

Christians Killing In Self-Defense, by Anonymous, is the original document, graciously made available to me by the author who wishes to remain unknown. The well-written document presents arguments against Christians killing in self-defense.

I offer a rebuttal to the author's positions and statements. The author has not yet had a chance to refute my rebuttals of his arguments, but I think the issue is important enough to make the material available now, so that people can think more deeply about the contested points than they might have otherwise.

As I have spent several years intermittantly working on my reply, I am very anxious to hear from anyone who reads the material.

If you take the time to read even a portion of this file, please be so kind as to drop me a line, either by email, or snail mail, and let me know what you think. Whether you find it inscrutable, boring, enlighting, enraging, interesting, or whatever, please drop me a line.

As with the other material on the web site <http://www.ktc.com/personal/sirdavid> I intend to incorporate this material into a book someday when I have a little more time.

Offer me your own ideas, favorable, contradictory, etc. If they are good enough, I might add them to the material (but don't count on it ;)

Thank you very much for considering this important topic.

For Liberty,
David C. Treibs
c/o Battle Flags, Etc.
1141 Metzger Road
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
(sirdavid@ktc.com)

KEY

Text in Black: original text, by the anonymous author referred to as UCG

Text in Blue: my responses (David C. Treibs)

Text in Red: Bible verses added by DCT, all in KJV.

Some web sites where similar material may be found:

<http://www.ktc.com/personal/sirdavid/index.html>

<http://www.comeandtakeit.com>

UCG> CHRISTIANS KILLING IN SELF-DEFENSE

UCG> Table of Contents

UCG> Part I	4	
UCG> 1. Introduction	4	
UCG> 2. History and Status of the Issue	4	
UCG> 3. Purpose	5	
UCG> 4. Main Arguments Against Killing in Self-Defense	5	
UCG> Summary of Arguments	5	
UCG> Argument #1: [Violates the Sixth Commandment--defines murder]	6	
UCG> Argument #2: [Violates Jesus' commission to obey the gospel]	8	
UCG> Argument #3: [Violates the First Commandment--no other gods]	10	
UCG> Refuting Opposing Arguments	11	
UCG> Opposing Argument #1: [Old Testament saints killed--so can we]	11	
UCG> Refutation #1 [God has different rules for different people--these rules over-rule God's law]		11
UCG> Opposing Argument #2 [Old Testament law is still in effect, so why can't we smite a thief?]		12
UCG> Refutation #2 [Jesus canceled Old Testament references to self defense]		13
UCG> Opposing Argument #3 [Resist not evil, turn the other cheek refer to revenge, so why can't we use self defense?]		13
UCG> Refutation #3 [Love your enemies]		13
UCG> Opposing Argument #4 [Government can kill me in persecution, but why can criminals kill me for no reason?]		13
UCG> Refutation #4 [Jesus would not have killed anyone for any reason--neither should we]		13
UCG> Opposing Argument #5 [Jesus had no family to protect]		16
UCG> Refutation #5 [Jesus and the apostles did not fight--we should follow their example]		16
UCG> Opposing Argument #6 [Even though Jesus did not fight, we don't have to go to that extreme]		17
UCG> Refutation #6 [We must follow his example, he did not do anything we cannot follow]		17
UCG> Opposing Argument #7 [How are we supposed to protect ourselves if not with deadly force?]		18
UCG> Refutation #7 [Use the best methods available, trust jGod, restrain the bad guys if necessary until someone else arrives, use non-deadly force only]		18
UCG> Opposing Argument #8 [The world doesn't consider self-defense]		18
UCG> Refutation #8 [We live by God's Word, not by the world's standards]		18
UCG> Opposing Argument #9 [It doesn't really matter what a Christian thinks about self-defense; Christians should be able to live by their own rules.]		19
UCG> Refutation #9 [Those favoring self-defense have wrong assumptions/presuppositions about Christ: Jesus' commission excludes those threatening us; we don't have to be analogies of the gospel and models and pictures of the kingdom; Jesus would have killed everyone threatening him; God only protects those who are armed; we can use both spiritual weapons; we don't have to love or preach to those threatening us; God does not have to authorize killing; we should kill the threatening unconverted.]		19
UCG> Part II	21	
UCG> 5. Brief Lesson in Logic	21	
UCG> 6. Refutation of Major Arguments for Killing in Self Defense	23	
UCG> Argument 1	23	
UCG> Argument 2	25	
UCG> Argument 3	26	
UCG> Argument 4	26	
UCG> Argument 5	27	
UCG> Argument 6	28	
UCG> Argument 7	29	
UCG> Argument 8	29	
UCG> Argument 9	30	
UCG> Argument 10	30	
UCG> Argument 11	32	

UCG> List of Tables

UCG> Table 1. Old Covenant Laws Jesus Changed Under New Covenant [Self defense, divorce, eye for an eye, animal sacrifice, priesthood, death penalty.] 6

UCG> Table 2. Jesus' Gospel Commission to Christians 8

UCG> Table 3. Differences Between Old and New Testament Saints [OK = weapons, OT commissions, NT gospel commissions, OT not have NT commission, OT lacked full understanding, NT saints know more] 12

UCG> Table 4. Similarities Between Old and New Testament Saints [salvation, belief, repent, obey, suffer] 12

UCG> Table 5. Jesus' Assumptions about God's Sovereign Control [God = omniscient, omnipotent, controls everything; yield to God in all things, GJod answers prayers, protects; Christians can goof up; we must do our part] 15

UCG> Table 6. God's Promises of Protection [safety] 15

UCG> Table 7. What Jesus and His Disciples Have in Common 17

UCG> Table 8. Differences in Assumptions [see opposing Arg #9] 19

UCG> Table 9. Categorical Syllogism 22

UCG> Table 10. Disjunctive Syllogism 22

UCG> Table 11. Hypothetical Syllogism 22

UCG> Table 12. Fallacies 23

UCG> PART I

UCG> 1. INTRODUCTION

UCG> Part I provides the history and status of a Christian killing in self-defense and the purpose for writing this paper. Then the main arguments against a Christian killing in self-defense are presented. Part II of this paper is not needed to understand the arguments in Part I. Part II is intended only for those who have a strong interest in how logic works and want to be able to explain the logic of an argument. Therefore, Part II gives a brief lesson in practical logic and examples of how to apply those principles to refute current arguments for a Christian killing in self-defense.

UCG> 2. HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE ISSUE

UCG> Nothing occurs in a vacuum, and neither does this paper on a Christian killing in self-defense. For many years, the _____ taught that a Christian should not kill in self-defense. Mr. _____ wrote at least one article on this subject that evidently did not convince some in the church. Both _____ and the _____ are silent on the issue in the chapter on the sixth commandment in their respective booklets entitled The Ten Commandments.

UCG> As a member of the _____ for twenty-nine years, I have talked to members about this issue in eight different church areas, and I would estimate that among church members at least half or more believe a Christian should kill in self-defense. I've known some church members who have carried weapons to church services on their persons or in their purses. I knew one church youth leader who carried a gun on his person to youth outings, while my children were with him.

UCG> Some might insist that this is a minor issue. I disagree for two reasons. Crime in America is bad now, and according to prophecy, is going to get much worse. And though church members in America may feel relatively safe now, members in some foreign countries face political

UCG> and criminal violence as a way of life. This issue is all too real for
UCG> them. For some, accepting the position of killing in self-defense means
UCG> carrying a gun and training with a weapon or in the martial arts; some
UCG> in the church are already doing this. As I will explain later, a
UCG> member's position on this issue reflects a major difference in how a
UCG> member thinks about Christ and fulfills Christ's gospel commission.

UCG> Recently my son, a fairly new member of the _____, began
UCG> talking to other members about this subject, and he was amazed that no
UCG> one he talked to agreed with traditional church teaching on this issue.
UCG> Even more, he was ridiculed for believing what I had taught him -- that
UCG> killing in self-defense is wrong. Many e-mails were sent back and forth
UCG> presenting arguments for killing in self-defense.

UCG> No one against killing in self-defense responded. After much
UCG> discussion, he began believing that killing in self-defense is the right
UCG> thing to do. He was especially concerned about the increased chances of
UCG> having to deal with a life-threatening situation since crime in America
UCG> has escalated so much. He then asked me to present my arguments.

UCG> The issue of a Christian killing in self-defense is not straightforward
UCG> in the Bible. No scripture says, "You shall not kill in self-defense.
UCG> On the one hand, an Old Testament verse (Ex. 22:2) says it's all right
UCG> to kill in self-defense, and some Old Testament saints killed their
UCG> enemies. On the other hand, Jesus' teaching and example in the New
UCG> Testament seem to contradict Ex. 22:2.

UCG> Because of this lack of direct evidence, I would liken this issue to
UCG> that of cigarette smoking. Nowhere in the Bible does it say, "You shall
UCG> not smoke cigarettes. Yet because the Apostle Paul says that the human
UCG> body is the temple of God and anyone who harms the temple of God commits
UCG> sin (I Corinthians 3:17), most would conclude that cigarette smoking is
UCG> a sin based on the logical implication of this principle. And proving
UCG> the issue of whether Christians should kill in self-defense must be done
UCG> the same way.

UCG> Even though no direct Biblical statement exists about a Christian
UCG> killing in self-defense, enough indirect evidence exists to convince me
UCG> that a Christian killing in self-defense, unless authorized by God, is a
UCG> sin. And even though no one knows how they'll deal with a
UCG> life-threatening situation until it happens, it's important to decide
UCG> ahead what is the right thing to do rather than give in to carnal
UCG> inclinations under pressure.

UCG> 3. PURPOSE

UCG> My purpose for writing is two-fold. My first purpose is this: I believe
UCG> professing Christians should be able to present a logical and Biblically
UCG> based explanation for their beliefs, including killing in self-defense.
UCG> And this paper is my attempt to do so.

UCG> My second purpose is to use this paper as an opportunity to teach a
UCG> lesson in logic. This has less to do with whether killing in
UCG> self-defense is right or wrong than it has with countering the carnal
UCG> and fallacious reasoning (another word for deception, whether
UCG> intentional or not) in the use of scripture in the _____ today,
UCG> not only about killing in self-defense but other doctrinal issues.

UCG> For years I argued that godly love and doctrine are inseparably

UCG> connected. Church members need to understand the Bible in intricate
UCG> detail, with God's help, to prevent being tossed about by every wind of
UCG> doctrine, causing them to depart from God. I believe what's happened in
UCG> the _____ in the 1990s has proven me correct as doctrinal error
UCG> grows worse and worse.

UCG> Doctrinal positions in the _____ should always be consistent
UCG> with the rules of logic. Of course, this doesn't mean that knowing the
UCG> rules of logic is required to understand God's truth. God can convict a
UCG> church member that a doctrine is logical or illogical without the member
UCG> knowing anything about logic itself. Mr. _____, for example,
UCG> may never have studied rules of logic, but he consistently applied logic
UCG> in his doctrinal arguments, as God inspired him.

UCG> Knowing the rules of logic provides a tool for a Christian to see
UCG> through the most subtle of errors, explain to others why the errors are
UCG> false, and detect the false assumptions underlying them. Refer to Brief
UCG> Lesson in Logic and Refutation of Major Arguments for Killing in
UCG> Self-Defense in Part II for a brief lesson on the rules of logic.

UCG> 4. MAIN ARGUMENTS AGAINST KILLING IN SELF-DEFENSE

UCG> This section contains my arguments against a Christian killing in
UCG> self-defense. I have organized my main arguments so the reader can see
UCG> my position and the major reasons and evidence for that position. I
UCG> keep personal and emotional factors separate in notes designated
UCG> EDITORIAL.

UCG> Summary of Arguments

UCG> My Position: Unless God grants the authority, a Christian killing human
UCG> beings in self-defense is wrong.

[Which is exactly my position, also.](#)

UCG> 1. Because it violates the sixth commandment to not commit murder
UCG> by intending to kill another human being without God's authorization.

[That it violates the sixth commandment is blatantly false, because God specifically authorizes killing in defense and capitol punishment 25 verses later in Ex. 21:15-22:20 \(see a few lines down\) just for a start, and in many other places](#)

Furthermore, within the verse itself there is evidence in favor of armed defense. As UCG points out later, there are both sins of commission and omission, and standing by while someone is killed when it is in your power to stop them is equally murder, even if the person being murdered is yourself.

[Exodus 21-22](#)

15 And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death.

16 And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.

17 And he that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death.

18 And if men strive together, and one smite another with a stone, or with his fist, and he die not, but keepeth his bed:

19 If he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he that smote him be quit: only he shall pay for the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed.

...

22 If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine.

23 And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life,

24 Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,

25 Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

...

28 If an ox gore a man or a woman, that they die: then the ox shall be surely stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit.

29 But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death.

30 If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.

31 Whether he have gored a son, or have gored a daughter, according to this judgment shall it be done unto him.

...

2 If a thief be found breaking up, and be smitten that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him.

3 If the sun be risen upon him, there shall be blood shed for him; for he should make full restitution; if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft.

...

19 Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death.

20 He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed.

UCG> 2. Because it violates Jesus' commission to all Christians to obey

UCG> the gospel.

Jesus' commission was to preach the gospel to every creature, and baptise them, and teach them to do all things he had commanded the disciples to do, which included carrying a sword, which could be for no other purpose than for self defense.

There is no positive injunction against self defense;

There is no contradiction between self defense and the commission: you can do both at the same time;

There is positive evidence in favor of self defense in Jesus' parables, in the Bible's commands, and in other scripture;

There are examples of God's specific and divine blessings on those who used weapons;

God's character is in harmony with ownership and use of weapons.

UCG> 3. Because it violates the first commandment to have no other gods

UCG> before the true God by disobeying Jesus' command to love your enemies

UCG> and to obey the gospel commission.

This is not an argument for or against weapons, it is based on the assumption that weapons are wrong, and it assumes that those who use them place them above God and the Bible. This statement provides no evidence for the underlying assumptions. We are simply taken to task for committing idolatry and for disobeying the Bible, when it is not proven that we have done so. Remember, this is supposed to be an argument against weapons.

UCG> Argument #1

UCG> A Christian killing in self-defense is wrong because killing in

UCG> self-defense violates the sixth commandment, You shall not murder

UCG> (Exodus 20:13, New King James) by intending to kill a human being

UCG> without God's authority.

Ex 20:13 Thou shalt not kill.

UCG's main point is that the sixth commandment forbids killing, but then he argues that Jesus changed the order of things so killing is forbidden. Apparently he does think the sixth commandment allows for killing, or else he's giving arguments for those who think so.

UCG> Evidence

UCG> The sixth commandment, "You shall not murder, emphasizes two main

UCG> things. First, it emphasizes that You, the individual human being, shall

UCG> not murder. This commandment is saying that no human being has the

UCG> right to decide, APART FROM GOD, to kill another human being. Only God

UCG> has the right to kill a human being, or grant permission to a human

UCG> being to do so, because God is the one who created all human beings in

UCG> His image and established the sanctity of human life (Genesis 9:56).

There is no such verse as Genesis 9:56, so I'm not sure what verse he means.

However, if you look up in the book of Genesis all the verses with the words "image" and "God" you will find the following:

Ge 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Ge 1:27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Ge 9:6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.

In using the argument about the "image of God," Mr. UCG shoots down his own argument, because God himself explicitly says that BECAUSE man is made in the image of God, it is necessary for one human being to kill another under certain circumstances. (see analysis elsewhere explaining how Genesis 9:6 allows for killing in self defense).

UCG> So there is a time to kill (Ecclesiastes 3:3),

Ecclesiastes 3:1 To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven:

2 A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted;

3 A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up;

but only when God authorizes

UCG> that killing.

Absolutely. And when someone is threatening your life or your family or the life of some other innocent person, it is time to kill. When a convicted murderer is given the death sentence, it is time to kill. When a nation attacks our nation, it is time to kill.

And if God hasn't authorized the killing, we shall all

UCG> give an account to God for killing anyone (I Peter 4:5).

I Peter 4:5 Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.

True. We shall also give an account for everything else we have done, including adding to or taking away from God's word. At least one of us is in trouble for either adding to or taking away from God's word.

UCG> God has not given any authorization for Christians to kill human beings

UCG> under any circumstances. I know of no such authority in the Bible.

I will be happy to point some out.

(re-summarize main points)

UCG> The

UCG> only verse in the Bible (Exodus 22:2) that supports ancient Israelites

UCG> killing in self-defense is not applicable to New Testament Christians

UCG> because even though Jesus did not do away with God's spiritual law in

UCG> the Old Covenant books of the law (Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, and

UCG> Deuteronomy), or in any of the Old Testament writings, He did change

UCG> some laws that were intended only for physical Israel under the Old

UCG> Covenant.

Exodus 22:2 If a thief be found breaking up, and be smitten that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him.

Exodus 20:13 Thou shalt not kill.

If Exodus 22:2 does not apply to Christians, than neither does Exodus 20:13 ("Thou shalt not kill."). Either both apply, or neither does. If Ex. 22:2 does not apply, then you just eliminated Argument #1 completely. If Ex 20:13 does apply to Christians, than so do other scriptures explaining and expanding its meaning and extent, as do the examples where people obeyed this commandment under various circumstances. If Ex 20:13 does not apply to Christians, then the other nine commandments probably don't either.

UCG> Jesus also changed other laws that He expects Christians to obey because

UCG> those laws are contrary to Jesus' gospel commission. We know which laws

UCG> Jesus changed by direct scriptural evidence or by implication from the

UCG> principles He taught. Refer to Table 1 for some examples of laws Jesus
UCG> changed.

The table is full of errors.

Some parts of the law Jesus fulfilled.

Other parts he showed us a more perfect way.

He also said that not one jot or tittle of the law would go unfulfilled.

He did not repudiate acts of righteousness/faith done with the sword. On the contrary, some of them were re-affirmed in Hebrews 11

UCG> Jesus also changed other laws that He expects Christians to obey because

UCG> those laws are contrary to Jesus' gospel commission. We know which laws

UCG> Jesus changed by direct scriptural evidence or by implication from the

UCG> principles He taught. Refer to Table 1 for some examples of laws Jesus

UCG> changed.

UCG> Table 1. Old Covenant Laws Jesus Changed Under New Covenant

The implication of this chart is that there have been sweeping changes made between the OT and NT, and, therefore, we should not be surprised if UCG presents sweeping changes in regard to self defense (he says he does not, but he spends so much time trying to convince us that it's OK that he is presenting sweeping changes, I am convinced he thinks otherwise). The sweeping change would be that, in the OT, justified killing was allowed by the Sixth, whereas, in the NT, it is disallowed. On the one hand, he argues that the Sixth (Ex 20:13 **Thou shalt not kill.**) does not allow for killing, whereas in this chart and other places he implies that it does.

