

## HLH- 800202- Military Service \_ Church

So I was involved in those early days in the Korean War with Mr. Dick Armstrong as one of the two first so involved in having the problem brought directly to our attention where we had to make appeals, where we had to appear before a local judge to have certain matters decided.

So today I should like to address the question less from the perspective of trying to explain every verse in the Bible that might touch upon the subject as to give you a preliminary view as to how you might approach the topic, what you as parents should know, and whether your parents or grandparents what you ought to know in terms of instruction, and in terms of your responsibility should a crisis arise which I do not foresee at the moment with respect to your jobs.

There are a number of things that most people do not know about and decisions that had to be made which may not have to be made in the future, which indeed may have to be altered so that the church policy is not necessarily a fixed policy because the Bible is not the only standard in this case that determines what you do.

Now that may sound strange, but indeed it was the circumstances and I want you to note.

We live in a world of course where Rhodesia's policy, South Africa's policy, the United States' policy, or East Germany's, or Czechoslovakia's policy where we have brethren are so different that we have to provide solutions administratively that would be unacceptable in one country but acceptable in another.

Therefore there is more than the Bible on this matter and it is very important that you realize it in terms of your cooperation as people who are outside of the draft age area because what you do can determine the legitimacy of the church's request in terms of conscientious object or status and it can jeopardize the legitimate rights that an individual would have who is of draft age.

The teachings of the Worldwide Church of God were first brought to our attention as a result of the events of 1939, 40, 41 when the World War II began to bring this country into it as a result of the problems across the Atlantic and then at the end in December 7th in 1941 with what happened at Pearl Harbor.

There was an immediate decision that had to be made.

Shall we be conscientious objectors or shall we not be? And in being a conscientious objector, does one enter the military in non-combative duty or does one seek to have some solution in civilian service? Now you will note immediately that we are already dealing with some things of human definition that are non-biblical.

That is the question of whether you have any conscientious rights in this matter of going to war or not going to war varies from country to country.

Prior to the new republic in Germany, there was no such recognition since there has been such recognition.

Some governments allow non-combative military duty as the only possibility, thus our brethren in Rhodesia had to serve in non-combative military duty, that is to guard the villages as distinct from going out into the field.

Now there are alternatives and that is you can be jailed.

One has to weigh the question and Mr. Armstrong himself did as to whether it is better to go to jail when your conscientious objector status is refused by some judge who simply would not listen, even though the church otherwise was recognized.

Should he go to jail or should he take non-combatative duty essentially involving hospital service? These are all strangely decisions that in a sense pertain to the conscience of the state, how the state looks at matters, what the state expects of us.

We are also going to look clearly at what the Bible expects and we will see areas of variation that we have to come to grips with.

When the church of God made the decision, which was inevitable on the basis of the Bible, that it is our role not to go into military service to shoot and to kill and to maim other human beings, whether of your faith in another country or not.

We were in a sense following the tradition of the church of God as it had already been established eight years before at the time of the American Civil War.

I did not know of this.

I was not reared in the church of God, but I had an experience which I should now draw upon.

Those who were reared in the church of God could give much more information if they remembered what grandparents taught them.

When I was called to appear before a judge, and I will not tell the whole story of that appearance at this moment because it involves another matter, which is voting, which is critically important in this subject, this man told me, after our discussion, he said it is interesting that from the beginning of the principle of conscientious objection, there have been two churches that have remained fundamental in their understanding.

The Mennonites and the churches of God.

For the churches of God, then, with the headquarters in Standbury, Missouri, did appeal and were granted conscientious objector status in the days of President Lincoln.

I did not know this.

I had not heard this.

But when the judge himself told me who had to be responsible for law, I thought it was a very fine historic record to know that this is the tradition of our people.

The Jehovah Witnesses came later.

They obtained such status in the first world war at that time through the aid of Judge Rutherford.

But their view and ours would not wholly coincide.

The Seventh-day Adventists, though they would not go to war as a general rule, did not take the view of either the Mennonites or ourselves with respect to conscientious objection in this sense that they readily entered into, as a result of the teachings of Ellen G. White, to non-combat in military service, especially related to the area of medicine and drugs and hospitals and so forth.

In this sense, we share a very close affinity with the view of the Mennonite churches within the United States.

