Why would He force

them to do things He hates? He's not the author of confusion, **(1 Cor 14:33)** but complete order (even if we don't understand the whole picture).

So what about Christians joining the military? No. Already stated, our nation hates God—so why would a Christian even want to be involved? We are **ALREADY soldiers of the Highest calling & in BATTLE** at present: **2 Tim 2:3-4** “**Endure hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No soldier in warfare entangles himself in the affairs of this life, that he may please his commanding officer.**” Military service to a wicked nation would be an entangling worldly affair at the very least.

What about Christians converted in service? Wouldn't they have to remain in what they are called? **(1 Cor 7:17-24)** Of course not! The Bible may permit military service, but the best advice I would give someone is to get out asap. (Entangling affair) Unfortunately, you can't just quit- doesn't work that way here. Also, Paul didn't expect us to remain in evil or place ourselves in potentially compromising situations. We already know our nation is evil & we should never serve evil. We serve Jesus **(Col 3:24)** and cannot serve both God & evil; “**having two masters...**” **(Luke 16:13, Matt 6:24)**. None of Paul's examples in **1 Cor 7** passage were evil things. Staying a prostitute would be another good example of a profession in which someone naturally cannot remain...

What about the examples of soldiers in NT? Cornelius “**FEARED God, was just & devout & treated the people well & prayed to God always.**” **Acts 1:2** Yet, He did not have salvation... Soldiers weren't told to leave the military just as tax collectors weren't commanded to stop collecting taxes,

but both were told that their personal mindsets/actions/desires would have to change in order to have salvation.(**Luke 3**) Same thing Jesus told Nicodemus (**John 3**)

If that can NOT be done, while continuing in ANY profession you're in: Naturally a Christian has to quit. Also, while military service may be permissible, its hardly profitable to the Kingdom of God & service to Jesus. **1 Cor 6:12** “All things are lawful for me, but all things are not profitable. All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of anything.” How hard it would be to be obedient like Paul here, to Jesus, if you were given a command to do something evil (which is not unheard of in our military).

Find another job- rather than place oneself in ANY possible compromising situation. We must defend our family, the ones we have responsibility over, not our wicked nation; **for we're not citizens here at all.** (**Heb 11:13-14**) Above all things, we must have a clear conscience before the Lord. It would be nearly impossible to do so in our nation's forces today. This same concept is shown in: “meat to idols” teachings by Paul. Although it was not a sin to eat this meat sold in market after idol sacrifice, it was only with a clear conscience that it could be eaten & abstinence was far better for conscience sake of others. **1 Cor chapter 8 & 1 Cor 10:23-33**

ABOVE ALL, THE CHRISTIAN MUST HAVE A PURE HEART & PURE CONSCIENCE BEFORE GOD.

How can that be done with Innocent Blood on the Hands?

“Surely for your lifeblood I will demand a reckoning; from the hand of every beast will I require it, & from the hand of every man. From the hand of every man’s brother I will require the life of man.” Gen 9:5

Love takes ACTION.

Otherwise it’s just words. (Luke 6:46, John 14:15)

This is why we don’t sit at home & pray people to repentance. We go to the streets & compel them with everything we can because that’s true love Brothers; Most of you already know that.

Closing Scriptures

**The more important matters of the law are:
Justice, Mercy & Faith Matt 23:23**

“Go & learn what this means, “I desire mercy & not sacrifice”... Matt 9:13

**He is a Jew who is circumcised in heart, in the Spirit
-not by keeping the Letter-
& has God’s praise. Rom 2:28-29**

Love is the fulfillment of the law Rom 13:10

God bless those who break out the Word, study with a humble heart & if need be; change their view of this important topic...

Those who refuse to go to Scriptures & do a serious study, yet hold to their views with little - to- no scriptural back up; The Bible says

“Let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment”. James 3:1

Also, Ask yourself, what are the physical & spiritual consequences of teaching others not to fulfill the righteous requirements of defending and/or protecting innocent life?