Example of Laws Jesus Changed	Scripture	Why Christ Changed the Law
Killing in self-defense done away	<p>Exodus 22:2, Matthew 5:44 Refer to Table 2 for all scriptures about the gospel commission.</p> <p>Exodus 22:2 If a thief be found breaking up, and be smitten that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him.</p> <p>Matthew 5:44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;</p>	<p>Jesus' commission to Christians to go to the world with the gospel and to love their enemies cancels out all Old Testament laws and directives for physical Israel to kill their enemies. Refer to Argument #2 in this section for more detail about the gospel commission.</p> <p>Israel, too? If Israel followed this, they would all have been swimming in the Mediterranean Sea since 1948 and 1967, because the Arabs have wanted to drive them into the sea since they came into existence, and have attacked them numerous times, and would have attacked them more often if Israel had done anything but vigorously defended themselves.</p> <p>***</p> <p>con't in the following cell</p>

con't from previous rightmost cell

Preaching the gospel and self-defense are in no way mutually exclusive, any more than carrying a sword (which Jesus commanded) and preaching the gospel are mutually exclusive.

after the last supper..

In Luke 10, Jesus tells them, among other things, to carry a sword. Then, about the same time, he tells them a number of other things, which are discussed below.

John 13:34 a new commandment: love one another

14:15 if you love me, keep my commandments

--to carry a sword does not contradict his commandments

--to carry a sword is one of the commandments we must keep

--love, and carrying a sword are not contradictory, or else Jesus is schizophrenic, contradicting himself in a few minutes time

--carrying a sword does not contradict loving people (one another)

14:27 peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you:

--a sword--a weapon of warfare and killing--does not contradict God's peace

14:30 the devil ...finds nothing in me

--carrying swords or telling others to do so do not "give place to the devil"

15:3 now ye are clean, but not all

--carrying swords does not make you unclean. The only unclean person was the one who carried the money, and his uncleanness had nothing to do with money.

15:13 Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

--He never said as a pacifist only, but is equally applicable in combat or defense, particularly since it was in the context of carrying a sword.

--You can carry a sword and have God's love, and love for people.

con't in next cell

con't from previous cell

17:4 [Father]...I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work....

--Carrying a sword in no way detracts from God's glory (he told them to carry a sword, and he glorified God at the same time);

--it does not interfere with God's work (see Nehemiah for more details on how carrying weapons can help further God's work)

17:16,17 They are not of this world, even as I am not of this world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.

--Carrying a sword does not make them (or us) a part of this world;

--it does not ruin their (or our) sanctification to God;

--it does not violate God's truth;

--it does not contradict God's word.

<p>Bill of Divorce done away. See NOTE 1 below. Mark 10:2 And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. 3 And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? 4 And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. 5 And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. 6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. 7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; 8 And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. 9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. 10 And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter. 11 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. 12 And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.</p>	<p>Deuteronomy 24:1-4 Mark 10:2-12 [see left cell]</p> <p>Deuteronomy 24:1 When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. 2 And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. 3 And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; 4 Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.</p>	<p>God allowed the carnal Israelite husbands to write a bill of divorce against their wives because of the hardness of the husbands' hearts. But God did not intend this as a part of His spiritual law for those who have His spirit. Today Christians aren't allowed to put away their wives except for fornication.</p> <p>God made no real changes here. He did not change his mind, nor change his character. God was never pleased with divorce. He said in the OT in Malachi 2:16 that he hates divorce. He said that it is against his plan (Gen 3), and it is not his will, even though he made some allowances for it. In the new Testament he made a couple allowances for divorce, but he never said he was pleased with it, and he said in I Corinthians 7:11 that if they divorce, they should be reconciled. What Christ wanted people to do was to obey God's commands from the heart, not just the letter.</p> <p>Mal 2:16 For the LORD, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away....</p> <p>I Corinthians 7:11 But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.</p> <p>It's not that in the OT divorce was OK, and now it's not allowed at all. God's view in both old and new testaments is that divorce is wrong, but he will grudgingly allow it in certain cases, but if you want to please him, you won't do it. Furthermore, if you do it, you and your children and succeeding generations will reap a bitter harvest.</p>
<p>"Eye for an eye" law done away</p>	<p>Leviticus 24:20 Matthew 5:38-42 [verses cited below]</p>	<p>Individual Christians are expected to suffer injustice, and even death, for righteousness sake, not seek revenge against someone who may do them harm.</p>
<p>Leviticus 24:20 Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him again.</p> <p>Matthew 5:38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: 39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. 40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also. 41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. 42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.</p>		

Again, God did not change his mind or his character between OT and NT on this issue. He said very clearly in the OT, Lev. 19:18, that we should love our neighbor as ourself. If Israel had obeyed, Jesus would not have needed to be a little more specific in Matthew 5. Interestingly enough, Lev. 19:18 also says: “Thou shalt not avenge ... against the children of thy people.” It sounds at least reminiscent to not striking back when someone does you wrong, almost like “turn the other cheek.” But, when does anyone ever do what God says, either in the OT or NT?

We are certainly expected to suffer injustice and even death for righteousness’ sake, and we are not to seek revenge, but there are instances where it is proper for us to take the sword to defend ourselves and others. There are instances, in Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, for example, where the people suffered much persecution for Christ’s sake, but also defended themselves. You have to know when is the time to resist, and when is the time to not resist; and when you do resist, you have to know what kind of resistance to use. I’m not going to try to explain when it is time to resist and when it is not, just that there are times when resistance is proper.

“Eye for eye” was a judicially administered law that had nothing to do with self defense. It was judicially administered revenge/justice. If you follow through with the reasoning that “eye for eye” means no injustice should be resisted, then you would have to conclude that he disallowed all judicially administered justice, since we are supposed to take evil without responding. After all, most of the retribution was not mortal, but dealt with eyes, teeth, wounds, stripes, burnings, clothes, etc. A person who lost an eye would go to the authorities and bring charges against the wrong-doer, who would be tried, and then would have penalties against him. If this has become condemned by God, then all civil and criminal penalties would have to be eliminated. You would not even be allowed to defend yourself in court. (In Note 1 UCG says Jesus directed his statement both at individuals, and those in authority.) You would just have to take the wrong. Fortunately, we know that is false, because in Romans 13:3-4 he mentions the administration of violent justice. UCG’s conclusion also contradicts other scriptures which call for swift retribution against evil. Importantly, both forms are necessary to keep the wicked in check, to eliminate them as much as possible, and to make others fear to do evil.

Furthermore, defense and revenge are two different concepts. One is an effort to stop evil, the other is to punish it afterwards. Defense is usually carried out by the affected individuals, or by those close to them, or by passers-by; revenge is usually adjudicated by government at the request of those who have been wronged (??).

Here’s a little more about Matthew 5. In 5:17-18 he talks about the law and how it is true. In v. 19-20 he tells them how they think they keep the law but they really don’t. In v. 21-48 he gives examples of laws they think they keep but really don’t, and he shows them how they don’t keep it. In some of the examples, he expands on God’s intent for the command, and/or he shows them a more perfect way.

<p>Ceremonial offerings and animal sacrifices done away</p>	<p>Leviticus 9 Hebrews 10:1-14</p>	<p>No longer any need for ceremonial offerings and animal sacrifices since they were only a type of Christ’s sacrifice. Christians need only Christ’s sacrifice for salvation.</p> <p>While there has been a big change in some ways, other aspects remain the same. The penalty for sin is still death. The price for remission of sins is still the shedding of blood. God’s wrath for sin must still be fulfilled (for those who have not yet accepted Christ). What was a type and a shadow in the OT, Christ has literally fulfilled in the NT (Heb 9:11-12). But it’s not that God changed his mind, or did things in the NT contrary to how he did them in the OT. Salvation is still by faith in Christ, through the blood of Christ, as it was in the OT, even though they didn’t know as much about Christ as we do, and even though the works required to prove their faith was different. This “change” is not a very good basis for demonstrating that there is a radical difference between the OT and NT which is so radical that we can accept going from total militancy to total pacifism. The only real difference is, now the shadow is gone, and the real thing is in its place. The requirements for offerings and sacrifices was fulfilled in Christ, not eliminated or contradicted or changed.</p>
---	--	---

Leviticus 9:

- 1 And it came to pass on the eighth day, that Moses called Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel;
- 2 And he said unto Aaron, Take thee a young calf for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering, without blemish, and offer them before the LORD.
- 3 And unto the children of Israel thou shalt speak, saying, Take ye a kid of the goats for a sin offering; and a calf and a lamb, both of the first year, without blemish, for a burnt offering;
- 4 Also a bullock and a ram for peace offerings, to sacrifice before the LORD; and a meat offering mingled with oil: for to day the LORD will appear unto you.
- 5 And they brought that which Moses commanded before the tabernacle of the congregation: and all the congregation drew near and stood before the LORD.
- 6 And Moses said, This is the thing which the LORD commanded that ye should do: and the glory of the LORD shall appear unto you.
- 7 And Moses said unto Aaron, Go unto the altar, and offer thy sin offering, and thy burnt offering, and make an atonement for thyself, and for the people: and offer the offering of the people, and make an atonement for them; as the LORD commanded.
- 8 Aaron therefore went unto the altar, and slew the calf of the sin offering, which was for himself.
- 9 And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him: and he dipped his finger in the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar, and poured out the blood at the bottom of the altar:
- 10 But the fat, and the kidneys, and the caul above the liver of the sin offering, he burnt upon the altar; as the LORD commanded Moses.
- 11 And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp.
- 12 And he slew the burnt offering; and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled round about upon the altar.
- 13 And they presented the burnt offering unto him, with the pieces thereof, and the head: and he burnt them upon the altar.
- 14 And he did wash the inwards and the legs, and burnt them upon the burnt offering on the altar.
- 15 And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat, which was the sin offering for the people, and slew it, and offered it for sin, as the first.
- 16 And he brought the burnt offering, and offered it according to the manner.
- 17 And he brought the meat offering, and took an handful thereof, and burnt it upon the altar, beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning.
- 18 He slew also the bullock and the ram for a sacrifice of peace offerings, which was for the people: and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled upon the altar round about,
- 19 And the fat of the bullock and of the ram, the rump, and that which covereth the inwards, and the kidneys, and the caul above the liver:
- 20 And they put the fat upon the breasts, and he burnt the fat upon the altar:
- 21 And the breasts and the right shoulder Aaron waved for a wave offering before the LORD; as Moses commanded.
- 22 And Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people, and blessed them, and came down from offering of the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and peace offerings.
- 23 And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out, and blessed the people: and the glory of the LORD appeared unto all the people.
- 24 And there came a fire out from before the LORD, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces.

Hebrews 10:

- 1 For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.
- 2 For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.
- 3 But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year.
- 4 For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.
- 5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:
- 6 In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.
- 7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.
- 8 Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law;
- 9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.
- 10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.
- 11 And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins:
- 12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;
- 13 From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.
- 14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

<p>Levitical priesthood done away</p>	<p>Exodus 40:12-15 Hebrews 7:11-28 [see below] Exodus 40:12 And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water. 13 And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him; that he may minister unto me in the priest's office. 14 And thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with coats: 15 And thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office: for their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations.</p>	<p>Christ administers all priestly functions in the Church of God as high priest through those He chooses as ministers. The Levitical priesthood does not exist in the body of Christ.</p> <p>On the one hand, Christ has become our high priest. On the other hand, we are priests and kings to God through Christ. (Revelation 1:5-6; 5:8-10) There is only one mediator between God and man--no priest through which we have to go--the man Christ Jesus (I Timothy 2:5). I Peter 2:5,9 also says that we are a priesthood unto God.</p> <p>The law, and the requirement for a high priest have not been eliminated, but fulfilled Heb 2:17.</p> <p>God didn't change his mind in that he said, well, you don't need a high priest any more. The requirement is still there, but now Christ is the high priest forever. There's been no change, except Christ has done what we cannot do.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--

Hebrews 7:11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?

12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

13 For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.

14 For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.

15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest,

16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

17 For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

18 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

19 For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

20 And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest:

21 (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)

22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

23 And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:

24 But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

26 For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;

27 Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.

28 For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

<p>Administration of death (death penalty administered by Israel for sin) done away</p> <p>Where is Israel mentioned in any of the 2 new testament verses cited??</p> <p>How can you say death is done away when Romans 13:4 says he is the bearer of the sword to execute wrath upon evildoers (ie, sinners, or those who sin)? What is the sword used for except to kill? If he is God's minister killing people for sin, how is the death penalty for sin done away? If he is God's man, and is doing God's will, and is doing good, why can it not be a Christian who is the man? After all, he will be doing good, doing God's will, and in Christ's stead (as his body) doing what Christ would do.</p> <p>[Further discussion follows in below column]</p>	<p>The verses cited have nothing to do with eliminating the death penalty. According to Romans 13:4 the physical death penalty is still in effect, and so is the spiritual one in Ro 6:23.</p> <p>Numbers 15:35-36</p> <p>Numbers 15:35 <i>And the LORD said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp.</i></p> <p>36 <i>And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the LORD commanded Moses.</i></p> <p>One of the first death penalty cases, under Moses.</p> <p>II Corinthians 3:6-11 [cited below]</p> <p>The entire chapter is comparing Moses' law to Christ's grace; it talks about how the law is death and grace is life; it has nothing to do with the death penalty. The law did not give eternal life, all it did was point out to everyone how sinful we are, and how much we need a redeemer. Christ came to give us life, and that more abundantly.</p> <p>However, the penalty for sin is still death (Ro 6:23), or to word it another way, it is the death penalty for sin.</p>	<p>God has not appointed Christians to administer the death penalty (capital punishment) against anyone. He has ordained civil authorities to do this.</p> <p>God has ordained righteousness governments to execute wrath against the wicked. What does that have to do with Christians being excluded from the death penalty? If Christians are not in government and the military (two of the seats from where the sword is wielded), then the wicked will be in power, and they will not be a terror to evil, but to good works; you will not have praise of them if you do good, but scorn; he will not be a minister of God, but the devil; he will not execute wrath upon him that does evil, but on him that does good. If anything, it seems these verses make it compulsory to be in government, and to be in the position of wielding the sword, otherwise the wicked will wield the sword against the righteous, and all the above bad results will happen. Where is there one single negative statement in these 4 verses forbidding Christians from participating in government, and, presumably, the military, or in the administration of the death penalty?</p> <p>Note 1 says "Jesus directed his teachings to both authorities and individuals." Why is it in this instance (the death penalty) there is a different standard for those in authority (government) and for individuals? The ungodly also are responsible for obeying God's law.</p> <p>If they are not responsible, then how can they be judged at the Judgment seat of Christ? Where there is no law there is no sin, and where there is no sin, there can be no condemnation and no hell.</p> <p>Also, we are to be salt and light to the entire world, not just to portions of it, and that includes in position of wielding the sword, ie, government and military and the militia (the armed citizenry).</p>
<p>II Corinthians 3:6 <i>Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.</i></p> <p>7 <i>But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away:</i></p> <p>8 <i>How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?</i></p> <p>9 <i>For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.</i></p> <p>10 <i>For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth.</i></p> <p>11 <i>For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.</i></p>		

	<p>Romans 13:1-4 [cited to the right]</p>	<p>Romans 13:1-7 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.</p> <p>2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.</p> <p>3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:</p> <p>4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.</p> <p>5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.</p> <p>6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.</p> <p>7 Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.</p>
--	---	---

[Continuation of Romans 13:1-4]

Administration of death (death penalty administered by Israel for sin) done away

Only if Christians are totally dissociated from government, perhaps not even voting, and perhaps not even holding citizenship, since each of these hold certain responsibilities involving government. However, we cannot fulfill our duty to be salt and light to the world (illuminate it, both the good and the evil, and flavor it, and persevere it, ie, reduce the corruption) and withdraw from it at the same time.

...

Christians are supposed to be in civil government, are not excluded from civil government.

...

This was part of the criminal justice system.

(Putting away the wicked does not equal revenge, not even if the wronged party is the one initiating the death penalty. This is how our justice system works for the most part also--the wronged party is the one initiating the action.

***Responsibility for putting away evil starts with the most directly affected by it, and then moves outward. Why? It maximizes the chances a wicked person will escape, and minimizes that an innocent person will be falsely accused, protects other innocent people from that wicked person; protects the nation from God's wrath for not protecting innocent blood; elevates to the highest level, even above collective responsibility, the individual responsibility for dealing with the wicked, protecting the innocent, etc.

In some cases, responsibility starts with the individual and moves outward to eventually encompass the nation, just off the top of my head, I think these cases involve personal, violent crimes; whereas areas of "social responsibility" do not extend beyond individuals or families. Murder, robbery, rape, involuntary manslaughter, are supposed to be dealt with by the individual, and if they don't, the matter is to be taken up by civil authorities, but the individual is first and foremost required to deal with the problems, and that responsibility necessitates his having the tools to do it, ie, weapons. In those cases where the responsibility does not move outward, the initial responsibility still lies with the primarily affected individual.)

revenge does-not-equal self defense; but also, as noted above, putting away the wicked does-not-equal revenge.

1. Self defense to kill the perpetrator.
2. blood avenger to kill him if the criminal succeeds.
3. civil authority to deal with him if the avenger fails--the avenger takes the first shot if the perpetrator is found guilty.

...

The Bible is written to all, not to believers only. The OT is written to all: if they had faith in God as evidenced by keeping the law, God would accept them. In the NT, same thing: obey by faith and live. God's principles are the same for all: sin brings death for believers and non-believers alike, although eternal death is limited to non-believers.

(these quotes go somewhere in the above chart)

All men everywhere are to believe, meaning, obey God's word.

All will stand before God to be judged for their obedience to the word, Christians will have their transgressions forgiven by Christ, non-believers will not.

...

This chart consists of misinterpretation and misapplication.

##end of chart##

UCG> NOTE 1: Even though Israel's civil government administered laws concerning divorce or "eye for an eye", Jesus directed His teachings to both authorities and individuals on such issues because individuals are responsible for making sure they abide by Jesus' teachings whether or not those in authority do.

If authorities in this instance (which would include believers and non-believers, by the way) are to obey God's laws, why in other places does UCG say they don't have to (those laws commanding not to kill)? That there is a difference in carrying out the death penalty between Christians and non-Christians in authority.....

UCG> "...authorities and individuals..." must obey Christ
UCG> "God has given all Christians a commission that does not allow killing"

Later he says non-Christian authorities are to kill. Here he says authorities are to obey Christ's supposed injunction against killing, which means authorities are not supposed to kill. This attempted fine hair splitting probably results from his efforts to limit the Bible's obvious allowances for killing to non-believers in authority, which excludes believers and most others people in general. In this manner he can both argue that killing in self defense is wrong, while acknowledging the Bible's obvious allowance for killing in some circumstances.

...

UCG> "...authorities and individuals..." must obey Christ

If authorities are to obey God's laws, why does he say previously that there is a different standard for authorities and individuals in bearing the sword of Romans 13, and between believers and non-believers.