In a sense, the Worldwide Church of God obtained a great deal of favor before the government because of the previous efforts that had been made both by the churches of God for 80 years previous to this and because of the powerful role of the Mennonite church in Washington and their recognition.

So much for the immediate background.

Let me explain that any government may change its definitions as to 1A being subject to immediate call, CO being a conscientious subject or status, or 1O, whatever you would call it.

We use CO to define the name or the expression 1O is usually the government definition.

1AO means you are subject to call, but for non-combative duty.

These are just letters that you will see and should come to recognize, which may or may not be changed.

Let me explain that the Jehovah's Witnesses may take our view in terms of not going to war, but they do not take our view with respect to violence.

Nor do they understand Romans 13, which Mr. Armstrong explained in his tape, which was written in the material that Mr. McNair read to you.

Our view is that the higher authority is the government of God in the group that we call Jehovah's Witnesses.

It is our recognition of Romans 13 as indeed a reference to human government that God has allowed for the maintenance of safety in general and for the preservation of peace and calm in a community.

We therefore do not find that our literature would in any way parallel much of the Jehovah's Witnesses' material, and in the sense that Adventists have been very closely wed to medicine and to all of the principles that underlie the vast number of hospitals that they have built, we do not share an explanation with them in the same way that most often we share with the Mennonites.

I am trying to define that because it will help you better to understand how the government looks at this subject, because it tends to note that there are different points of view in different groups.

It is important that there be some kind of unanimity within the church.

Therefore, we had to make decisions in the last crisis following the Korean War and in general up to, but not really extending greatly through, the war in Vietnam.

That you all had to cooperate if the church itself was to have recognition.

We could not leave it to the individual to decide.

It was not left to you to decide whether you did or did not want to kill your neighbor, who may live in another country.

It was not left to you to decide what your job should be, because if the government said that you cannot be at work in a job that produces military weapons, then simply we had to ask you not to have that job or the church would not receive recognition.

If the government said you cannot work at a factory that builds planes for both military and civilian purpose, we had to tell you you could not keep that job.

It would jeopardize the right of the church to conscientious objector status.

If you were a gardener and worked on the grounds, you were 50 years or 60 years old and you worked on the grounds and mowed the lawn and pruned the shrubbery around a hospital, which was a veteran's hospital, you would have to give up the job because the government would say, and this case was decided, that if your church takes part in that function which they regard as the support of the military, you cannot maintain conscientious objector status as a church.

Now, as far as Mr. Armstrong is concerned, as far as the Bible is concerned, whether I clip that hedge or another or mow that lawn or another has nothing to do with the subject.

But the conscience of the government made the decision that it did.

And therefore, we were not free to make the kind of biblical decision which says, sure, you could keep the job.

I mean, that's incidental.

The government said, you have that job for your older people, your young men have to go into the military or into jail.

We do not recognize CO status for them if that's the view you take.

So we had to say there are things that the Bible would allow that we ourselves simply could not permit the brethren to do.

And we therefore were regulated very clearly in our decision, both by the Bible, which govern those things we should do, and by the conscience of government in part, which did not tell us to do what was wrong.

We do not allow the government to dictate.

But where the government says that what the Bible might say is perfectly all right to do.

If the government says you can't, then even that we have to avoid.

This is the same principle that underlies the fact that I will not eat meat or drink wine in the presence of my vegetarian or Adventist friends so long as the world stands, though I am permitted by the Bible to do so.

It is the conscience of somebody else.

I could eat meat, said Paul, in an idol's temple, because to me an idol is nothing.

Instead of somebody else who thinks an idol is something, sees me and is himself emboldened to do it, then I should not be there.

Because he will use my example, which is perfectly permissible as an excuse for sin, to go on.

Seventh-day Adventist views do depend heavily on the teachings of Ellen G. White with respect to the major role of medicine in the church.

There we would greatly differ, despite the fact that they observe the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week.

Mennonites do not.

You simply see these remarkable variations.

The government does expect the church to have a fixed policy.

The government does not expect, of course, that every individual should go along with it, because they recognize conscientious objectors among Catholics where it is permitted to go to war.

They recognize it among Methodists where it is permitted to go to war.

They recognize it among Quakers where normally it is not permitted to go to war, but some do.

Nevertheless, it is important for such a congregation or church as ourselves to have established policy.