If Christ's commands are directed towards both, how could he say in the gospels killing is wrong, but in Romans 13 it is right?

...

We are to bear our own burdens, not expect others--unbelievers or those in authority or whoever--to provide for us, including our defense. Paul made it a point to not rely on others to provide for his needs, and he said he was the example others should follow in this matter. He was talking about financial dependence, but defense dependence applies equally.

...

"eye for an eye" is after the fact (the crime). Defense prevents the evil in the first place, or at least lessens it, and also prevents evil in the future, and protects future victims.

"eye for an eye" was administered only after the means made available to the individual failed or were not used. Evil was to be stopped by the individual. Only if he failed was the burden to fall to authorities, and then the task became more difficult, requiring a trial, evidence, witnesses, judges, etc.

...

Other implied changes between the OT and NT according to UCG, believers were in OT gov't (in fact, they were the government), and believers administered the death penalty, whereas he argues that neither is proper now.

UCG> If God were to inspire me with the understanding that I should kill someone and I knew this to be true, I would do so.

If God did this, after supposedly telling us not to kill, then God would be schizophrenic, or inconsistent, or prone to change his mind, and why should we obey him, if that is the case? God would be contradicting himself and his own supposed word. He would be telling you to sin.

UCG>

I am ready to kill

UCG> God's enemies when Christ comes back, but only because God says he will

UCG> authorize the saints to do so (Psalms 149:5-9). But at this time God

UCG> has given all Christians a commission that does not allow killing in

UCG> self-defense.

Wrong.

UCG> Refer to Argument #2 for more detail about the gospel

UCG> commission.

UCG> Ps 149:5-9

He ought to add Psalm 118 and 18 to this as well.

If Psalm 149:5-9 is an authorization to kill, which he says it is, he has just defeated his key arguments:

1. that the OT has been supplanted and does not, and never will again count or apply,
2. That Christians are not authorized to kill.
3. That this applies only to the end.

Where does this Psalm say it applies only when Christ comes back? Are there any other Psalms with these constraints? Do the 23rd ("the Lord is my shepherd") and the 91st (promising God's protection) and the 119th ("thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path") and the rest of them also apply only to the Old Testament, and to the saints at the end of the world? If not, where is a delineation noted? That would mean the Lord is not my shepherd, he doesn't make me to lie down in green pastures. Maybe some guy 3000 years ago, or 100 years from now, but not me. He is not my shade, nor my protection. His word is neither a lamp unto my feet nor a light unto my path. "Everything that hath breath" really only applies to those with breath 2000 years ago or earlier, and at the end of the world. We don't have to do it now, because it doesn't apply now. We are not blessed if we walk not in the council of the ungodly (Psalm 1). A few more babies going out with the bath water: Ps 3, 18:1-3, 27:1-3, 42:1, 46:1, 107:1. Furthermore, don't praise him (Ps 150:1), some guy at the end of the world can bother with it. Praise him for his mighty acts, but only if you are in the OT. Why praise him, since his excellent greatness applies only to the OT, and to the end of the world? Praise him in the sanctuary some other time, but not now. Let somebody else at the end of the world praise the Lord, but nobody now. Any time but now. Anybody but us. Those last two sentences are sometimes mantras for those who don't like what they read in the Bible: Any time but now; Anybody but us. Israel had this same reasoning when the prophet Ezekiel warned them of God's impending judgment for their wickedness. They said, the judgment was for someone else, and for some other time: **Eze 12:27 Son of man, behold, they of the house of Israel say, The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of the times that are far off.**

In saying it applies only when Christ comes back, he is admitting it still applies, but he is trying to limit where and when it applies. His admittance here also at least partially shoots down his theory that the OT no longer applies, because by his own argument here, it still applies, even if only in limited circumstances, which is precisely my argument.

He also admits this authorizes Christians to kill, but, to keep us from being able to kill now, he limits it to the future.

This is not just for the end (he says the OT has been supplanted, so if it only for the end, then it has no meaning to anyone at any time, because it did not apply then and at could not apply after Christ, having been forever after Christ been negated, so, if he is correct, it never was applicable. So, why is it in the Bible at all?)--this was back then, and now, and it includes ALL saints, including us.

UCG> The second thing the sixth commandment emphasizes is to "not murder".

UCG> It's important to know what murder is from God's view to know what we're

UCG> not to do. Most agree that the Hebrew word for "murder" means to kill a

UCG> human being. But we need to know the conditions that define murder

UCG> rather than, for example, accidental killing, which is not murder. The

UCG> Biblical meaning of murder for a Christian has two defining

UCG> characteristics: 1) it is not authorized by God and 2) it involves the

UCG> intent to kill.

With a few caveats I would agree with his above definition of murder in 1) and 2), while adding a couple items for clarification: 3) killing which you did not do but are responsible for (the twice goring ox in Exodus 21:29, etc). I would also add that you must add killing that is not murder, which the Bible clearly defines: self-defense and defense of others, defense of the nation (from enemies foreign and domestic), and capital punishment.

UCG> intent to kill

If you intentionally kill for the right reasons, that is OK, which means item #2 is incorrect.

“intent to kill” makes it murder only if his application of the Sixth is correct--his application is false--Furthermore, there are examples where unintentional killing merited the death penalty--if an ox was wont to push, and the master did not kill the ox, if the ox killed someone, the master was guilty of murder, perhaps also if someone fell through a roof without a railing, or in a hole? Not sure.

#1 would be moot if God made no authorizations, which is Mr. UCG's position. He might as well define murder as any intentional killing, since he does not believe God makes any authorizations (except for the ungodly now, and for Christians later). You could summarize his definition of acceptable killing as applying to everyone but us, and any time but now.

UCG> A defining characteristic means that all acts called murder must have
UCG> these characteristics, or they are not murder. Hate, for example,
UCG> cannot be a defining trait of murder. Even though many murders are
UCG> motivated by hate and God says hating others is murder (I John 3:15),
UCG> hate cannot be a defining trait because some human beings murder others
UCG> without hate. We know this is true because even Old Testament saints
UCG> would be guilty of murder for killing their enemies, though authorized
UCG> by God, if they did it in an attitude of hate (I John 3:15).

I John 3:15 Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.

“...Old Testament saints would be guilty of murder for killing their enemies, though authorized by God, if they did it in an attitude of hate”
That is so ridiculous. God commanded people in the OT to commit murder? He commanded them to sin? Off the top of my head I can't think of any place where commanded them to kill the wicked, but warned them that, if they hated them while killing them, they would be damned.

Or is Mr. UCG saying that as long as you don't hate someone, it isn't murder? So you could slaughter people all day and it wouldn't be murder as long as you don't hate them?

I suppose, then, that David went to hell, because he killed so many people at God's command, and he also hated the wicked:

Psalm 139:21 Do not I hate them, O LORD, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?

22 I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies.

If you kill someone in self defense, it is irrelevant if you hate them or not, it's just that if you hated them in times past, it might be used as evidence against you that what you did was murder, not defense.

When OT saints were commanded to kill their enemies, if they did not, right attitude or wrong one, hatred or love, they were disobeying.

UCG> Some criminals kill people, for example, because they fear their victims
UCG> will identify them if they're caught, not because they hate the people
UCG> they kill. Defining murder in terms of hate would eliminate such acts
UCG> as murder.

God did not authorize you to kill while committing evil.

UCG> On the other hand, hate or acts motivated by hate are murder
UCG> because they always involve the intent to kill.

If no one ends up dead it's not. It might be attempted murder or conspiracy to murder, but not murder. In heaven when you stand before God you will be charged with murder for hatred, but not here on earth.

It is possible to kill in self defense when you hate someone (your abusive ex-husband), premeditate it (carry a gun knowing he is going to jump you), conspiratorily plan it (have your friend come along to help), intend it (watch for him), don't love them (put an end of note 1) and it is not murder because it is self defense (you try to avoid it, but cannot), or national defense--they did this in the OT without breaking the Sixth. Apparently the aforementioned characteristics are not how God determines murder--it based on other or more or different criteria: was it defense? This is proven by: was it an accident? Did he hate him (this is a good reason to never hate anyone, and to be kind to them)? Was it premeditated? (lie in wait)?

Deut 4:42; 19:4,6,11; Jos 20:3,5,9; Nu 35:11,15,20

Deuteronomy 4:42 That the slayer might flee thither, which should kill his neighbour unawares, and hated him not in times past; and that fleeing unto one of these cities he might live:

Deuteronomy 19:4 And this is the case of the slayer, which shall flee thither, that he may live: Whoso killeth his neighbour ignorantly, whom he hated not in time past;

6 Lest the avenger of the blood pursue the slayer, while his heart is hot, and overtake him, because the way is long, and slay him; whereas he was not worthy of death, inasmuch as he hated him not in time past.

11 But if any man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and smite him mortally that he die, and fleeth into one of these cities:

Joshua 20:3 That the slayer that killeth any person unawares and unwittingly may flee thither: and they shall be your refuge from the avenger of blood.

5 And if the avenger of blood pursue after him, then they shall not deliver the slayer up into his hand; because he smote his neighbour unwittingly, and hated him not beforetime.

9 These were the cities appointed for all the children of Israel, and for the stranger that sojourneth among them, that whosoever killeth any person at unawares might flee thither, and not die by the hand of the avenger of blood, until he stood before the congregation.

11 Then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the slayer may flee thither, which killeth any person at unawares.

12 And they shall be unto you cities for refuge from the avenger; that the manslayer die not, until he stand before the congregation in judgment.

15 These six cities shall be a refuge, both for the children of Israel, and for the stranger, and for the sojourner among them: that every one that killeth any person unawares may flee thither.

16 And if he smite him with an instrument of iron, so that he die, he is a murderer: the murderer shall surely be put to death.

17 And if he smite him with throwing a stone, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a murderer: the murderer shall surely be put to death.

18 Or if he smite him with an hand weapon of wood, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a murderer: the murderer shall surely be put to death.

19 The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer: when he meeteth him, he shall slay him.

20 But if he thrust him of hatred, or hurl at him by laying of wait, that he die;

21 Or in enmity smite him with his hand, that he die: he that smote him shall surely be put to death; for he is a murderer: the revenger of blood shall slay the murderer, when he meeteth him.

22 But if he thrust him suddenly without enmity, or have cast upon him any thing without laying of wait,

23 Or with any stone, wherewith a man may die, seeing him not, and cast it upon him, that he die, and was not his enemy, neither sought his harm:

24 Then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the revenger of blood according to these judgments:

25 And the congregation shall deliver the slayer out of the hand of the revenger of blood, and the congregation shall restore him to the city of his refuge, whither he was fled: and he shall abide in it unto the death of the high priest, which was anointed with the holy oil.

26 But if the slayer shall at any time come without the border of the city of his refuge, whither he was fled;

27 And the revenger of blood find him without the borders of the city of his refuge, and the revenger of blood kill the slayer; he shall not be guilty of blood:

28 Because he should have remained in the city of his refuge until the death of the high priest: but after the death of the high priest the slayer shall return into the land of his possession.

29 So these things shall be for a statute of judgment unto you throughout your generations in all your dwellings.

30 Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses: but one witness shall not testify against any person to cause him to die.

31 Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall be surely put to death.

32 And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest.

33 So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it.

34 Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell: for I the LORD dwell among the children of Israel.

I included a few extra verses. Notice it says repeatedly that if the person is guilty of murder, he shall be put to death, and he shall be put to death by the revenger of blood. It also says if the person who accidentally killed someone leaves the city of refuge before the death of the high priest, and the revenger kills him, that's just too bad--he knew the rules, and should have stayed in the city of refuge--it's his own fault. Mr. UCG claims that the Sixth Commandment forbids all killing. The above verses amply demonstrate that this is an entirely false notion.

UCG> Neither can conspiratorial planning be a defining characteristic of
UCG> murder, though some murders are planned. Some people, for example, kill
UCG> in the anger of the moment. Such acts are completely unplanned. Jesus
UCG> has already defined such acts as violating the intent of the sixth
UCG> commandment (Matthew 5:21-22). Yet defining murder as always planned
UCG> would nullify such acts as murder.

Matthew 5:21 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

UCG> I do not include the actual killing as a defining characteristic of
UCG> murder, because God considers murder to have been committed when people
UCG> intend to kill, not just when they actually kill someone.

False. No one was given the penalty for murder (the death penalty) unless they actually killed someone.

If this were true, and if killing in self defense is allowed, you could kill everyone who hates you, because they would be guilty of "murdering" you, and you have a right to self defense. Nobody did that in the OT. It's only the actual act, or the attempt of it that earns punishment or judgment, or that merits self-defense response.

UCG> Though not a
UCG> defining trait, actually killing someone with intent to kill them would
UCG> also come under acts called murder because all acts with intent to kill,
UCG> without God's authorization, is murder, in God's eyes, whether or not
UCG> someone actually dies.

If no one ends up dead it's not. It might be attempted murder or conspiracy to murder, but not murder. In heaven when you stand before God you will be charged with murder for hatred, but not here on earth.

If an innocent person kills, you must ask, was it an accident.
If an evildoer doing evil kills, too bad if it's an accident.

...

Before God in heaven, but not before man in earth--there's no earthly judgment for hate.

UCG> I have already explained that if God does not authorize the killing of
UCG> another human being, that killing violates the sixth commandment and is
UCG> murder. It must also include the intent to kill. The word "intent
UCG> means a person's conscious purpose is to put to death another person.
UCG> This excludes all accidental killing such as hunting accidents, which is
UCG> unintentional and therefore does not violate the sixth commandment. It
UCG> also means that point blank shooting someone (intent to kill), even in
UCG> self-defense, without God's authority, is murder.

By his definition, intent + death = murder, which can include self defense. In fact, intent = murder in his final definition.

UCG> Keeping the sixth commandment goes beyond avoiding murder, or even not
UCG> hating people. It also includes expressing godly love even toward our
UCG> enemies (Matthew 5:44).

Matthew 5:44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

Not doing this is equivalent to intent to kill.

Perhaps not loving someone is the same as murdering them, IF you can back it up better, otherwise, it is murder only to the extent that, if you have broken one, you have broken them all, not that you have specifically committed murder. James 2:10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. If not loving someone is the same as murder, then we should be able to give them the death penalty, or we should be able to kill them in self-defense, or at least they should be put in prison. Of course, that is ridiculous, because, down here on earth, the only thing that is murder is killing someone, or trying to kill them.

UCG> As the Apostle John put it: "He that does not love his brother abides in
UCG> death (I John 3:14, King James version). This verse reinforces Jesus'
UCG> teaching that not loving others, even our enemies, is a sin because no
UCG> one lives under the death penalty unless sin is involved.

True, not loving someone is sin, but it isn't murder.

UCG> Not doing this is equivalent to intent to kill.

On the other hand, not protecting those under your care would also amount to intent to kill them.

Apply these verses equally to the victim and the perpetrator--then decide who you will kill--true, God does not "delight in the death of the wicked," but that he would turn, but God would kill the wicked over the just.

Anyone who does not differentiate between the two earns God's wrath. You are not allowed to stand back and say, may the best man win. You must actively involve yourself in differentiating between good and evil, and preferring good over evil, and defending good against evil, and putting away evil.

It was one of the sins in Obadiah to stand by and do nothing while the wicked destroyed the good--and that was even in the case when the "good" were being punished for their wickedness.

UCG> Keeping the sixth commandment goes beyond avoiding murder,
UCG> or even not hating people.

I kill animals without hating them--deer, stray dogs, sick animals, kittens--and yet for various reasons, they must die, with with only warm feelings towards them (stray dogs excepted), they die--so I can threaten or kill people, even while having pity and even love for them.

As UCG said earlier, you don't have to hate someone to kill them, either in murder or self defense.

UCG> For those who want to justify themselves by asking "who is my brother, I
UCG> want to present three reasons why the word "brother in I John 3:14

Do you mean "neighbor?" which is the term Jesus used when he gave the parable of the good Samaritan.

UCG> includes all human beings, friends and enemies.

"Brother" does not include anyone but fellow Christians. If you are hinting at the notion of the "brotherhood of man," you are wrong, because some people are of their father the devil, some people have God for their father. We are not in the same spiritual family. The wicked definitely are not my brethren. Neighbor, perhaps, but not brother. We definitely are to love them, even though they are the enemies of God, and we are to give them the message of reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ.

UCG> First, nothing in the
UCG> context of I John contradicts this conclusion.

Wrong. "Brother" means brother in Christ in that verse.

14 We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.

15 Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.

16 Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

What better verses could you find to support self defense, or giving your life to defend others?

We know we love the brethren (v.14) because we lay down our lives for the brethren (v16) while defending them.

If we don't love the brethren (v14), maybe we demonstrating it by not laying down our lives for them (v16), by not risking our own lives to save them when they are attacked.

UCG> Second, all violations

UCG> of godly love break the ten commandments and are sin, no matter who is

UCG> involved (I John 3:4, Romans 13:8-10). Third, Jesus defined the

UCG> neighbor

Correct. Neighbor, not brother.

I John 3:4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Romans 13:8 Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not cover; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

Christians are supposed to love as our most hated enemy, for

UCG> that was what the Samaritans were to the Jews (Luke 10:27-37).

Luke 10:27 And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.

28 And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live.

29 But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?

30 And Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead.

31 And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.

32 And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side.

33 But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him,

34 And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him.

35 And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee.

36 Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?

37 And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

What are you going to do when the wicked attack your family? Pray? Read scripture? Reason with them? Write your congressman? How is this showing love to those who depend on you? How can you meet their needs without also providing safety?

If you refuse to harm the wicked while they destroy your family, sure, God's grace is sufficient, but so is my .357 magnum. God's grace is equally sufficient for the criminal lying on the floor with bullet holes in him. Maybe I can lead him to Christ before he dies.

God's grace will also be sufficient for you when you stand before him and give an account as to why you did not defend those entrusted in your care, who God commanded and empowered (by sword) you to defend.

Loving someone is not the same as allowing them to harm you, your family, or other innocent people.

It falls in the same category as allowing the wicked to harm the innocent, the helpless, the widows, etc.

We make the choice who will be harmed: the wicked or the innocent.

UCG> God's command to love others is violated by acts of commission and

UCG> omission.

UCG> An act of omission

Acts of omission would also include harming our families by not stopping the wicked.

UCG> would include not doing good for our enemies.

Allowing them to do evil is not doing them or anyone, particularly their victims, any good.

UCG> Acts

UCG> of commission would include actually doing harm to them. As Paul

UCG> explains it, "Love works no ill (Romans 13:10).

Romans 13:10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

You could turn it to say love allows no ill to work, to destroy the innocent, etc. It is not love to allow abortionists to murder babies and butcher women, or other sorts of murderers to do their deeds.

You also must define "ill." God's definition does not include destroying the wicked under certain conditions, or else God would be guilty of doing ill, and commanding us to do ill.

Note that "love" and "ill" are overlapping concepts that do not contradict each other. See the discussion elsewhere where "love" can include destroying the wicked. Since "love" includes destroying the wicked under certain circumstances, "ill," being complimentary, excludes the destruction of the wicked under certain circumstances.

Since we are God's hands, we are able to conform ourselves to him to a limited degree on this issue to the extent to which he has empowered us--we can cut off the wicked as he does, once they cross certain boundaries (which is the point of no return, or the point at which we pull the trigger).

UCG> Not feeding or caring

UCG> for an enemy when it's in a person's power to do so,

As would be "killing" our family members by inaction or by inadequate action when they are being attacked.

If thou forbear to rescue those who are drawn unto death...

Is not this the fast that I have called, ...to break every yoke...

Put away the evil among you...defend the poor and fatherless....

deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the hand of the wicked....

Go to the breach in the wall, to the hottest part of the battle

(don't hide and run and expect someone else to do it for you).

UCG> for example, is

UCG> murder (Romans 12:20-21).

20 Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

21 Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

The verses do not say or imply that not feeding your enemy is murder. Only indirectly can you call it so in that if you have broken one commandment, you have broken them all, including the Sixth. Which is not to say that you should not help your enemies; but also you definitely are not supposed to empower them to do evil.

UCG> Shooting someone with the intent to kill is

UCG> doing harm to an enemy.

We shoot the wicked with the intent to protect the innocent; the harm of the wicked is a secondary result of using effective means to stop them.

It is possible to shoot someone solely with the intent to neutralize their ability to harm, and their death is an unfortunate occurrence.

Furthermore, the death of the wicked is not always a bad thing: “when the wicked perish, there is shouting.”

Pr 11:10 When it goeth well with the righteous, the city rejoiceth: and when the wicked perish, there is shouting.

UCG> It is certainly not doing them any good.

It is stopping them from further evil, which would bring more of God’s judgment on them. At least on this point, it is good for them.

The context is clear--the enemy is someone who has already done you wrong and you have the chance to take revenge on them--you are not to take revenge on them, but do them good. Revenge (personal revenge) is God’s business--hatred only destroys you and is ungodly; forgive and love . However, this does not address what to do when someone is presently harming you or someone else. Nor does it address cases where the harm is ongoing, like someone on a killing spree; maybe they are not harming you right now, but you have to deal with them to stop the evil, or you are party to it.

Note (not sure where to put it): if the 6th commandment carries over, so do the meanings and definitions and understanding of it, which which was given in the chapters following Ex 20.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Let me emphasize that loving enemies is not necessarily
UCG> contrary to killing enemies.

Dobson would say, “love must be tough.” Sometimes you have to hurt someone, if not for their own good, then for the good of others.

UCG> God Himself loves every enemy He destroys
UCG> at the right time in the right way for the right reason (Revelation
UCG> 11:18).

Revelation 11:18 And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth.

But only God has the wisdom to know how to do this.

Which he imparts to us. All the ways of God are beyond our understanding, but he reveals himself to us through his word. We can have the mind of Christ (I Corinthians 4:16), to the extent that he has revealed it to us in scripture. And it is not just his job, because we are his hands, we are to do his work (job), we are his body down here on earth to do his will and accomplish his plans. Furthermore, he has commanded us to do a number of things that necessarily involve violence.

UCG> For
UCG> Christians, killing enemies is a sin at this time only because Jesus
UCG> nowhere authorizes

Ps 149: UCG admits that this authorizes killing. This privilage
have all the saints. (He just says it is in the future, not now.)

Psalm 149:6 Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a twoedged sword in their hand;
7 To execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people;
8 To bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron;
9 To execute upon them the judgment written: this honour have all his saints. Praise ye the LORD.

“authorizes... to kill” harmonizes with scripture, is commended to us in various examples with God’s blessings, is part of obeying other commands, such as, carry a sword, put away the wicked, defend the innocent, provide for your family, etc, it conforms to God’s character, whereas not killing would contradict his character of defending the innocent and righteous from the wicked (being trigger happy is not, because God does not delight in the death of the wicked, but that he would repent, nevertheless, when the wicked move to destroy his people, God will intervene, sometimes using his people bearing the sword to against those who do evil).

UCG> His disciples to kill people and it would violate
UCG> Jesus’ commission to all New Testament saints to obey the gospel. For
UCG> more on Jesus’ gospel commission, refer to Argument #2 below.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Applying the principle of godly love in particular
UCG> situations requires prayer and wisdom. Christians are to be wise as
UCG> serpents toward all people, friends and enemies, just as Jesus was.
UCG> Jesus did not turn the other cheek or passively approach evil in all
UCG> situations.

Here Mr. UCG is using scripture to explain scripture (the one about turning the cheek and resist not evil), and in so doing, he opens himself to my arguments--using scripture to show God's character, other commands, principles of scripture, etc.

UCG> Sometimes Christians can't directly love their enemies
UCG> because the enemy would kill them while they're doing so.

This is because UCG has a false definition of love. Love is not just syrupy kind gooey stuff. Love is part of God's character that includes justice, retribution to the wicked, and defense of the innocent.

UCG> Some
UCG> occasions require Christians to escape, hide, or use physical force

This can include using deadly weapons, and if the criminals die, it may not have been part of the plan.

UCG> to
UCG> restrain an enemy until further help arrives.

What if you live in the middle of a Christian community and there are no ungodly people to rescue you, or what if all the ungodly people want to hurt you and will not help? It just about amounts to needing to call the devil to help, since God via his people cannot. (If you were hungry, thirsty, naked, fearful, etc, God would help you through his people, but somehow, he is not able to help you in the matter of personal security, according to Mr. UCG.)

UCG> No scripture says exactly
UCG> how to do this. Our faith is that God will give discernment in a
UCG> particular situation.

UCG> Argument #2

UCG> A Christian killing in self-defense is wrong because killing in
UCG> self-defense violates Jesus' commission to His disciples to be His
UCG> instruments to proclaim and model for all humanity the gospel (good
UCG> news) of peace, reconciliation, and salvation.

We are to preach the gospel. Your idea of "modeling" includes some non-Biblical baggage.

God's command for us to defend the innocent is nowhere retracted in the NT. Nor does it contradict preaching the gospel.

UCG> Evidence

UCG> Refer to Table 2. Jesus commissioned not just the ministry, but every
UCG> New Testament Christian (Philippians 4:3 to be God's instrument in
UCG> bringing the true gospel to the whole world, even as Jesus did (Mark
UCG> 16:15). That gospel message is about God's way of peace (Romans 10:15),

Philippians 4:3 And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellowlabourers, whose names are in the book of life.

Romans 10:15 And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! [note: this is a quote from the Psalms, you know, where they don't have anything to do with preaching to the lost!?!]

Peace with God, war with the devil, the world, the beast, our old nature, etc. I suppose the 2 prophets at the end of the world can't call fire down on people and preach at the same time? It surely seems to me that they do both in the following verses:

Revelation 11

- 3 ¶ And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth.
- 4 These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.
- 5 And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed.
- 6 These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will.
- 7 And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them.
- 8 And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.
- 9 And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves.
- 10 And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth.
- 11 And after three days and an half the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them.
- 12 And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

UCG> how He's reconciling His enemies to Himself through Christ and through

UCG> the Church, and eternally saving those He's calling now.

UCG> Table 2. Jesus' Gospel Commission to Christians

Gospel Commission to Christians	Scriptural Proof
<p>To be Christ's ambassador to proclaim the gospel as a warning and witness to God's enemies (that's the whole world); to obey and model the gospel of peace as a way of life, even unto death, if necessary; to help Jesus reconcile God's enemies to Him; and to build God's divine nature.</p> <p>What does "build God's divine nature" mean?</p> <p>Obeying this commission is necessary to qualify for the Kingdom of God. See NOTE 1 below.</p> <p>"Qualify?" We don't qualify for anything except hell. Tit 3:5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;</p> <p>The evidence (works) of our salvation (faith) includes preaching the gospel. However, there will be those who preach the gospel, but will go to hell, ie, not "qualify" for heaven. Matthew 7 :22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied [ie, preached] in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? 23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.</p> <p>If "obey and model the gospel of peace" means to follow the commands of Christ and the scriptures, fine. However, I think a little more is being sneaked in with the words "obey" and "model," which are discussed elsewhere.</p>	<p>Romans 3:17, 8:7, 10:15, 12:18; I Peter 3: 11, II Peter 1:4-11, James 3:18, Hebrews 12:14, Luke 1:79, II Corinthians 5:18-20, Mark 8:35, 16: 15; Luke 20:35, I Thessalonians 5:14-15, Matthew 24:14, II Thessalonians 1:5; Ephesians 6:15</p> <p>[See following row]</p>

Romans 3:17 (10-18)

cursing Romans 3:17 Psalm 10:7

throat Ps 5:9 Romans 3:13

23:10 copied from Ps 53:2-3

Romans 8:7

7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God

The carnal man is enmity against God.

The works of the flesh are manifest...

The fruits of the spirit.

If UCG implies that self-defense is carnal, he provides no logical or scriptural construct to demonstrate it. It might be a physical act, but it does not fit under the category of carnal, any more than eating is gluttony or drinking is drunkenness, or clothing is vanity, or occupation is being entangled in the affairs of this world, etc. This is precisely the mistake Jesus' accusers made: **Matthew 11:19** **The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.** Gal 5:19 murder is the only act that could count as being carnal -- find source of the lists.

Galatians 5

19 Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,

20 Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

21 Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

22 But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,

23 Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.

24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

25 If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.

26 Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

Self-defense was included in the law, further illustrating that self-defense is not carnal, but is aligned with God's law.

Additionally, if it is part of the law of God:

--it is not carnal (because God's law is not carnal);

--it is with God, not against him (because God does not contradict himself or his word);

--Ro 8:8 it pleases God, or at least it does not displease him, since it is not carnal or part of the old nature

Romans 10:15

15 And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!

Most Christians don't spend their entire life hunkered down behind barricades pointing their rifles at everyone who comes near. They go about their lives in a normal manner, working, witnessing, etc. Those who are in the military or other situations where they *are* hunkered down, they still witness, and comfort the hurting--just like Christians (Corrie Ten Boom) do in prison camp.

Armed Christians (like Jim Elliott) can be "sent" to proclaim the gospel of peace as well as unarmed ones.

The gospel is peach with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Isa 52:7 is what this quotes, discussing Christ: **7 How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!**

Regarding good feet bringing good things:

Psalm 119:59 I thought on my ways, and turned my feet unto thy testimonies.

101 I have refrained my feet from every evil way, that I might keep thy word.

105 NUN. Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.

But you can't ignore other verses with feet. If you throw out the following verses because of some reason or other (which boils down to your dislike of them), you must also throw out the previous ones.

Psalm 18

37 I have pursued mine enemies, and overtaken them: neither did I turn again till they were consumed.

38 I have wounded them that they were not able to rise: they are fallen under my feet.

39 For thou hast girded me with strength unto the battle: thou hast subdued under me those that rose up against me.

40 Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I might destroy them that hate me.

41 They cried, but there was none to save them: even unto the LORD, but he answered them not.

42 Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets.

Psalm 47

2 For the LORD most high is terrible; he is a great King over all the earth.

3 He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet.

Psalm 58

10 The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked.

11 So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.

Romans 12:18

18 If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

2 phrases "as much as lieth in you"

"live" -- if you are going to die, perhaps that does not "lie in you" to live/die with that.

Also, "peaceably" doesn't necessarily mean non-violence, or non-violently. David was not a violent man, in fact, he prayed to God to save him from the violent man, even though he was a soldier and a warrior. He loved peace, even though he engaged in war.

Helping someone in need to win them to Christ is different from helping them to do evil, or wishing them godspeed while they are doing evil, or on their way to do it, or in this case, allowing them to do evil without stopping them by whatever means is available, including deadly force, which Mr. UCG seems to be implying in using this verse. He seems to be implying that if your enemy is coming to do you harm, you must do kind things to him. If we take it to mean that we cannot stop them from doing evil, but have to do them "good," or perhaps, what they would like, then, perhaps if an evil doer comes to rape your wife, we should fix him a meal and then hold our wife down. After all, we are to do him good, and live peaceably, and that rapist won't be happy or at peace until he has raped your wife, so help him, and then he will feel no need to do violence to you. Maybe. On the contrary, we are very clearly warned not to help the wicked do evil, or we are party to it. 2 John 10 If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: 11 For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds. We can't even bid them godspeed, or we are partakers in their evil deeds.

I Peter 3:11

11 Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it.

(a few other verses containing "seek peace"):

Psalm:14 Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it.

Ezekiel 7:25 Destruction cometh; and they shall seek peace, and there shall be none.

Ch 3 has been comparing the behavior of OT people and how we should model ourselves after them. It is nice of UCG to bring in this scripture and this point, since I agree that OT saints should serve as models.

We seek peace by putting away the wicked. The ungodly's definition of peace is a lack of conflict, because everyone conforms to their ideas, meaning a lack of Christians. The righteous definition is peace with God, and the wicked dealt with.

Notice that the first part of the verse (I Peter 3:11) says to eschew, or avoid, evil. It reminds me of other verses that tell us to hate evil:

Psalm 97:10 Ye that love the LORD, hate evil: he preserveth the souls of his saints; he delivereth them out of the hand of the wicked.

Proverbs 8:13 The fear of the LORD is to hate evil: pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate.

James 3:11

11 Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?

The implication is that deadly force is bitter, and Christianity is sweet, but this is true only if deadly force is bad in the first place, which this verse nowhere establishes. See the many verses that say something beautiful about a weapon, a fortress, a stronghold, a battle flag (ensign), a strong man armed, a mighty man, etc.

Such as the following verses comparing weapons to beautiful things, like children, or referring to warriors as good, such as the following:

Psalm 127:3 Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward.

4 As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth.

5 Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.

(children are a blessing, so are weapons; the more you have, the more "happy" you are. Happiness is a house full of children, and a closet full of assault weapons (and the children know how to use them))

Judges 6:12 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him, and said unto him, The LORD is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. in other words, God is calling him a very brave warrior, in a very positive reference.

Ephesians 6:10-17

10 Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

11 Put on the whole armour...

13 Wherefore take unto you the whole armour...

14 having on the breastplate...

16 ...taking the shield...

17 And take the helmet... and the sword...

If God wants us to be pacifists, like Mr. UCG suggests, he certainly uses militant language.

Hebrews 12:14

14 Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord:

Peace includes stopping those who destroy the innocent and the nation. It definitely does not include allowing the wicked to run rampant and unhindered. If all the evil and predators are not out destroying everyone, the nation will be more peaceful. If you can't remove all of them, you can take care of the one who is giving you grief.

A blessing in the OT is that God will remove the evil beasts, because they are a curse, just like evil people, which God commands us to put away, or they will be a curse to us. (Leviticus 26:6-7 And I will give peace in the land, and ye shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid: and I will rid evil beasts out of the land, neither shall the sword go through your land.

7 And ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword.)

Luke 1:79

79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

Christ has guided us in the way of peace, but it's undefined here, and doesn't necessarily mean non-violence. For example, Christ said he did not come to bring peace, but a sword, to divide families, etc.

But equally valid, we are not to engage in bloodshed at the drop of a hat.

The Bible generally specifies peace with God, and with our brethren, but war with the world, the devil, our old nature, the Beast, etc.

The guy who came to guide us in the way of peace also told us to carry a sword.

2 Cor 5:18-20

II Corinthians 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

20 Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

A perfect verse for the discussion -- we are to be reconciled to God, which will irreconcile us to many others, although we certainly are to do all we can to live peaceably with men. He does not say that primarily we are to be reconciled to everyone including the wicked, but to God, and to take that message to them however they may receive it. That generally will put us to war with everyone else, which does not bode well if your main concern is peace with everyone.

Mark 8:34-38

Mark 8:34 And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

35 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it.

36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?

37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

38 Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

Maintaining and preserving our physical life and things related to it are not our highest goals. Our supreme purpose does not revolve around physical, but spiritual things. If God calls us to be a missionary, we may be malnourished, contract illness, lose family members, and die prematurely. Whereas, if our focus was solely on the physical, we would not subject ourselves to these difficulties. If we witness to lost family members, friends, co-workers, etc we may be ridiculed, disowned, thrown out in the streets to poverty, lose our jobs, etc. We may be thrown in jail, raped, murdered (Indonesia), beaten, lose our possessions, etc. If we refuse to follow Christ or obey his commands to avoid these things, we are denying him.

However, we are not required to suffer these things if we can avoid them. We do not have to starve to death if we can by any means obtain food. Same for all the other sufferings. (Some people think there is spirituality in suffering, so they intentionally make themselves suffer, either for their own benefit, or for others to admire, and think they win points with God. While God can use suffering to conform us to his image, and to pry our hands loose from the things of this world, and cause us to look beyond the physical world to him, he does not intend for us to intentionally afflict ourselves (which is different from "crucifying the flesh," fasting, keeping our bodies under subjection, etc).)

God expects us to take care of ourselves and our charges (those under our care). Losing our life means we follow and obey Christ no matter what the price. It doesn't mean we are required to be killed or else be damned, which is what a strict interpretation of v. 35 without considering any other verses might conclude. It certainly does not address self defense.

If implying that to attempt to save our life is "to love it," you must realize that the scripture doesn't apply only to self-defense. Notice that even Mr. UCG tells us we must "save our life," but he says only that we may not use deadly force. So, if "saving your life" disqualifies a person from heaven, Mr. UCG will not be in heaven, because he instructs us to "save our life."

Fortunately for both of us, Mr. UCG's interpretation of "save your life" is incorrect, even by his own standards, which also renders all his other references to "peace" as being synonymous with non-violence and non-deadly force as incorrect. (Otherwise God would be inconsistent.)

If any effort to "save [your] life" is wrong, it would equally apply for almost every act of life--including going to the doctor, washing a cut to prevent infection, eating good food so you lead a long and healthy life, eating any food at all (you eat to live, or to save your life, so if you are going to do nothing at all to save your life, that would even include breathing, so if you breathe, you are doing so to stay alive, or, to "save your life," so stop breathing, or you are violating Jesus' command, which also forbids you from using deadly force to preserve your life!

Seriously, the phrase "save your life" doesn't address breathing any more than it does self-defense with deadly force. It discusses the need for putting nothing, even your own life, above Christ.

You might even call it Jesus' expounding of the First Commandment: **Exodus 20:3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me.**

Mark 16:15-18

15 And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

16 He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.

17 And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues;

18 They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

We are commanded to preach the gospel, but no details as to how, or how not to carry out his command, or else the list would be endless, and even then it would not be complete. He just gives us a general command, and the common sense to figure it out, and principles to use to do it correctly, just like he commands us to provide for our own, to care for the needy, to defend and rescue the helpless, etc.