How we shall administer it is not the subject of this sermon, because we simply yet do not know what the government stand will be with respect either to men, to women, to young, or to old, and whether some of their rules on violence will hold.

Because the question, brethren, even of child-rearing came up as to whether or not spanking was an act of violence.

There were some judges who held that any parent or any young man who believed that children should be spanked was himself violating his conscience if he claimed conscientious objector status.

We did not change the teaching on this subject because the Bible is clear.

We rather changed the wording.

We would define child-rearing in terms of discipline rather than spanking.

Because the government, in examining any letter or listening to an individual in any exposition if he had to appear before a judge, would take and interpret certain actions on the basis of how it was worded.

We even had to discuss the question seriously of how far one could go to protect one's wife or children from a rapist who would try to break into a house.

At what point, let us say, may we use leverage, distinct from force, because to use force for some judges was to do violence? At what point must we say we can go no further? This was the conscience of the government.

It had nothing to do with the teachings of the Bible, as I will show you.

We have to be very careful, and these things will have to be examined again.

But I am bringing these various and peculiar related subjects to your attention.

Because if the church would say why we have a right to knock the fellow out, the government would say, well, then how can you claim conscientious objector status? That is, one must not hurt the man, but you must try to get his arms behind him, see, then that might be permitted.

This kind of reasoning by men who really didn't respect a conscientious objector status had to be wrestled with for more than 15 years.

It was in the Korean War during the last year of college that I was asked to explain both the teaching of the church and myself before a judge.

This was not in the traditional jury sense.

This was strictly a hearing on my case, because every case tended to have this at that time.

I explained our general view in terms of the fifth commandment or the sixth commandment.

Let me deviate again a moment.

Normally when you spoke of the sixth commandment, this would only confuse the Catholic who was working for the FBI and gathering information.

Because to a Catholic, thou shalt not kill is the fifth commandment.

Their numbering is different.

You can always note that it was usually a non-Catholic and non-Lutheran who would use the term sixth commandment.

It was a Catholic or a Lutheran who was in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who went around and interviewed, and he would define it as the fifth commandment.

I was asked to explain what our basic teaching on the sixth commandment is.

I normally define not the commandment by number, but by actual definition.

You shall not murder.

You shall not kill.

We will look at how that is to be explained later in terms of the Old Covenant, but for the moment we will examine it in terms of what our role is.

It has reference to the attitude of hate, and here we would go to Jesus' exposition in Matthew 5.

You have heard that it was said in times past, you shall not kill.

Jesus said, it goes so far as to say you shall not hate.

It goes so far as to say you should reconcile yourself to a brother, and to go to war cannot avoid hate, and therefore there is simply no way, and any judge would recognize that factor.

There is simply no way to avoid the violation of that commandment as Jesus expounded it, and to enter into the army which teaches that one hates one's enemies.

Further, John the Baptist went inquired of by soldiers who were then functioning as police because the concept of a police system did not arise in the Western world until 1828 when it was introduced in Britain.

The idea of a police that is non-military is the mind of the children of Joseph, and it is hardly more than 158 years old.

That's how recent the concept is.

The Romans had a police system, it was the army, and when things got too far out of hand the army went through and brought peace.

It was otherwise defined as solitude.

Everybody was killed off.

Now when I explained the matter of the commandment, when I explained the teachings of Jesus, the man himself said, but you have to recognize that you do live in this world, and that there is the need of defending a country which grants you the right to be a citizen in that country.

From his point of view, he could understand conscientious objector status for those who entered in non-combatative duty.

From our perspective, entering into any of those was to come under an authority that transcended and superseded the authority that is God's.

Because when you come into the military authority, in general, you are in a position where you simply do not have the rights of an ordinary citizen as of that time.

It looks like today, of course, being in the army gives you quite a number of rights, but then it did not.

That's because they want you to volunteer.

This is all as a result of President Nixon's decision that have governed basically the 1970s.

But there was one thing he simply couldn't understand.

Why we wouldn't defend a government that provided us the freedom to preach? That was one of our duties.

Provided us the opportunity to have free, peaceful, assembling for religious services.

Why would we at least not enter into the Seventh-day Adventists? Then I said something without realizing, I knew I was going to explain it, but I said something that changed his whole view of the problem.

I said, but we also, though we pay taxes, do not vote.

We do not enter into politics.