You can preach the gospel and engage in self-defense at the same time. There is no contradiction, any more than it is contradictory for God to die for the whole world, while at the same time throwing most of them in hell.

Luke 20:35

Luke 20:35 But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage:

36 Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

We are made worthy by the blood of Christ. We will not have weddings in heaven. Nothing in the verse suggests we will be made unworthy by engaging in self-defense.

I Thessalonians 5:14-15

I Thessalonians 5:14 Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feebleminded, support the weak, be patient toward all men.

15 See that none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men.

You certainly aren't rendering evil to your family or other innocent people when you defend them. And, it is not evil to resist or even kill the wicked in self defense. Since self defense is not evil, it is not evil to do it to someone, and so this verse, to not "render evil" to someone does not apply to self defense.

Self defense might be better termed "rendering justice" or "righteousness," which we are commanded to do. It all hinges on whether or not self defense is "evil," and this verse does not deal with the issue.

Matthew 24:14

Matthew 24:14 And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

Preaching the gospel is not contradictory to self defense. The verse says nothing about self-defense. If Mr. UCG is implying that you can do nothing but preach the gospel, including defend yourself, that would include absolutely nothing, since not one single thing is listed here, including earning a living, seeking an education, raising a family, attending social functions, etc. Maybe you're not even supposed to eat or dress yourself or have personal hygiene or sleep. Sorry, all you can do is preach the gospel! So, quit reading this Bible study and go start preaching!

Which, of course, is silly nonsense. We are supposed to live life in all the details that are part of it, as long as we don't violate God's word. And, all the while we live, in everything we do, and every opportunity we have, while living life, we are to preach the gospel. It's not that we are supposed to stop living so we can preach, we are to preach while we live. Like Noah preached while he built the ark. The only thing we have to stop doing is sinning.

God has called some people to preach full time, but not even they stop living to preach. It's just that they make it their occupation.

II Thessalonians 1:5

II Thessalonians 1:5 Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:

People who use self defense suffer as much as anyone else. Consider those in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* who resisted and suffered. In fact, they may suffer even more, because they might live longer and see more evil. Those who use self defense do not use deadly force to resolve every problem and conflict. In fact, almost none of them are resolved this way. 99.9% of all our conflicts are resolved in the same way that a pacifist resolves his problems, because deadly force is not an option, nor is it desirable.

Ephesians 6:15

Ephesians 6:15 And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;

The “gospel of peace” is the news about peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, it is not about non-violence or pacifism. When we make things right with God so we are at peace with him, we become at war with the devil, the world, unbelievers, our families, our own nature, and whatever else exalts itself against God. This certainly does not mean you start shooting them all (you’d have to shoot yourself as well) but there’s certainly no peace.

like with most other commands

The wicked’s definition of peace is the elimination of the righteous, or at least they are so disarmed, constrained, and controlled that they can’t do anything. The righteous’ definition of peace is the wicked put away, out of power, put to death, or too afraid to do anything. Only pacifists have a definition of peace that involves the wicked and the righteous living harmoniously together.

Jehu put it aptly when he answered the question, “Is it peace?”

II Kings 9:22 And it came to pass, when Joram saw Jehu, that he said, Is it peace, Jehu? And he answered, What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many? (there cannot be peace when the wicked prevail!)

23 And Joram turned his hands, and fled, and said to Ahaziah, There is treachery, O Ahaziah.

24 And Jehu drew a bow with his full strength, and smote Jehoram between his arms, and the arrow went out at his heart, and he sunk down in his chariot. (THAT is one way to deal with the wicked.)

27 But when Ahaziah the king of Judah saw this, he fled by the way of the garden house. And Jehu followed after him, and said, Smite him also in the chariot. And they did so at the going up to Gur, which is by Ibleam. And he fled to Megiddo, and died there. (He assassinated BOTH kings, and v.31, the queen.)

30 And when Jehu was come to Jezreel, Jezebel heard of it; and she painted her face, and tired her head, and looked out at a window.

31 And as Jehu entered in at the gate, she said, Had Zimri peace, who slew his master? (Jezebel says, whoso takes the sword will perish with the sword, you better not kill me! Jehu knew the proper application of this principle, paid no heed to Jezebel’s misapplication of it, and put away the wicked, as God wanted him to do, v33.)

32 And he lifted up his face to the window, and said, Who is on my side? who? And there looked out to him two or three eunuchs.

33 And he said, Throw her down. So they threw her down: and some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses: and he trode her under foot. (We make peace with God by accepting Christ as our Savior. We make peace on earth by putting away the wicked.)

To save life, not destroy it.

“not destroy it” would include not destroying the innocent and victims by omission. If a Christian is going to use deadly force, it is only because an innocent person is going to die or be severely harmed, therefore, the real question is, WHOSE life will you destroy, the innocent and righteous, or the wicked. Can you find a verse anywhere where God commands us to destroy or harm the innocent and righteous? No, on the contrary, we are warned that we better not, or else. That leaves one alternative, we harm the wicked, and, complying with what the Bible commands us, defend the innocent and righteous, and put away the wicked, and defend INNOCENT blood, not guilty blood.

Also, the context of this verse (save life not destroy it) is in killing those who refuse to repent, like the Moslems do (they kill the infidels, ie, the unrepentant). The verse does not directly address self defense.

Luke 9:56

Luke 9:51 And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem,
52 And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him.
53 And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem.
54 And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?
55 But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.
56 For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.

Whose life will you destroy? Your family and the innocent and helpless by omission, or by commission the wicked and evil predators who are out to destroy them? Since the only reason you would use deadly force is to save someone's life, it's a matter of who do you chose to live, and who do you chose to die: the innocent and righteous, or the wicked.

[Continued below.]

Also, if we are under all circumstances forbidden to kill, it is a commandment we are not able to obey, because either by our action or inaction, someone is going to die. God has told us to do what is impossible to do.

If we are forbidden to destroy men's lives for any reason under any circumstances, then we should become adamant advocates against the death penalty, because if we stand by and allow people to die when it is in our power to defend them, we are party to it.

Romans 13 does not say the death penalty or sword is evil, but good, and so, either God is schizophrenic, contradicting himself in different places, or the death penalty is not wrong, meaning that we are not forbidden under all circumstances to kill.

Romans 13:3

3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

Rulers are to terrorize the evil and make them afraid -- the wicked fear nothing but brute power and force strong enough to overthrow and destroy them.

Romans 13:4

4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

"he is the minister of God" -- that means he is doing God's work in God's stead or on his behalf, and what he does is "good," not evil, which it would be if deadly force were evil.

"Minister of God" is specifically related to "bear[ing] the sword," (bearing arms), and this is "good." So here we have God specifically saying that bearing arms against evil is good.

[Continued below.]

"Minister of God" and "the sword" are also directly linked by God personally into executing God's wrath against the wicked. What are God's judgment against the wicked and those who destroy the good? Death and destruction. Nobody disagrees that God destroys and kills the wicked, but here he authorizes people to do it on his behalf!! This verse in general refers back to put away the evil among you, from the OT, of course, which is what gov't is supposed to help us do.

To fight with spiritual weapons such as prayer and faith, not with carnal weapons such as guns and swords. Wrestle with wicked spirits, not human beings. See NOTE 2 below.

On occasion we may have to deal with evil spirits and not use physical weapons. Furthermore, we understand that behind human evil is “spiritual wickedness in high places.” This does not relieve the necessity of physical battle.

If we never use carnal means, then maybe we don't have to use carnal means with any physical obstacle: flood, fire, famine, pestilence, sickness, disagreements, illogic, etc.

“not with carnal weapons” Perhaps this would be better applied to those who want to physically conquer without the gospel.

Find similar statements, that, taken to extremes (ie, beyond what they are supposed to mean) that conflict with other passages, such as--take no thought of tomorrow, resist not evil, don't worry about food or clothing, etc.

Here UCG contradicts himself. In other places he argues it is OK to wrestle and even to use weapons, even if only those that are non-deadly, as long as you don't kill the criminal. But, here, he proscribes physical wrestling of any sort with weapons of any sort, no matter what the outcome (dead or alive criminal).

Either physical wrestling of any sort is absolutely forbidden, which he here states, or he is mis-understanding and mis-applying this verse.

You can't take this verse, and ignore all the other verses dealing with the subject. You must compare scripture; not ignore those portions non-conducive to your personal beliefs, or you fail to rightly divide the word of truth.

Furthermore, there is only one interpretation of scripture. God doesn't have a contradictory message for different people. Yes, there are different levels of meaning, but none of them contradict anything else in the Bible. The Bible won't tell you on one place not to wrestle against flesh, and another place that you should wrestle against flesh. If you think it does, somewhere you messed up in your reading or interpretation.

II Corinthians 10:3-4, Matthew 26:52, Ephesians 6:12

II Corinthians 10:3-6

- 3 For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:
- 4 (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)
- 5 Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;
- 6 And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

We are not like liberals who turn the gospel into a social gospel (where they replace the gospel with social services), or like Moslem militants or Crusaders who replace the gospel with militant salvation earned by killing the infidels (replace the gospel with militant action).

[Continued below.]

II Corinthians 10:3-6 con't

This does not mean that social action is wrong, but neither is militant action. It's just that these are not replacements for the gospel. Also, these are not supposed to be our primary mode of action (although it might seem that way for someone who works at a mission and spends most of their time "serving tables," or for a soldier/minuteman who spends most of his time fighting or preparing to fight.

Our primary tool is the gospel. The way we win the lost is with the gospel. The way we cleanse our minds of evil imagination is with God's Word. (though you can't preach the gospel to a piece of ground to bring up a garden of food to eat.) The way we conform ourselves to Christ is with the Word. These are our main focuses and purposes, and physical devices including weapons are not solely sufficient within themselves to accomplish these. However, the more mundane aspects of our lives require physical action and devices (not to mention most of our time), which God command us when he told us to dress the garden and keep it, and also to till the ground by the sweat of our brow.

Spreading the gospel is not a matter of holding a knife to the throats of the heathen and forcing them to convert, as Moslems do. Removing evil thoughts and living the Christian life is not a matter of using violence to do it--we use God's word, preaching, etc, but this does not negate the need for doing physical things, including using weapons, doctors, occupations, hammers, Maytag repairmen, etc.

On a side note, the gospel is that part of God's word dealing with salvation. We cleanse our minds with that part of God's word dealing with our thoughts. We work hard because of those portions of God's word dealing work. We defend ourselves because of those portions of God's word dealing with life and evil.

[Continued below.]

Matthew 26:52

- 52 Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.
53 Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?
54 But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?
55 In that same hour said Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.
56 But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

Jesus' main reason to saying no to any force of any sort at all, was that he would not be able to fulfill scripture, be it with swords or angels. He adds an aside that those who use means of violence will probably die of the same sort of physical violence. In modern parlance, what goes around comes around. The next question to ask, then, is it wrong to die of fighting.

By the way, he even declined to use angels, which UCG says is OK, as opposed to humanly force, which he says is not OK. Since Jesus declined even "proper" force, it is evident that force was not the issue, but rather, the fulfillment of scripture.

What Jesus said: put your sword back into the scabbard, that is on your waist. (He did not say throw it away, turn it over to the police, or sell it and give the money to the poor. In fact, this may have been the sword he told them to acquire by selling some of their clothes.

Why he said put away the sword is answered in scripture, and is not left to conjecture.

1. it isn't necessary (he was already heavily armed, but chose not to use his weapons)
2. because it would bring about undesirable results (Peter's death) in the long run
3. The scripture would not be fulfilled.

Principles we can glean from the 3 specific reasons given to Peter:

1. Not every situation merits force; you need wisdom to understand when;
2. Look at the long term consequences of the action to see what will bring the best long term results. If being physically harmed brings better long-term results, then so be it.
3. Don't violate God's word.

It is clear that he told Peter to put away the sword so scripture would be fulfilled, because Jesus not only had available but even used some force (knocked them all down), that is legitimate according to Mr. UCG, but chose not to use it, precisely so scripture would be fulfilled, and that's also why he told Peter to use no force either, plus he wanted to protect Peter from the civil authorities.

There's nothing forbidding deadly force, just common sense and spiritual wisdom and God's word to guide you.

[Continued below].

I can see personal application to the warning that, they that take the sword will perish with the sword. There are times when we have considered that Health and Human Services or Homeland Security or some other band of Nazis might attempt to kidnap our children from us because we spank them, or because we home school them, or because they are not vaccinated, or because we teach them Christian values, or because we have deadly weapons in our home and teach our children to use them, or because we have a patriarchal structure, or because we don't allow them to follow popular culture, or because we tell them homosexuality is an abomination, and sex outside of marriage is wrong, or whatever. If those agencies were to attempt to kidnap our children, I would be mightily tempted to use deadly force, just as I would against any other pornographer or child molester trying to kidnap our children. However, the words of Christ shine on the situation: if we use deadly force, we will have to face the wrath of the government, and we want to avoid that if at all possible, and as much as lies within us, we will live peaceably with these people, because to use deadly force would basically be the end of our family, I would end up dead or in prison (I would perish with the sword). So, I intent to be very cautious and careful in the matter, but if worst comes to worst, and our legal assistance from Home School Legal Defense, and all the other methods of defense we have lined up fail, we will do whatever it takes. Jesus never said it was a sin to perish with the sword, it's just that it's not something you want to bring about carelessly or when there is an alternative . And, yes, it is possible to die before your time because of stupidity, rashness, unpreparedness, etc.

Matthew 24:14

14 And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

It says nothing about self-defense or deadly force. It only tells us to preach the gospel. Not how or with what tools or methods or approaches. It doesn't say what things we cannot do while preaching, nor does it say that the only thing we can do is preach the gospel .

Part of equipping the saints and edifying them and training them into how to serve and live life in a way pleasing to God (avoid things strangled and fornication and other than that, that's it), is helping them to live life (the children of this world are wiser ...(Luke 16:8-12), Proverbs on wise living) in a wise manner.

Not everyone "preaches" to the same extent. Some "Serve tables." Not everyone has the same "talents" and "gifts" as others. Not all have the same ministry--some are primarily ministers to the church "apostles, prophets, teachers, pastors, evangelists," although they don't lose their commission to reach the lost.

Notice that "serving tables" is not the same as "preaching." Acts 6:1-8. Notice that serving tables decreases ones ability to "preach the gospel," and yet, it is considered vital. They chose Stehpen to do the mundane task of "serving tables," and yet, he also did not neglect preaching, and was stoned for the preaching he did while serving tables (just like we can be in the militia, fight for the Constitution and the Bible, and provide for our families, all the while preaching the gospel), even though the apostles said that serving tables was different from preaching the word continually.

Anyone who uses verses dealing with "preaching the gospel" to disallow self-defense--as if to say that preaching is all we are allowed to do-- should show me a record of their daily activities and the time spent in the various activities. If they do any "preaching of the gospel" at all, it is probably minimal, I would dare say, even if they are a preacher. I doubt very seriously that they do so much "preaching of the gospel" that they have no time for anything else, and that any other activity they undertake (including self-defense) would take away from their preaching activities, or would interfere with their preaching activities, or by their nature would preclude preaching (I suppose they spend so much time gunning everyone down that they have no time to witness to them, or when they try to they are dead from being shot, or they are running away too fast to be effectively witnessed to.)

UCG> Ephesians 6:12

- 10 ¶ Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.
- 11 Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.
- 12 For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.
- 13 Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.
- 14 Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;
- 15 And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;
- 16 Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.
- 17 And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:
- 18 Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;

It is obvious that the world, the flesh, and the devil are our enemies, and that as a rule of thumb we do not fight these with physical means, whether violently or non-violently. However, that does not negate the fact that we do have physical enemies and obstacles which must be physically overcome, whether it be hunger, pestilence (crop pestilence and disease pestilence), diseases, predators, accidents, car wrecks, etc.

v. 10: Be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might.

Our strength is supposed to be in God... Notice the below references to God being our strength, and how the strength of God translates into action: to fight, war, destroy the enemy/wicked, use weapons skillfully and fatally, etc. Notice that God does the enabling, but David does the action: 1 & 2, God is his strength, ie, the one who enables him to do what he does. (29) God enables him to run through enemy troops, and guessing based on the rest of the Psalm, he probably kills a number of them while running through them. (32) again David credits God for being his strength, that enables him to do everything listed in this chapter. (34) Not only does God strengthen David to fight, he also teaches him how to fight. God works with David to bring about David's triumphs in battle. God: enlarges (36), David pursues, overtakes, consumes (37) wounds, crushes under his feet (38); God girds and subdues (39), gives (40), David destroys (40), beats (42), casts (42); God delivers, makes him the head; David is able to rule over the heathen (43, 44), make them fade and fear (45). To summarize it, David gives the credit for all the action to God (46).

In this same vein you can look up Ps 28, 22, 19, 29, 31, 43, 46, 59, 68, 71.

Psalm 18

- 1 I will love thee, O LORD, my strength. (compare to Eph 6:10: Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.)
- 2 The LORD is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; my God, my strength, in whom I will trust; my buckler, and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower.
- 29 For by thee I have run through a troop; and by my God have I leaped over a wall.
- 30 As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the LORD is tried: he is a buckler to all those that trust in him.
- 31 For who is God save the LORD? or who is a rock save our God?
- 32 It is God that girdeth me with strength, and maketh my way perfect.
- 33 He maketh my feet like hinds' feet, and setteth me upon my high places.
- 34 He teacheth my hands to war, so that a bow of steel is broken by mine arms.
- 35 Thou hast also given me the shield of thy salvation: and thy right hand hath holden me up, and thy gentleness hath made me great.
- 36 Thou hast enlarged my steps under me, that my feet did not slip.
- 37 I have pursued mine enemies, and overtaken them: neither did I turn again till they were consumed.
- 38 I have wounded them that they were not able to rise: they are fallen under my feet.
- 39 For thou hast girded me with strength unto the battle: thou hast subdued under me those that rose up against me.
- 40 Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I might destroy them that hate me.
- 41 They cried, but there was none to save them: even unto the LORD, but he answered them not.
- 42 Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets.
- 43 Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people; and thou hast made me the head of the heathen: a people whom I have not known shall serve me.
- 44 As soon as they hear of me, they shall obey me: the strangers shall submit themselves unto me.
- 45 The strangers shall fade away, and be afraid out of their close places.
- 46 The LORD liveth; and blessed be my rock; and let the God of my salvation be exalted.

Do we not believe God strengthens us to act, not just to believe or think?

You can't eat faith, truth, righteousness, gospel of peace, salvation, and the Word of God, nor do they pay your bills, mend wounds, build good relationships with your family, etc.

If we turn it into a physical struggle, we miss the spiritual source of the problem, and of the strength. However, that does not mean that there aren't physical aspects to the struggle, which Mr. UCG admits when he says we must struggle physically as long as we don't use deadly force.

This is not what the verse says. It says the weapons of our warfare are not carnal (physical), but spiritual. If we take this to mean no physical resistance is allowed, because the struggle is spiritual instead of physical, there's nothing in the verse to distinguish between any sort of physical resistance at all, and deadly force. If it is a prohibition at all, it is total and complete prohibition, including physical/carnal weapons such as hands and feet, or other non-lethal physical weapons, for which Mr. UCG allows.

What are we to fight against?

wiles of the devil (trickery, sneakiness)

principalities, powers, rulers of darkness of this world,

spiritual wickedness in high places

fiery darts of the devil

These are spiritual problems, it makes sense that we would use spiritual weapons, and anyone trying to use physical weapons would be stupid. Don't call ghost busters. Wrong kind of weapons.

He doesn't say what weapons to use if we fight against a plague of locusts eating our crops (Hey, brother, pesticides are carnal, so are squishing instruments, and so are hands and feet to manually squash them. Sorry, no carnal weapons allowed here.) or a snake biting your child, or a lion eating your cattle (nope, sorry, no carnal weapons allowed, pray for that sucker only, and if he jumps into your room and starts eating your wife, pray even harder, and maybe even quote some scriptures. What a spiritual fellow you would be! In fact, in a couple minutes, you'd be totally spiritual, because you'd be dead!)

If the answer is that these are not what we are talking about, I'd have to reply that that's exactly the point--nor are we talking about physical conflicts with people that require self-defense. We are talking about the listed spiritual problems, which are to be dealt with in the listed spiritual way.

Ephesians 6:10-17

This is similar to "casting down imaginations." Our weapons are truth, righteousness, preparation of the gospel of peace, faith, salvation, and the word of God. See previous notes on Eph 6:12

II Thessalonians 1:5

5 Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:

Those who use deadly force suffer as much as anyone else, perhaps more because they live longer and see more evil.

If you are inclined to argue that more suffering is a good reason to not resist, so you can die and go to heaven and suffer less, you are advocating suicide through inaction--ie, self murder--which is clearly forbidden by the Sixth Commandment.

Also, we don't respond to every threat with violence or threatenings. The vast majority of them we suffer exactly the same as pacifists do. See *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* to see how much Christians suffered who resisted.

Luke 9:56

52 And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him.

53 And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem.

54 And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?

55 But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.

56 For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.

You won't find a clearer difference between Islam and Christianity. Moslems certainly would have called fire down, or hacked the entire town to pieces. Their scripture says kill the infidels who don't become Moslems. God commands us to love them and be longsuffering, and patient, and kind.

Christ's purpose is to save men's lives, but there are times when he will kill: Annaniah and Sapphira, Sodom and Gomorrah, the entire earth during the flood, all the wicked at the end of the world, the 7 wicked nations of Caanan.

Our purpose is also to save lives, but just because we have that purpose doesn't mean that's all we ever do. Our purpose is also to preach the gospel, but we also serve tables, rescue the oppressed, put away the evil among us, break every yoke, etc.

Most of our time we do NOT spend killing or threatening people. It's only a minor sidebar, unless we fail to do it when necessary, and then it might be the end of our life, either because the wicked flourish and fill the land, or one of them kills us.

When we do take life, it is PRECISELY to save life, which, after all is our PURPOSE (that might mean that killing the wicked in justifiable causes is one of the highest action one could take), or to put away the wicked, which in the long run not only saves lives of those who would be destroyed by the proliferation and empowerment of the wicked that happens when the wicked are allowed to flourish and organize and spread evil and destroy the good.

God's justice does save lives, and brings about repentance and restoration (which is usually the goal of his judgment and wrath, except when his purpose is simply to annihilate and remove).

As for the context (of Luke 9:56) we are not like the Moslems who kill those who don't follow their false religion.

To love our enemies

"Love" does not mean you give them whatever they want, or let them do whatever they want. In children, this produces brats. In adults, recalcitrant criminals who prey on the innocent. You spank your children. You put away the wicked. If a man had a son who was completely hardened in rebellion, the man was to bring him before the judges and have him stoned. That was love dealing with unrepentant wickedness.

Matthew 5:44

Matthew 5:44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

<p>To be those whom Christ sends into the world to live as sheep among wolves and as harmless doves. Wolves symbolize all human beings who intend harm to a Christian physically and spiritually. Sheep are defenseless animals who need a shepherd (Christ) to provide special protection against the wolves.</p> <p>While here UCG says harmless, most of the time he argues for non-lethal, not harmless.</p> <p>Sheep are not entirely harmless. Sheep with lambs will kill a dog, given the opportunity and very limited circumstances. My opa used to break his dogs of chasing sheep by putting them in the sheep pen full of sheep. He would hold the dog by a leash so it could not escape or defend itself. The sheep would butt and beat the dog to a pulp until my opa removed the dog from the pen. I suppose the sheep would have killed the dog if he had left him in the pen long enough.</p>	<p>Matthew 10:16 Matthew 10:15 Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city. 16 Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.</p> <p>Refs I wrote down: Matthew 10:16 wolves Luke 10:3 harmless Pp 2:15, Heb 7:26 doves Mt 21:12, Mr 11:15, Jo 2:14,16 sheep</p>

To be willing to face danger and death daily as sheep for the slaughter because demonic spirits stir human beings to persecute, attack, and kill true Christians to try to prevent them from fulfilling the gospel commission.

Matthew 10 first time

Luke 10 second time (?? see notes to Don)

We certainly do not witness to people and then shoot them if they don't listen. There may be times when we suffer persecution though we be armed, without retaliating, as Jesus and Jim Elliott did. There's certainly nothing wrong with that. Jesus even said he was armed to the teeth (10 legions of angels) but chose to not use them, and Jim Elliot had a rifle but also didn't use it. But, just because we are sheep for the slaughter plenty of times doesn't mean we are always sheep for the slaughter, as other scriptures point out. (Being armed in no way guarantees you won't be slaughtered.) To develop this point, Mat 9 is the first (?) time Jesus sent out his disciples.

[In addition to telling them harmless as doves, he also told them to not provide any money for themselves, nor extra clothes, and none of his other necessities, because those to whom he ministers are to provide these. Also, the implication is that all they are to do is spread the gospel, and not even have an occupation. I wonder if Mr. UCG is advocating this as well as non-violence? I don't think so.

While there are some who do this 100% of the time, there are others whose job is to "serve tables," which goes against those above. And, just as sometimes we are sheep to the slaughter, other times we are not, but are more like the horse going into battle (Job) or like David conquering Goliath]

To develop this point, the last time Jesus sent them out, he told them to take money, clothes, and a sword. He specifically told that, even though previously he sent them without these, now he was sending them with these, including a sword. This doesn't mean that now we can be harmful and dangerous, but it might suggest that we can be both harmless and armed.

Jesus was heavily armed by both angels and his own power, he knocked them down, he passed through the midst of the mob, he used a non-lethal weapon, a scourge, he told his disciples to carry swords.

"sheep for the slaughter" is taken from Psalm 44:22, the same book of Psalms with Psalm 18, 149, etc.

slaughter

Acts 8:32, 9:1

Romans 8:36

James 5:5

Romans 8:36, 36 As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

See below cell for further discussion, including the quotation of and discussion of Ps 44, which is from where the phrase "sheep for the slaughter" is quoted.

II Corinthians 4:10-11, II Timothy 1:8, Mark 8:32

II Corinthians 4:10 Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.

11 For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.

II Timothy 1:8 Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God

Mark 8:31 And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.

32 And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him.

33 But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

34 And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

35 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it.

36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?

37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

38 Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.;

Romans 8:16 The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:

17 And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

18 For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.

19 For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.

20 For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope,

21 Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

22 For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.

23 And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.

24 For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

25 But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.

26 Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

27 And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.

28 And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.

29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

30 Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

31 What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?

32 He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

34 Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

35 Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?

36 As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.

38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,

39 Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

He is discussing how we suffer in this life, just like Christ suffered, how we have hope in spite of our suffering, how God helps us through our infirmities and sufferings, how it's OK to suffer because God will bring good out of it, how we are being conformed to the image of Christ through our suffering, how nobody and no suffering can separate us from Christ, and how even the scriptures (OT) refer to us as continually suffering (Ps. 44), and how we don't need to worry about the misery of this life, because none of it can separate us from the love of God.

By extension of the context of Ps. 44, neither will being killed in combat, or other acts of violence, separate us from the love of God.

Romans 8:36 does not preclude us from violence, it just lets us know that violence and suffering done to us, whatever the reason, will not separate us from God.

Psalm 44

- 1 We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work thou didst in their days, in the times of old.
- 2 How thou didst drive out the heathen with thy hand, and plantedst them; how thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out.
- 3 For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them: but thy right hand, and thine arm, and the light of thy countenance, because thou hadst a favour unto them.
- 4 Thou art my King, O God: command deliverances for Jacob.
- 5 Through thee will we push down our enemies: through thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us.
- 6 For I will not trust in my bow, neither shall my sword save me.
- 7 But thou hast saved us from our enemies, and hast put them to shame that hated us.
- 8 In God we boast all the day long, and praise thy name for ever. Selah.
- 9 But thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; and goest not forth with our armies.
- 10 Thou makest us to turn back from the enemy: and they which hate us spoil for themselves.
- 11 Thou hast given us like sheep appointed for meat; and hast scattered us among the heathen.
- 12 Thou sellest thy people for nought, and dost not increase thy wealth by their price.
- 13 Thou makest us a reproach to our neighbours, a scorn and a derision to them that are round about us.
- 14 Thou makest us a byword among the heathen, a shaking of the head among the people.
- 15 My confusion is continually before me, and the shame of my face hath covered me,
- 16 For the voice of him that reproacheth and blasphemeth; by reason of the enemy and avenger.
- 17 All this is come upon us; yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant.
- 18 Our heart is not turned back, neither have our steps declined from thy way;
- 19 Though thou hast sore broken us in the place of dragons, and covered us with the shadow of death.
- 20 If we have forgotten the name of our God, or stretched out our hands to a strange god;
- 21 Shall not God search this out? for he knoweth the secrets of the heart.
- 22 Yea, for thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter.
- 23 Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? arise, cast us not off for ever.
- 24 Wherefore hidest thou thy face, and forgettest our affliction and our oppression?
- 25 For our soul is bowed down to the dust: our belly cleaveth unto the earth.
- 26 Arise for our help, and redeem us for thy mercies' sake.

The context of Ps 44:22 is being sheep for the slaughter in battle, and being occupied and oppressed by enemy forces. The Psalm discusses how they have heard all the victories Israel won in battle in Caanan, but now God is not helping them and they are being beaten in battle, oppressed, destroyed, and generally being treated like sheep, which are nothing more than a commodity for the owner to use, abuse, kill, and eat at their whim. The Psalmist is asking God to help them to be able to cast off the enemy (not with pretty-please politeness, mind you), to win the battles, to remove the oppressor, because he knows they can't win with their swords alone--God must be with them.

I can think of a contemporary application. There are many people who recall how God helped us win glorious victories over the British in the 1700s to establish the God-given rights and freedoms we cherish. But, now, evil powers have seized control of our government (globalists, secular humanists, new agers, socialists, environmentalists, loose constructionists of the Constitution, pagans, jack-booted thugs, etc) and if we should engage them in battle to defend and regain our rights and liberties, I suspect we would be crushed like sheep for the slaughter, and their oppression would continue and increase. Not even any of this would separate us from the love of God.

Those who survived could pray Psalm 44, remembering the victories God gave us in the 1770s, but now he is not helping us, we could ask him to help us like he used to, we could discuss our miserable, oppressed condition, and remember Romans 8, that no matter how much we are wronged, oppressed, and destroyed, we will not be separated from the love of God. It is one of our great hopes.

UCG> NOTE 1: Romans 12:18 (King James version) says "if it be possible, as
 UCG> much as lies in you, live peaceably with all men. When Paul says "if
 UCG> possible, he didn't mean a Christian tries his best to live at peace and
 UCG> if that doesn't seem to work, draw a weapon and kill the enemy.

Straw man argument. Nobody advocates suddenly drawing a weapon and killing those with whom you cannot live peaceably.

Again the distinction between using deadly force and killing.

The statement is true, but the verse also acknowledges that there is a limit, beyond which you are not required to live peaceably with them. The trick is finding out what is the limit. If you do not "live peaceably" with someone who has kicked down your door and is heading

toward the bedroom where your wife and children are (why, you just stay out of their way, especially if they are unsaved, and then wife and kids can deal with them as long as _you_ don't have to face them, since that is certainly Christian, right? Since it's obviously false for your own family) why should you step aside so the criminals can harm others?

UCG> If it's

UCG> possible to live at peace we try, but if not, a Christian stays out of

UCG> their way, or lets God or the legal authorities

But, previously UCG said Jesus speaks to both the individual and the authority with the same message. Now he's saying there's a different message? Furthermore, if you or someone you love is the target, you cannot stay out of the way. You ARE their way.

UCG> take care of the enemy.

UCG> In Romans 12:19-21,

Romans 12:19 Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

20 Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

21 Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

13:3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. ...

4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

This is similar to: if your enemy's ox comes to you, feed him. It doesn't address if he comes to rape your wife, sacrifice your children to the devil (or to the state), and murder you, because it is covered elsewhere.

You can tell the fellow: this demonstrates how much I love my wife and children, and it is a good picture of how much God loves you: he will do whatever it takes to save you. However, it is also a good picture of God's justice, in that he will not let you go on forever doing evil, but some day you will have to pay the price for your wickedness if you don't turn, like right now, I'm going to blow you away if you don't turn away from my children's doorway and sit down here and wait for the police.

On the other hand, if you take the pacifist position, the murderer will see a picture of God as a fellow who does not care what happens to the weak and helpless, or in any event will not intervene for some esoteric reason or other, and there is no justice for evil.

Romans 12:19-21 is talking about wrath, meaning you are angry at someone and want to hurt them in revenge for what they did to you. Since you are not advised to call the civil authorities and let them deal with it, you can surmise this is an insult or a wrongdoing that is relatively minor, or at least is not a crime, or else you have to conclude that you are not allowed to call the authorities no matter what, which position Mr. UCG does not hold.

Therefore, we can conclude it is a minor matter, and not one that is capitol in nature.

"heap coals of fire"

You cannot empower the wicked to do evil, although you should help them to the extent that it does not enable them to do evil, as a way to witness, as you would to an abortionist (but not change his tire on his way to kill babies) or to an enemy soldier who is no longer a threat.

You cannot do him good if you are dead, or are being raped, or if your food and water are being stolen from you, so obviously a deadly or violent confrontation is not at all what he is talking about, nor is it even any act against you like theft. It's just that there is this neighbor who hates you and has done you wrong, and you have a chance to pay him back, but instead, you show him love.

"bidding godspeed"

We never do this to someone who is doing evil, or who is not doing God's will, or we are a partaker in their evil.

I

Also notice, Romans 12:19 is followed just a few verses later by Romans 13:3-4 where we are told that one purpose of government is to wield the sword against the wicked. It would be contradictory for God in one place to tell us things that totally contradict the use of the sword, and then discuss correct uses of the sword three verses later.

UCG> Paul reinforces this conclusion by telling

UCG> Christians not to take justice into their own hands, no matter what the

UCG> enemy may do.

...in regard to revenge, not self defense, but eye for eye stuff.

We can certainly wish to stay alive so we can do the work God has for us, and so we can help our families, and set forward God's kingdom, and set back sin and the world and the devil, and bring glory to God in general, so we need to try to stay alive.

If we fight against the wicked to ensure the spread of the gospel, are we not fighting for the gospel? Are we not acting in faith, and in accordance to God's principles? If not, why are they commended for doing so in Hebrews 11, which is the New Testament?

UCG> NOTE 2: Jesus told Peter "they who take the sword shall perish with the sword (Matthew 26:52, King James Version).

It is not necessarily bad to die doing God's commands (Ps 44:22 *Yea, for thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. Ro 8:36 *As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Ps 116:15 Precious in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints.), whether it be to preach the gospel, or to defend the innocent -- as long as we are killed doing God's will and not as evil doers (1 Peter 4:15 *But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. 16 Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.*), we have God's blessings.**

We do need to heed the admonition--if we resort to arms, if the wicked, particularly those in positions of power to wield the sword, have not already done so, they probably will, and we may die in a fight.

Also, dying is obviously a bad thing (in that it prematurely stops our work for God), so that Jesus wanted his disciples to stay alive so they could continue to do his work on earth.

Many OT folks were commended for fighting and dying and killing, so while you want to avoid death, when it happens, as long as you are doing God's will, that's OK.

UCG> Here is a direct statement by Jesus that reinforces Paul's statement that Christians don't use carnal weapons such as swords to defend themselves against their enemies. Some argue that Jesus told Peter to put away his sword not because defending himself was wrong, but only because it would have prevented Jesus from achieving his mission to die for the world (Matthew 26:54). But verse 52 states that all people, including Christians,

Obviously not everyone will be killed who takes the sword, but enough to be dissuasive.

UCG> shall perish with the sword if they take it.

You might die, is the most plainly spoken reason--if there were more, we have to say it is implied, or found in other scripture. He didn't say it would happen in every single instance. It's just a good rule of thumb; if you roll a stone, it will roll back on you, if you dig a hole, you will fall in it. But that doesn't mean every single time. It's just that you are setting yourself up for a fall, and you better be careful, and think it through, and behave wisely as a serpent.

UCG> The statement logically implies something wrong with using carnal weapons to fight our enemies, and is in fact contrary to Jesus' commission to save lives, not destroy them (Luke 9:56).

Which is precisely what we are doing--saving lives from the destruction of the wicked. And if we are able to save the lives of the wicked, we do that, too--however, Pr 28:17 *A man that doeth violence to the blood of any person shall flee to the pit; let no man stay him. Pr 11:10 When it goeth well with the righteous, the city rejoiceth: and when the wicked perish, there is shouting. Pr 28:28 When the wicked rise, men hide themselves: but when they perish, the righteous increase.* So, if we don't stop the wicked on their way to the pit, while they are committing violence, don't hinder their dying (go ahead and pull the trigger); we haven't done anything wrong, and they will go to the pit.

You might die if you use your sword. How does that logically imply something wrong with using a sword? It means exactly what it says

without any interpretations. It does suggest that dying is not a good thing, and a person should make an effort to avoid dying, which a person could take to mean that, if using a sword would prevent you from dying, using a sword would in that case be a good thing to do.

After all, we are to lose our lives for Christ's sake, and while it is not the context, there's no reason why it should not apply under the right circumstances to using a sword as well as not using one--it can comfort those who are in the military or police.

Mr. UCG agrees with the v.54 interpretation (that Jesus told Peter to put the sword away so scripture could be fulfilled), except he sees the contradiction of dying with the sword--which objection is nullified by dying doing God's will--it all goes back to using deadly force, whether it is right or wrong.