And suddenly he saw the whole picture.

He said, well, if that's the case, then you really don't look on the governments today as the governments.

If your church members are scattered around the world, which they then were not, but you don't look on the governments today as the ultimate government that you serve.

You look on the government of God as a future government.

That changed his whole perspective.

If we had said it is the teaching of the church that we are conscientious objectors, that we do not enter into the military and non-combat roles, we even avoid that.

We are subject to the penalty.

In some cases, we would even be willing to go to jail if that's required, if we pay taxes, and if we were to vote for one party or another and consider the government over us as the government that God has established to represent his kingdom, because that's the way it would be viewed.

That's the way people who are Catholics and Methodists and Episcopalians look at it, that these are the governments of God, which church members are a part of in terms of their spiritual life.

Physically, we all recognize physical citizenship.

But in terms of our experience spiritually, is this the government that we're a party of? Are we to be born, in a sense, into this government, this kingdom? And the answer is no, we're to be born into the government of God, the kingdom of God, the family of God, which does not make its appearance until the world tomorrow.

And Jesus said, as he did, this, of course, is recorded in the account that John has given us of Jesus' statements before Pilate.

Pilate asked him, well, is your government a government of today's world? Are you trying to be a king now? Are you trying to raise an issue of whether you're a king or Caesar is emperor? Are you raising an issue of whether you have a right to be a king within the Roman Empire without his approval as emperor? Jesus said, no, my kingdom isn't of this age.

My kingdom is of a time much further, far into history.

As it turned out to be more than 19 centuries downstream, he said, if my kingdom were of this world, then my servants would fight to have me delivered.

But my kingdom is not of this world.

You don't have to worry.

Caesar doesn't have to worry.

The man himself was very aware that the drift, though we were separated by a decade more, the drift that began to take place in the church in the 1970s, that the church members should vote was a drift that indeed went contrary, because if contrary to all sense of reason, if the church itself takes the view that we should vote Democratic, Republican, independent or whatever it is, if the church takes it that we all have a right, then he who determines who should rule over him also has the right to defend that right.

Further, he has a responsibility to defend that right.

If you have the right to determine whether President Carter should or should not be re-elected and you exercise that right and you demand to exercise that right, which is to vote, then you cannot deny that the government has the right to call upon you to defend the system that gives you this right.

But when we decide that we pay taxes as citizens, because Jesus himself set the policy rendered to Caesar that which is Caesar's, to God that which is God's, and God tells us that we should live at peace with our enemies as well as our friends, that we should not only kill but not even hate or not even allow an attitude of a grudge or something like that to separate one another, remember Jesus' statement that if you have something against your brother or you know your brother has something against you, get that straightened out too before you continue with the gift at the altar, all of that laid out in Matthew 5 under the subject of the commandment, you shall not kill.

That is, if all those things are made clear as to why Jesus expects of us and that we also pay taxes, which is why Jesus expects of us, Peter was questioned as to whether he had paid his taxes and it did appear at that time he hadn't really done it, little negligent.

So they fished and they found a coin and that was sufficient to take care of it.

So Jesus wanted to be sure that we understood that we submit to the powers that be, Romans 13, to submit has reference to being subject to the penalty when indeed the government says you should do this but you have to obey God then you're subject to a penalty. We have to be willing to be subject to a penalty. Jesus was willing to be subject to a penalty even in that case one that was not properly imposed because he was not guilty but he did so to fulfill scripture.

Paul had to go through another route to pay, let's say, his way to appeal to Caesar, which he had a right to do as a Roman citizen. Jesus did not have that right, he was not a Roman citizen. Peter did not have that right, he was not a Roman citizen. Paul was, he was born free. We don't know that any of the other apostles out of Galilee were in that sense Roman citizens.

This is very important to take note that there is a time to appeal and conscientious objector status. We always appealed. I don't know how men got the idea in 1979 that one should not appeal because every church member knew that if a young man was given 1A classification or 1AO he had the right to request a 1O or conscientious objector status and we appealed all the way up if we needed to to the president of the United States. Where these members were? Were they members? Were they a menace? When we knew we had these rights and suddenly that they should not be exercised in 1979 would seem rather strange because the Bible gives clear illustrations but we submit if the government says no I still won't grant it to you even at the level of the president then you submit to the penalty. If ultimately in our present case the government were to say no and we couldn't exercise our role freely here we'd have to go somewhere else there's no other recourse that's the penalty.

But we recognize a right to appeal, we recognize a responsibility to pay tax, we recognize that we are not to kill and hate whether enemy or friend. We recognize also that if our government is of this world the one into which in a sense we are begotten if it is of this world we have a responsibility to defend it Jesus said if my government were of this world this age my servants would fight we do not deny the right of the government to make the demand to be drafted Jesus himself said if his were a worldly government he would have no alternative or some greedy neighbor would take it over but we also recognize that since though we are citizens in terms of passports request the right to travel and pay taxes for this reason among other reasons that since our government in terms of our spiritual life is from above and of the world tomorrow we simply do not vote to exercise our citizenship in that manner and in so doing we may legitimately claim in the United States the right to be recognized as conscientious objectors without the need to do non-combatative duty in the military that's the usual expression for defining hospital and other services we do expect that there may be civilian work and we would have to submit to that civilian work for one two or three years whatever it would be but that is a freer situation than to be under the military in the medical core those are areas that we have to take a look at in terms of the subject at hand and we should begin to familiarize ourselves with the different views that each judge could present or each draft board could bring to bear there were areas where our people had no problems draft boards that looked at it clearly and other cases draft boards who thought they never heard of such a thing as conscientious objector status the government at the level of congress will cause different rules to apply at different periods of time so we will now move and take a look at a number of other things in connection with it that are laid out in the bible john himself mentioned that we should repent for the kingdom of god is at hand he therefore was announcing the kingdom of god and in so doing was giving instruction to men who were in the military just as we would say men who are called by the broadcast that Mr Armstrong makes who were called by the literature that is published when they ask what they shall do john said to them do violence to no man be satisfied with your wages is not relevant in this case this is why we expect young men and or women today who are in the military when god begins to

call them to convey to their superiors subject to our advice in the means for proceeding what their new convictions are what the stand of the church is and what the requirement is for someone who is baptized and converted so we have to deal with those who are young people in the church and those who are already in the military and for the latter there should be serious advice given in terms of knowing how best to proceed you can bungle it and be thrown in the brig the first day or you can proceed quietly and without fanfare and perhaps get out easily not only is the issue of military service a factor the question of unclean meats is a factor there the question of the Sabbath and the holy days are all factors which we put together because you cannot freely observe the Sabbath you cannot freely recognize let's say reckon your diet in accordance with the biblical rules you cannot freely observe the annual holy days and be under the total submission of any military government that these are all reasons and they go hand in hand we have never explained it only from the perspective of the commandment thou shall not kill we've explained that the nature of military government affects all these other areas where we are required to obey god rather than men now however there are rare cases which Mr. Armstrong did decide that in some instances in the nature of the penalty a young man might find greater freedom working in a hospital not subject to the military government than that is but being of some service in the medical area as long as he didn't enter into the army in a non combative status this was a civilian role outside of the army but a penalty that he would pay the statement Mr. Armstrong made in one case that the man in this sense was a free citizen freer than he would have been if he took the only other alternative which was two years in the jail in the jail he had less freedom in terms of diet less freedom in terms of the holy days and the Sabbath he had much more freedom and in this case it was a choice of the lesser of two evils in the one case there would be some problems in terms of conscience with respect to the administration of drugs but that would be all and in that sense it was a matter of the choice between the lesser of two evils all these things can be factors we have to weigh over the years one of the very interesting gentlemen who would continue from the fbi to call on us and since many of the young men were college students and i was functioning academically at that time in an administrative capacity i was often asked questions by this man quite apart from giving an evaluation of whether the person that we know was a conscientious objector or not he would ask the question uh do you from your perspective do you regard it as a legitimate right of the state to execute criminals now this was indeed one of the shockers that he could hardly understand from his perspective it was perfectly legitimate for the government to ask its young men to go to war but his conscience forbade him to execute a criminal for murder and when i told him that we do not judge the matter with respect to whether the person is guilty or not but we do recognize that a government has a right to execute its criminals he was quite surprised and now we open up a whole new area of the bible that we should come to understand in this connection one the Worldwide Church of God of god is a church governed by the principles that are laid down in the first presentation of the new covenant that we have recorded in the gospels matthew chapter five this is a new covenant church we are not asked to come into a relationship with god on the terms and conditions laid out at sinai which promised the land of palestine and all sorts of physical blessings of the sky above the earth beneath where we enter into a relationship to god that it ultimately involves a temple at jerusalem or a levitical priesthood and the laws of moses governing that a law at sinai which asked you to be responsible for keeping it in the letters you were able our relationship is different jesus said not one iota not one even decorative addition to any of the letters describing the laws of god given at sinai would he alter he did not propose a revision of the old testament he did not say we must reword the old testament not even at the point of changing a single letter where to keep it as it is and read it as it is but in reading it we are now to take a new look which says you shall not kill in a manner that would differ from the role of ancient israel or to put it in other words we do not claim that we have to explain away every verse in the law of moses or the law of the lord because we have some other view when