UCG> Every Christian is Christ's ambassador to help reconcile God's enemies
UCG> (II Corinthians 5:18-20); to obey and model the gospel as a way of life
UCG> (Matthew 5:14-16; John 1:4, 14:6; Acts 24:14; I Peter 4:17) and as a way
UCG> of qualifying for the Kingdom of God, even through death, if necessary
UCG> (Mark 8:35, II Thessalonians 1:5); and to proclaim the gospel as a
UCG> warning and witness (Matthew 24:14). Obeying the gospel also means
UCG> building the divine nature of God (II Peter 1:4-11).

II Peter 1:

- 1 Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:
- 2 Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord,
- 3 According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue:
- 4 Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.
- 5 And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;
- 6 And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness;
- 7 And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity.
- 8 For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.
- 9 But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.
- 10 Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall:
- 11 For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

What on earth do you mean by "Obeying the gospel also means building the divine nature of God?" The verse says that God has given us promises, by which we can partake of God's divine nature. God has given us an escape route from the corruption within us. I doubt if Mr. UCG is a new age pagan, so I don't understand what he means when he says we can build the divine nature of God. We can't build anything into God's nature. We can accept a little bit of his, by his grace. II Corinthians 4:7 *But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.* There's nothing good we can do for God's nature.

(to what verse does this refer????) The verses refer to how we need to look beyond the sufferings of this life, to the reward that will follow, and how our sufferings will give glory and honor to Christ. There is no reference to self-defense or pacifism. We can suffer and bring glory to Christ being militant, as well as by being pacifist. There is no added glory or reward for pacifism. The issues of bringing glory to Christ through suffering, and militancy, are unrelated. The only problem is, pacifism is contrary to God's word, so you will receive less of a reward.

UCG> Obeying the gospel
UCG> means every part of a Christian's life -- in thought and behavior -- is
UCG> an extension of the gospel (Philippians 1:27, II Corinthians 4:10-11,
UCG> Titus 1:16).

Philippians 1:27 *Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel;*

Following God's word regarding self defense (carry a sword, arm yourselves, fight for your houses, wives, etc) is very becoming of the gospel of Christ.

II Corinthians 4:10 *Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our*

body. 11 For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.

Ro 14:8 For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

You can both live and die for Christ being armed as well as being unarmed, as the below verse says: whether we live or die, we are the Lord's. He can be glorified either way.

Titus1:16 They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.

Mr. UCG is implying that deadly self defense denies God in works, but none of the verses cited state or imply that idea. He simply assumes it does.

As a side note, just because you use self defense doesn't mean you use it in every situation, and it doesn't mean you won't die suffering persecution for Christ, and even die for him--plenty have done so.

UCG> Obeying the gospel means exercising living faith (James 2:14-26).

What's living faith? There's only 1 kind of faith: the kind that produces works suitable to God. Anything else is not faith, and so there's no need to describe the real thing as "living."

James 2:14 What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?

15 If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food,

16 And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit?

17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.

18 Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works.

19 Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.

20 But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?

21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

22 Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

23 And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.

24 Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.

25 Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?

26 For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.

UCG> Exercising living faith means seeking God's will about how we should

UCG> live the gospel, rather than blocking God out (Hebrews 4:2-3, 11:6;

Faith is simply: 1. knowing God's word, and 2. doing it.

Hebrews 4:2 For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.

3 For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.

Hebrews 11:6 But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

Matthew 7:21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

UCG> Matthew 7:21). It means allowing God to convict us that His way of

UCG> peace works (James 3:13-18).

James 3:13 Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness

of wisdom.

14 But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth.

15 This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.

16 For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.

17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

18 And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

1 From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?

2 Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not.

3 Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.

It means asking God to reveal His wisdom

UCG> about every important issue in our lives, including whether to kill

UCG> someone created in His image (James 1:5-6).

James 1:5 If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

6 But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.

The verse says ask God for wisdom if you are ignorant. That doesn't mean if something comes to your mind, or you "feel led" to think a certain way, or you just "know" a particular idea is correct, that it's from God. If you want to know what God thinks, you must search it out in the Bible, realizing that there is only 1 interpretation of scripture; some Christians are right, and some are wrong in their application of scripture.

We will not make peace by allowing the wicked to destroy the righteous, and to flourish, and to take over everything, which is what will happen if we do not stop them; and frequently the only way to stop them is violently.

UCG> Faith means believing God's

UCG> promises cannot be broken; that He will reward us for obedience, even

UCG> when we suffer for it (Hebrews 11:6, 24-27, 36-40); that God is who He

UCG> says He is and does what He says He does no matter what.

Hebrews 11:6 But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

24 By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;

25 Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

26 Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.

27 By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.

36 And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment:

37 They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;

38 (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.

39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

40 God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

No arguments with the above paragraph.

However, God rewarded those who suffered, but he also rewarded those who fought. Mr. UCG conveniently left out the verses where God commended those who were warriors for him.

32 And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets:

33 Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions,

34 Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.

Hebrews 11 lists people who had faith in God and suffered for it, and did not lose their reward, and did not lack faith, even though many of them were armed to the teeth, and either used or were prepared to use deadly force--all with God's blessings. Faith does not in any way contradict self-defense.

UCG> even when we suffer for it (Hebrews 11:6, 24-27, 36-40)

Using this verse implies that those who use self-defense repel suffering, which contradicts Mr. UCG's assertion that using self-defense will bring about your death (if you use the sword, you perish with the sword)--you can't have it both ways: either we who use self-defense suffer (in which case, we are not casting off our reward and disobeying scripture) or we do (are killed with the sword) according to Mr. UCG.

However, since Mr. UCG wrongly interprets both scriptures, we need to present a better understanding of them.

Those who use self defense suffer as much as anyone else, but they are better able to preserve theirs and others' lives, better able to accomplish God's work for them, and better able to stop the wicked.

(they that take the sword) If they are not wise in using the sword ("take the sword"), particularly in regard to resisting government, they might end up dead before their time.

The obvious rebuttal might be, if you suffer as much as everyone else, why use self-defense?

1. Because some suffering is avoidable, and we don't want to be like those who perish for lack of knowledge (they don't know that they can defend themselves) or they are like the sloth who won't plow by reason of the cold, and so will beg in harvest (they won't defend themselves, so they will be physically assaulted, robbed of their substance, bereft of their loved ones, raped, their children will be abused or stolen, etc).

2. Because we are commanded to, to prevent self-murder by omission, ie, pacifism (thou shalt not kill), to protect our family (provide for them, or be worse than an infidel), to defend the innocent, to break every yoke, to put away the wicked, to protect the land from innocent blood, etc.

There are times when self-defense will lessen suffering, because the wicked are gone (or at least fewer in number) etc, and then you are rewarded by having peace in your land, as Solomon did, because of the successful fighting done by David.

And God will reward the nation because it is not full of the blood of the innocent.

But, if you insist in suffering needlessly in the unsubstantiable hope that God will bless you more than those who don't suffer as much as you do, if you can't find a nearby rapist to abuse you (probably because some woman who believes in self defense already shot him), you can always sleep out in the cold on the hard ground with some fire ants.

Then you will be very blessed indeed for all your needless and pointless suffering (if not also somewhat stupid)!

UCG> Christians killing their enemies

But if this applies only to killing, there are many violent actions Christians can undertake which could defame Christ. Violently resisting without killing, which Mr. UCG advocates, could equally defame Christ.

UCG> violates the gospel commission to model

UCG> and picture God's way of peace.

God's way is no peace to the wicked (Isaiah 48:22, 57:21), except by being reconciled with God through Jesus Christ.

Peace with God means at variance with all those opposing Christ.

UCG> For example, the gospel is pictured by

UCG> the seventh-day Sabbath as a symbol of the Kingdom of God and millennial

UCG> prophecies.

Where is the gospel compared to the Sabbath?

UCG> Those prophecies describe a time when "they shall not hurt

UCG> nor destroy in all my holy mountain, a time when God will bring peace

"God will bring peace..."

Until that time we will not beat our swords into plowshares, because there will be no peace on earth. In fact, we will probably follow Jesus' advice and go out a buy a sword or two.

UCG> and reconciliation to all nations as a requirement to enter the Kingdom

UCG> of God (Isaiah 11:6-9, 19:23-25, 32:17-18).

4 But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. [I wonder if we can type and symbol this one too, and help him slay the wicked.]

6 The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

7 And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

8 And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.

9 They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea.

Jesus commissions His

UCG> disciples to live these symbols now, in type, as a way of life.

Where does it say we are supposed to be symbols and types as a way of life? Notice there is no Bible reference, because the Bible does not say this. It is contrary to scripture, regarding self-defense, for example, and we have no obligation to follow it.

UCG> Years ago members of the _____ understood the commission to be

UCG> living symbols of the gospel. For example, one reason God commands

UCG> Christians to work six days and rest the seventh day is to picture six

UCG> thousand years of man's work of sin and the one thousand years afterward

Where does the Bible say there will be 6000 years of sin? I think this is a good example of how Mr. UCG jumps to false conclusions based on erroneous assumptions and presuppositions.

UCG> when man will rest from sin through living God's righteous way of life

UCG> (Hebrews 4:9-10, II Peter 3:8, Revelation 20:3).

Hebrews 4:9 There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God.

10 For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.

I'm not entirely sure what Hebrews means by "rest," but it does not say anywhere in the chapter that it refers to a thousand year day.

1 This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance:

2 That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour:

3 Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,

4 And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.

5 For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water:

6 Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:

7 But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

8 But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.

9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

10 But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.

Every cult on the planet uses II Peter 3:8 to prove their escatological point of view, and to prove when Christ will return, and to prove whatever thing it is they want to prove that is not revealed in scripture. The verse is saying, if you read the context, that we have no idea when Christ will return. It is saying nothing about the earth lasting 7000 years, and the last 1000 being the millenium.

Revelation 19:21 And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

Revelation 20:2 And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,

3 And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the

thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

Christians are
UCG> walking, talking analogies of God's master plan of salvation, not just
UCG> witnessing to the world, but actually obeying the gospel through keeping
UCG> the Sabbath this way.

This sounds hokey. We are commanded to honor the Lord's day. We are commanded to witness to the world and preach the gospel to them. But none of this stuff about "being analogies of God's master plan of salvation" is in the Bible. This is just a good-sounding tool to cause people to disobey scripture, such as to not engage in self-defense.

UCG> In the same way, Christians today obey the gospel of peace as reflected
UCG> in all of Jesus' teachings and Biblical analogies. Christians can obey
UCG> this commission only when they live the same way of life Jesus lived --
UCG> as defenseless sheep and harmless doves; as lambs for the slaughter;

You cannot carry these analogies to the point of violating scripture, which is precisely what you are doing. For example, Jesus plainly commanded us to carry a sword. You, on the other hand, take the analogies of being sheep and doves so far that you proscribe any such sword carrying.

If you really wanted to be exactly like sheep, so that you do not in any way violate the analogy, you could go graze in the pasture, live in a sheep shed, let your children be sold at the livestock auction, and go to the slaughterhouse and be BBQed and sold for people to eat. That would clearly be taking the analogy beyond what Jesus intended, or what scripture permits, and it is exactly what you are doing in using this analogy to decry self-defense.

UCG> as
UCG> living sacrifices; as crucified daily; as ambassadors for Christ through
UCG> whom God is reaching out to His enemies to reconcile them. It is
UCG> impossible to fulfill this commission while killing God's enemies.

If we hunt them down and kill them the way the Moslems do all "infidels," yes. If we operate the way Israel did when she was right with God--war with those who threaten or attack us, and peace with those who do not, no. In all cases, we witness to them.

UCG> Some reject the idea of being God's symbolic instruments

We are literally, not symbolically, God's body, his hands, his feet, his mouth, to literally do his work; just like the sword Jesus told us to carry is not symbolic, but a literal sword.

UCG> in living God's
UCG> way of life as an ideal and type of the Kingdom.

"ideal and type of the kingdom" are extra-Biblical concepts, ie, they are not in the Bible.

UCG> Some say it's
UCG> impossible to do this because we live in such a hostile world and that
UCG> God can't possibly expect this much from His followers. My answer is,
UCG> with God all things are possible (Luke 18:27).

Luke 18:22 Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.
23 And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.
24 And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!
25 For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.
26 And they that heard it said, Who then can be saved?
27 And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.

While it is true that we must follow Christ's example, we need to be sure to follow the correct example, which UCG fails to do or present.

Just out of curiosity, Mr. UCG is telling us to do what is extremely difficult. He takes a few verses out of context and says we must do them

without considering any other verses that shed light on the subject. I wonder if Mr. UCG follows v. 22, where it says he must sell all he has and give to the poor, and follow Christ? I know he hasn't, because he has a house, and a computer, and probably a car, etc.

UCG> God expects Jesus'

UCG> disciples to be living symbols of the future Kingdom of God according to

UCG> Jesus' teachings, whether or not it's easy.

God expects us to obey Jesus' commands, including the one where he told us to carry a sword.

UCG> God expects this of

UCG> Christians the same way He expected prophets such as Isaiah to walk

UCG> naked in Jerusalem as a witness of God's message to Judah (Isaiah

UCG> 20:1-4). Doing otherwise is disobedience to God and the gospel

UCG> commission.

If you are going to obey Jesus even though it is difficult, then where is your sword? Symbolic, you say? You are certainly saying a lot about symbols, analogies, pictures, etc. Would Isaiah have been obedient if he had only symbolically walked naked? "I have the nakedness of the spirit!" (as opposed to the sword of the spirit) I don't need to really do it!

Ezekiel adds, "Hey, I like this symbolic stuff. Pass me some spiritual poop to mix with my Ezekiel bread, and I'll just symbolically lie on my side for X days, in analogy I'll burn, chop, and throw my hair to the wind.

Sampson chimes in, I'll symbolically grow my hair long! Abraham says, I'll symbolically sacrifice Isaac! They all say, we'll be super-spiritual guys, cause we'll be typing and shadowing and analogizing and shadowing all kinds of things, but we won't really have to do it! What a cakewalk! (What a crock.)

UCG> The issue of Christians exercising obedient faith in not killing their

UCG> enemies is similar to the issue of whether America should have a

UCG> military force to fight its enemies.

Maybe if we say "pretty please" they won't fly airplanes into buildings. Maybe the Japanese just symbolically attacked Pearl Harbor, or it was just an analogy.

UCG> The _____ teaches

UCG> against Christians serving in the military.

It is instructive to note that he says his church is against it, and he doesn't say the Bible is against it.

We should turn certain areas over to the godless and wicked?!? Particularly all government and force-related (military, police) areas? I think not.

UCG> When the world argues that

UCG> doing this would allow the Hitlers and Saddam Husseins of this world to

UCG> destroy America, the Church replies that no nation that obeys God in

UCG> faith needs a military because God promises to defeat America's enemies

UCG> for them (Deuteronomy 28:7).

Deuteronomy 28:7 The LORD shall cause thine enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face: they shall come out against thee one way, and flee before thee seven ways.

The question is, how will God cause their enemies to be smitten before them? ...

De 7:2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them:

De 12:2 Ye shall utterly destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree:

De 20:17 But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee:

The Israelites were to do the smiting and destroying. God destroyed the wicked using his people.

God works and we work. (give the whole schpiel). God told Israel he would fight for them, but he said arm yourselves. God told Israel he would defeat their enemies, but he said if you don't annihilate them, they will come back to destroy you. Just because God does something does not leave us out of the picture. Quite often God accomplishes the things he says he will do using us to do it, or at least part of it. Plenty of times God will not finish what we start: if we don't do the job completely, it won't be done, and then everyone will suffer the consequences for our inadequate work, even though God promised he would do it. His promise is contingent on our action. We don't act, he won't work, because his intention is to accomplish his will through us.

God provides all our needs according to his riches in glory, but we are required to provide for the needs of our families. I am the Lord that healeth thee, but we are to anoint the sick, visit them, care for them, take a little wine for the stomach's sake, etc. God is a father to the fatherless, but we are to visit the fatherless and care for them, and we are to avail them to food. God is a shield to those who fear God, but we are to rescue those who are drawn unto death. We are to take no thought for tomorrow, but we are commended to the unjust steward who provided for his needs after losing his job.

Look up God's promise book and find many examples. Plus, go through my notes of where God commands us to do things he has promised to provide.

Since he brings up an OT reference, he opens a huge can of worms: God works and we work: he provides through ours and others' actions.

What is faith?

He also promises to feed and cloth us, and to meet our needs, according to his riches in glory, so we don't need a job to provide any of these things. He also promised to be a father to the fatherless, so we don't have to care for orphans, perhaps not even our own children. He also promised....

Faith without works is dead. In Heb 11, by faith, they DID things, they did not sit around and expect God to do everything. That is not faith, it is a combination of fatalism and laziness, and total lack of understanding of what faith is.

Faith was the basis of their serving God in the OT, and look at what they did.

Israel obeyed God and lived by faith, and because of faith, not in spite of it, they were able to subdue and defeat their enemies--faith brings works. God at work puts us to work. After all, we are his hands, we do his work in his stead down here on earth.

Faith MOTIVATES us to deeds, it does not dissuade us from them.

UCG> In the same way, Christians

Exactly true. Christians need to live by the same principles that nations live by, in the above discussed materials. If nations don't need a military, then Christians don't need any sort of self-defense weapons. On the other hand, if nations do need a military, then so do Christians need some sort of defensive weapons.

Notice that the final and ultimate responsibility for preserving one's life lies with that individual. Yes, the justice system is to put away the wicked, passers-by are to render aid, God commands a person to not murder, etc, but the final responsibility lies with the individual. To fulfill his responsibility, he needs the tools to protect himself--namely, weapons.

live the

UCG> gospel now in faith as a way of life believing God will make this

UCG> possible, even if God wills that Christians suffer death, as the

UCG> prophets did while fulfilling their commission as witnesses for God.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Some may argue, "But if American soldiers hadn't fought and

UCG> defeated Hitler, Hitler would have destroyed and enslaved all humanity.

UCG> My answer is that God is the one who defeated Hitler by using the

UCG> American military as His instrument,

But, the Bible says that we, God's people are his body, ie, his instruments--his means to accomplish his will on this earth.

UCG> whether or not America was aware of

UCG> this. God uses non-Christians to do many

“Many?”

Please supply some examples. Off the top of my head I can't think of one, much less “many.”

UCG> works that [1] He does not allow

UCG> Christians to participate in because [2] killing enemies in war or in

UCG> self-defense would violate a Christian's gospel commission.

UCG> [3] Non-Christians don't have that commission.

Wrong on all 3 counts.

The assumption is that there are different standards for Christians and non-Christians.

Lev 24:21-22

Leviticus 24:21 And he that killeth a beast, he shall restore it: and he that killeth a man, he shall be put to death.

22 Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country: for I am the LORD your God.