the statement in the law says and when you go to war we'll turn to that in a moment in deuteronomy we don't have to explain away and say this doesn't mean war when the statement said an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth we don't have to explain it away and say i did not mean i and tooth did not mean tooth because the congregation of israel the church of israel the congregation of god made up of the family of joseph and the Gentile converts who were repentant baptized or immersed and male circumcised and who took upon themselves the 613 points of the law all of those people who now were among israel and all of the israelites were a kingdom of this world and for it to survive since they were also sinful and carnal minded and not perfect they had to defend themselves god could have sent the hornets and the wasps and the spiders and the scorpions after the gentile canaanites and driven them out and the israelites could have walked in without the use of a sword but the israelites had disobeyed god and they weren't doing what was right and god therefore allowed them to acquire the land in part by their own efforts but not all together because much of it was god's own doing but not all of it david showed how much of it was not god's own doing he could see that but the israelites had to do much themselves we do not deny that but we are not a nation in this world we are made up of citizens of many nations who respect the authority of those nations but who do not vote to overthrow or to change administrations but who pay taxes that we may live peaceably we may have passports and we may do the work we are called upon to do as a new covenant church therefore we do not try to explain away the old covenant we state the old covenant for what it is but we see ourselves in terms of first rather of 2nd Corinthians chapter 3 let us note it clearly 2nd Corinthians chapter 3 we'll break into the thought you yourselves verse 2 our letter of recommendation Paul says written on your hearts i'm reading from the common bible which is the rsv to which the catholic scholars were allowed participation to be known and read of all men that is we should represent what paul himself would have us be and you show that you are a letter in fact from christ delivered by us in other words christ is found to be living in you what he might have said human beings should be like is what you should find the Corinthians to be like this particular reference now passes into the question of the law in an interesting way you are like this letter from christ but not the one written with ink but with the spirit of the living god an illusion to the laws that were written in the book all the rest after the 10 commandments and in fact you are not written either on tables of stone but christ's letter let's say to the world to define what christians should be like is actually to be observed by looking at the tables of your heart such as the confidence that we have through christ toward god that he is able to do this in you not that we're competent of ourselves to claim anything as having as coming from us because paul couldn't have done it by himself among the Corinthians our competence is from god who has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant that is we propose to you not that you should come into a relationship with god in terms of the new in terms of the old covenant otherwise you might just as well become jews orthodox jews and join some synagogue we are ministers of a new covenant and in so doing unlike moses what this covenant is is not written in the manner in which it once was not written sorry not in a written code but in the spirit for the written code kills but the spirit gives life now if the dispensation or administration of death carved in letters on stone came with such splendor that the israelites could not look at moses face because of its brightness which pertain to the material at sinai and not the whole stones at the jordan moses was already dead when the whole stones were written upon this pertains to the sinai covenant itself if that was glorious which glorious fading how much more glorious is ours so we won't go into that for more but to take note of the following which i have read what was given before was a code that didn't provide eternal life but in fact killed its violators a code which said that the following is the death penalty if such and such an action happened the whole of the old covenant in that sense may be viewed ultimately as an administration of death because when violated it brought death now the new covenant did bring death to the messiah and once we can be forgiven and the death penalty taken by him in our stead we can now proceed to

begin to live according to those rules that in a sense define the character of god because the law is actually a way of describing the character of god but as it was given in the old testament it was very limited let us see how limited even the commandment thou shall not kill is i illustrate when it comes to this we could turn either into deuteronomy or into the book of exodus i will quickly at this moment flip to the book of exodus and illustrate a point from chapter 22 2 if a thief is found breaking in this is the king james of the rsv order uh this happens to be verse one in the hebrew if a thief is found breaking in and at that time is struck in the dark of night so that he dies there shall be no blood guilt for him now here's a man breaking into your house whom in protecting your house you kill it's so dark you couldn't see and you accidentally struck him either at the back of the neck or on his temple or somewhere and he died the commandment said you shall not kill yet in this case there shall be no blood guilt you are not guilty of blood for him in this instance but if the sun has risen and you see he has no weapon you have no right for the sake of the little stuff he's stealing from you to kill him if you do and he has no weapon that's the sense of this there shall be blood guilt and you are guilty the 10 commandments are very broad very general and alone do not explain all the details in you in your interesting chapter number 19 of deuteronomy where the cities of refuge are mentioned if any man kills his neighbor unintentionally this is into verse four without ever having this person as an enemy in times past no premeditation why then you have the right to go to a city of refuge so that no revenger of blood could punish you so you see it was possible not even to be guilty of breaking the 10 commandments when you took somebody's life and the whole thing as god gave the law was wrapped up and the question of letting the citizen survive or a punishing him if indeed you had him as an enemy if any man hates his neighbor and lies and wait for him verse 11 and attacks him and wounds him mortally and this man flees to such a city then the elders will fetch him out hand him over to the avenger and he's to be executed now we could go on there's some very interesting things in that chapter then in chapter 20 about going forth to war with respect to your enemies offering terms of peace in verse 10 i introduced it in verse one and again in verse 10 of chapter 21 when you go to war there are clear indications you see in the law a man was to be whipped in chapter 22 verse 18 a stubborn and rebellious son 21 18 who would not obey the voice of his parents simply was incorrigible was to be put to death they used physical force and they executed a penalty that was the old covenant we do not deny that these were the penalties but it is our role to state that god has given us something greater something better if there were no need to improve upon the old covenant not only through the weakness of the flesh but through the fact that this was given in the letter and offered no promise of any holy spirit no promise of eternal life but merely a good life here and now why then we might as well be a part of the old covenant and enter into the military of the nation that is our nation but if we indeed come out of this world an ecclesia or church is a called out group though we are in the world jesus said we are not of the world and if we come out of the world and if we therefore do not enter into the politics of the world and it is our role to do good even to our enemies to love those who despite fully use us and not to hate much less to go outright and kill in war then it is clear that our relationship is a new covenant relationship and i have no fear that any of you should you ever be asked any question would recognize how properly to answer there are those cases of course where god did call out of israel such men as david whose nation was nevertheless the nation that god had made him responsible for and he went far beyond what god would have asked and god called him a bloody man for going beyond what should have been his role especially in the case of killing more philistines than he needed to to get sol's daughter then there was the case of daniel who entered into a political role by appointment because indeed his government at that time was subject to the government of Babylon and god saw fit in those days to use men of the congregation of israel in a capacity that he does not ask us now to serve because our kingdom is not the congregation of israel with jerusalem as its headquarters we have the jerusalem which is above not the jerusalem which is on earth over and over again you can understand that

what is expected of us was not asked even of those who were prophets of those who were levites or priests or kings or judges or magi as daniel was he asked them to function in a capacity that was different because the only government over which in a sense he made them responsible was the government that was established at Sinai and god had not yet brought a messenger of the new covenant he had only sent a prophet Jeremiah to say that there will be in the future a new covenant with these things written in our hearts and minds that much they could know but in terms of a governmental relationship where we are called out of the world that did not happen until the days of john the baptist and jesus christ i haven't begun to explain all the verses that you should look into but as Mr McNair said this is the kind of subject that i know he would like to and others would address to you from time to time and as with the Sabbath or as with any other major area there are numerous aspects of this that we can dwell upon i have chosen intentionally not to look at our past literature set out for young men but to give you a perspective from an individual experience and based on that to draw on those verses of the bible it should help us understand how we can answer someone who has never grasped what our role and our place in this world is because we're in the world we're not of the world we have a higher goal and this is what men have to have explained to them we have a government to come a government from above that ultimately and happily is going to intervene to save men from himself and to bring peace because he who takes the sword perishes by the sword the nation that does this will never ever permanently last and that is why the one government that will ultimately rule over all the world is not a single one now extinct but the kingdom of god