God's laws apply universally to everyone--even those who reject him or deny his existence or who never heard of him--else there would be no standard against which to judge them and cast them into hell. All must be under the law of God, not just the believers, because without the law, there is no sin, and even if the only law they have is what is written on their hearts (Romans 1), that's enough for them to be guilty of sin, and to be condemned.

When God used a foreign nation to punish Israel, he then turned around and punished that nation, because they had done evil, and it was accounted to their account as evil because God's law applied equally to them as to Israel, and so he punished them for breaking his laws. There was no different standard between Israel and the heathen: all were and still are under the same law, believers or not.

Will he force people to sin to accomplish his will? We needed a pretty big army to defeat Hitler, so that means God had to keep lots of people unsaved so they could fight, then send them off to battle where they were killed and hence go to hell. What a lousy way to defend a nation: send a few million people to hell.

This is completely contrary to God's example: he went to hell for us so we would not have to, and he gave his life so that others might live, so if we are to follow his example, according to the logic of UCG, maybe the Christians are the ones who should fight, to keep the sinners alive longer so they can have a chance to repent and go to heaven instead of hell, where they will assuredly go if they march off to battle to fight on the behalf of our nonparticipatory, worthless hides, and die. I'm glad God did not follow that example and send some poor hapless miscreant on his behalf to die. The pure and perfect died for the wretched and detestable, not the other way around.

Mr. UCG also makes an indirect admission: that pacifism is not compatible with life. It doesn't work. Nations adhering to the pacifist doctrine will be annihilated, or taken over by evil nations. To avoid this problem, he comes up with a work-around--the heathen have to be the ones to be non-pacifist to fight off the wicked. If pacifism is dysfunctional at the national level, why should it be any different with individuals? After all, he is the one who said a few paragraphs back, “In the same way, Christians:” when stating that there was no need for a national military, and he drew a parallel, stating that there is no need for Christians to engage in self-defense, either. Pacifism is just as dysfunctional for individuals as it is for nations.

UCG> Jesus Christ and the Apostolic Church set the example of not killing
UCG> even the enemies who threatened their lives. In doing so, they modeled
UCG> what it means to be living symbols of the gospel, even though their
UCG> lives were in constant danger while doing so. When their enemies
UCG> threatened them, the disciples hid; fled to other cities or nations, as
UCG> Jesus told them to; or died as martyrs rather than destroy their enemies
UCG> (Matthew 10:23, Acts 8:1, 4).

Matthew 10:23 But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.

Acts 8:1 And Saul was consenting unto his death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles.

2 And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him.

3 As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison.

4 Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word.

Notice that they did not use deadly force, but they also did not use non-deadly force, which Mr. UCG says is OK. By his own argument, Mr. UCG is wrong in approving non-deadly force, because the apostles did not use it as an example for us to follow.

The apostles gave us a good example, but theirs is not the only example, nor are we told to do only what the apostles did--we are commended to all of God's word.

Their example does not negate self defense, or say that it is wrong. It shows that being a martyr and suffering for Christ is a great thing. I would never argue to the contrary. I would add, however, that dying as a pacifist martyr is not the only way in the Bible that people died; plenty of them died as militant martyrs. There are examples who were commended in the NT as dying of fighting, which is as equally commendable as is dying without resistance.

As the Bible says, for everything there is a time and a season, a time for peace, and a time for war. As Jesus said, you must discern the signs of the times (Matthew 16:3), to know when is the time to fight, and the time to not fight. You can come to understand the times best by knowing God's word, and applying the principles and commands in it to your life.

UCG> The enemies who threatened Jesus and the Church were not just civil

UCG> authorities as some assume.

I am not one of them (who would assume that) and would never make such an argument. I would be just as happy to resist civil authorities as anyone else--after all--they are required to hold to the same standard as everyone else.

UCG> Everyone from common

UCG> criminals to business leaders to Jewish religious fanatics tried to kill the

UCG> Apostle Paul and other saints (Acts 9:23-25, 29;

UCG> 14:1-6, 19; 17:5-10; 21:27-31).

Acts 9:23 And after that many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him:

24 But their laying await was known of Saul. And they watched the gates day and night to kill him.

25 Then the disciples took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket.

29 And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians: but they went about to slay him.

30 Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.

Acts 13:50 But the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts.

51 But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came unto Iconium. (that wasn't very nice)

52 And the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost.

Acts 14:1 And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed.

2 But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.

3 Long time therefore abode they speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.

4 But the multitude of the city was divided: and part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles.

5 And when there was an assault made both of the Gentiles, and also of the Jews with their rulers, to use them despitefully, and to stone them,

6 They were ware of it, and fled unto Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and unto the region that lieth round about:

19 And there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people, and, having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead.

Acts 17:5 But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people.

6 And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;

7 Whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.

8 And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things.

9 And when they had taken security of Jason, and of the other, they let them go.

10 And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews.

Acts 21:27 And when the seven days were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him,
28 Crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is the man, that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place.
29 (For they had seen before with him in the city Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple.)
30 And all the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple: and forthwith the doors were shut.
31 And as they went about to kill him, tidings came unto the chief captain of the band, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar.

These are the same enemies some professing
UCG> Christians today would kill in self-defense.
UCG> Refer also to Refutation #4 in this section for an example of how Jesus
UCG> handled those enemies who were not in positions of
UCG> authority.

No one is saying their examples are wrong, or to be ignored, or not to be followed, it's just that those aren't the only examples, and some of the commands we must follow require force, and not everyone was required to follow the example of the apostles in doing nothing but preaching the gospel. Some Christians "served tables."

On the other hand, Mr. UCG tells us we should ignore and not follow certain examples and some who were highly commended by God--in Hebrews 11, for example--because he does not agree with what they did.

Mr. UCG is using a positive example (what the apostles did--ie, not resist) to infer a negative (they did not use force, so neither should we), and he ignores his example (Jesus' command to carry a sword (?I can't remember what I ment?)) that offers the positive (that force was sometimes used with God's approval). I offer the positive examples he ignores (from Hebrews 11, for example), that are contrary to his inferred negative (that force is wrong) to show that his inference is wrong (meaning there are circumstances wherein force is approved by God).

He is using a particular example, plus the supposed lack of other examples to demonstrate that the examples offered are the only ones to be followed, and anything deviating from these examples is wrong. He dismisses all examples that do not fit his theology.

If he really wants to follow the apostles' example, he needs to go to Saudia Arabia or Iraq or Iran and preach the gospel to the Moslems; then he can be persecuted and maybe killed for preaching.

UCG> What the Apostle Paul and others faced would be equivalent to hired
UCG> criminals, the head of Wendy's, or members of a local
UCG> Baptist church laying in wait for or breaking into the homes of Christians
UCG> today to kill them. All of this was just as illegal
UCG> then as it would be today. Evidently, those who believe in killing in
UCG> self-defense would kill these people, rather than be
UCG> living symbols of the gospel as were members of the early church.

It depends on the circumstances. If someone breaks into my house, it doesn't matter who they are--one of us will not walk out alive, or at least not unharmed. On the other hand, if I am a missionary in a foreign country, I'd probably be less likely to use deadly force, because it might raise the ire of the gov't, and it might turn off the locals to what I'm trying to do. If I were in Rwanda or South Africa, I don't think I would be all that hesitant, because the populace there knows they are in a violent place, and might not look down on deadly force. Perhaps it depends mostly on where you are and how the people will perceive what you do.

UCG> NOTE: The argument that the Apostles didn't fight their enemies because
UCG> they were outnumbered has no foundation.

Agreed.

UCG> Remember, the Jews have a
UCG> history of fighting against overwhelming odds, and many, including the
UCG> Apostles, were skilled with the sword. Peter is a prime example When
UCG> Peter was unconverted, he didn't hesitate drawing his sword to take on
UCG> all of the Sanhedrin's security force, even to the death (Matthew

UCG> 26:51). In the New Testament account, no example exists of the Apostles
UCG> drawing their swords against their enemies after their conversion, even
UCG> when their lives were in danger.

True, but there are examples of where those who did were commended (Heb 11) in the NT, also, Peter was carrying the sword Jesus commanded him to carry, and we can assume he continued to carry after Christ's resurrection, since they were to continue to do all things whatsoever Jesus commanded them to do previously; and, we don't know that he did or did not pull a sword on anyone. The Bible doesn't say either way. Obviously, they intended to be a witness without resorting to violence, and that is entirely commendable and appropriate, and in some cases it is the only option available, but that still does not negate those times when resistance is available and proper.

I again stress that Mr. UCG says fighting is good in some instances, and resistance is good (as in restraining) as long as deadly force is not used. By Mr. UCG's own admission, none of the apostles engaged in any of this allowable force, and nowhere did they say use restraining/allowable force, which puts Mr. UCG at odds with his own arguments, if we are not to do what the apostles did not do, and what they did not tell us we should use non-deadly force.

God did not stress violence, in my opinion, because he does not want us to be like Moslems, the apostles when they wanted to call down fire on the city because the city would not receive them, Revolution Theologists, athiests: physically attacking those with whom we disagree. He does not want us to force ourselves on them or jail them if they don't believe like we do. He does not want us to win people by any means except truth and love and compassion. He wants us to love our enemies and help them and suffer persecution patiently. But that does not mean that violence won't sometimes be a part of our lives. That doesn't mean sometimes we won't have to break the bands of wickedness.

The issue has nothing to do with whether or not Peter drew his sword inappropriately or if they had a historial precedent or if Peter was unconverted. These are all entirely irrelevant.

UCG> Argument #3

UCG> A Christian killing in self-defense is wrong because killing in
UCG> self-defense violates the first commandment "You shall have no other
UCG> gods before me (Exodus 20:13, King James) by disobeying Jesus' command
UCG> to "love your enemies and to obey the gospel commission.

This argument is silliness, perhaps based on movies or TV shows that make weapons into little power gods (or devils) enabling the users to do great acts of skill and bravery (or terrible acts of mayhem and terror). Most people don't idolize their weapons or fighting skills any more than they do their jobs, houses, cars, prestige, social or religious position, or the letters after their name, such as Ph.D.

"love your enemies"

Love must be tough (like Dr. Dobson's book)--love isn't mushy feelings that mean you allow people to do whatever they want to you or others--it means doing what is best for them from God's perspective, or that executes God's justice, even if it might not be very good for them.

UCG> Evidence

UCG> Whenever a Christian does not obey a command of God, he is putting a
UCG> false god before the true God (Romans 6:16). Refer to Argument #1 under
UCG> Evidence in this section for proof that Jesus' command to "love your
UCG> enemies applies to killing in self-defense. Refer to Argument #2 for a
UCG> discussion of Jesus' gospel commission.

If pacifism causes a person to disobey some of Christ's commands, then it, too, is an idol; commands such as defend, rescue, free, break, put away, etc.

UCG> Refuting Opposing Arguments

UCG> Opposing Argument #1

UCG> Just where does it say Jesus changed the authority of New Testament

UCG> saints to kill their enemies like Old Testament saints were allowed to
UCG> do? If God allowed Old Testament saints to kill their enemies, then why
UCG> can't New Testament saints kill their enemies? Aren't Old and New
UCG> Testament saints under the same standards for salvation?

Salvation has nothing to do with self defense, nevertheless, the standards for salvation in the NT are the same as they were in the OT: faith in God through the Messiah, resulting in obedience to his Word.

UCG> Refutation #1...which should be subtitled, "God occasionally breaks his Word and changes his mind."

Following Mr. UCG's fallacious arguments, God can't make up his mind whether it's wrong or not, and even if it is, he still needs to use it sometimes to accomplish his will.

Refutation #1. God said don't do it in the OT

--millions of times God broke his word (according to Mr. UCG's erroneous interpretation of the Sixth Commandment) and said, go ahead and do it anyway. In fact, he probably told people to kill more often than they would have if he had stayed out of the issue altogether and let people do whatever they wanted without any restrictions on killing.

At some point, with millions of exceptions, the idea of rules against any killing becomes ludicrous and pointless.

Refutation #2. God said it was OK (contradicts #1) in the OT but then changed his mind in the NT and said don't do it at all ever, and this time I really mean it! No exceptions. Except, the heathen can kill, millions of times, if necessary, especially to protect those who won't fight to defend themselves or the nation.

God will make more exceptions for the 2 prophets who will call fire down on anyone who tries to harm them.

God will change his mind (that killing is wrong) again when he returns and slaughters his enemies, presumably with our help, according to Mr. UCG's interpretation of Psalm 149.

All this mind changing seems to boil down to one issue, the Bible obviously allows for killing, but Mr. UCG does not wish us to engage in it, so he removes it from our reach by putting it way in the past, and way in the future, but nowhere near now. His tactic reminds me of Ezekiel 12:27, where the wicked Israelites could not deny that the prophet was speaking of judgment on them, so they just said it was for a time a long way away, and had nothing to do with the present.

UCG> Even though God never intended human beings to kill each other, God did
UCG> authorize Old Testament saints such as Samuel and David to kill their
UCG> enemies. The prophet Samuel killed King Agag (I Samuel 15:33). God had
UCG> authorized King Saul to do this, but when Saul refused, Samuel finished
UCG> the job. God also authorized King David to kill Israel's enemies (II
UCG> Samuel 3:18). In these cases, God had the right to execute His justice
UCG> and will for Israel through David and Samuel.

In the NT as well as the OT, we are God's hands to do God's work. That is clearly spelled out in the discussions of the "body of Christ." Has God's definition of justice changed? No.

God would never authorize someone to do something that he previously said (Ex. 20) was wrong, or else he is double minded and a hypocrit, and breaks his own word whenever it suits him, and he is weak in that he cannot bring about his will by any means except by going against what he has previously said.

UCG> In other cases, God supported saints such as Abraham and Nehemiah when
UCG> they fought their enemies by giving them the victory (Genesis 14:20,
UCG> Nehemiah 4:14-20). The Bible doesn't say whether God intended them to
UCG> kill in self-defense, but His direct support of the outcome implies He
UCG> authorized their actions.

Sometimes he directly told them, sometimes they did it because it was the right thing to do. Furthermore, Nehemiah based his actions on the law. Then again, if you hold to the position that God forbid killing in the OT, since God helped them do it, you must conclude that God helped someone do something evil, and even commanded them to do so.

UCG> If God did not authorize the killing of their
UCG> enemies, then Abraham and Nehemiah are guilty of murder, according to
UCG> the definition of murder already presented in this paper. Refer to
UCG> Argument #1 in the Main Argument section.

This arguement opens the entire section about determining God's opinion of gun control based on examples: God authorizing and blessing different people and deeds. The foundation is that God does not change and will not violate his own word.

Mr. UCG's position, his unstated underlying premise is that God will occasionally break his word, or will authorize others to do it in his stead; and that God changes his mind, when in the OT God said defense is good and killing is not wrong, but now it is.

So much for unchanging principles. First, killing is not sin in the OT, now it is sin, later at the end of the world it will not be sin. Or else if it has always been, then God commands people to do things that are sinful. Either God is very mixed up, or Mr. UCG is.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Abraham with only about 300 men killed kings of nations and
UCG> their armies (Genesis 14:17). How could Abraham with only 300 or so men
UCG> defeat the armies of several nations without God's miraculous
UCG> intervention on his behalf?

God gave Abraham the brains to have good tactics, good reconaissance, good communications, good battlefield coordination. He gave him the wherewithall to provide good weaponry, and to give his men good training. His men worked hard and were strong, hard fighters, persistent, disciplined, courageous, etc. Abraham positioned his men, and executed a complete surprise attack. It's not just that Abraham went in there limpwristedly and he had the faith to believe God could kill them all, and then sit around expectantly for God to do everything.

The enemy, on the other had was drunk and partying. They probably didn't have their weapons with them. There were no guards, and no expectations for an attack, no preparations to fight.

Under such conditions, everything was ripe for victory. God blessed Abraham's efforts to insure it.

UCG> In addition, anyone who believes that
UCG> Abraham's killing of his enemies applies to Christian practice today
UCG> must also accept the position, by implication, that God authorizes
UCG> Christians to engage in military war.

Absolutely. After all, God in the form of Melchisedec personally blessed Abraham and received the spoils of his work, which he would not have done if it had been blood money (*De 23:18 Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the LORD thy God for any vow: for even both these are abomination unto the LORD thy God.*) Technically, it was a militia more than a military. A military is a group of people selected from the general populace hired specifically for the task of fighting. They are hired by the nation and loyal to the nation, such as our federal military or the National Guard. A militia is a local group of regular working people who maintain their regular employments, but they are armed and trained to defend when needed. They are loyal to their local area.

UCG> Even though God authorized Old Testament saints to kill their enemies,
UCG> God has not authorized Christians to kill human beings under any
UCG> circumstances because doing so would contradict the commission Jesus
UCG> gave His disciples to live the gospel message.

Not any more than his commission to carry a sword, or his commendation of those who used their swords contradicts his commission to preach the gospel.

UCG> To understand why Exodus
UCG> 22:2 does not apply today, refer to Argument #1. To understand the
UCG> gospel commission, refer to Argument #2.

UCG> How then do we explain differences between Old and New Testament saints
UCG> in the area of killing their enemies? Old and New Testament saints hold
UCG> in common the basic requirements of salvation, but their commissions are

UCG> not the same.

In the OT God gave the law, also in Genesis 9:6, also implied in early Genesis (Cain). Law means everyone has to obey it. No exceptions. That's what law is. God gave specific assignments or missions to different people, but they had to carry it out within the bounds of the law of God, which did not change with every person and every mission. This principle is better illustrated by Moslems who came to this country to carry out terrorist acts, and violated the Koran to blend in (went to strip joints, committed fornication, drank alcohol, etc). Christians, however are not granted such indulgences, and never have been, even in the OT. (Contrary to what the Roman Catholic church did at certain times, granting "indulgences" to people who would commit various acts of evil, such as slaughtering, raping, torturing, and pillaging true believers at the whim of some corrupt church official. These indulgences are obviously contrary to scripture, but might be in accord with Mr. UCG's version of "commissions.")

UCG> All of those called now have commissions tied directly to
 UCG> qualifying for eternal life, but those commissions may be different from
 UCG> saint to saint.

God's law is the same for everyone, just like the "great commission" is the same for everyone. Whatever we do in life, God's word/law controls all the details in our lives in that each detail must conform to them, even though each person is different in how he lives his life for God.

UCG> God commissioned Abraham, for example, to qualify to be the father of
 UCG> many nations and the father of the faithful. God tested Abraham to
 UCG> fulfill this role by asking him to sacrifice his son Isaac (Genesis 22).
 UCG> Abraham's salvation and position in the kingdom depended on passing this
 UCG> test and fulfilling his commission. No other saint will have this
 UCG> commission or this test.

Abraham's salvation was based on exactly the same thing that ours is now: faith in God through the Messiah which resulted in obedience to God's word. His "commission" was to obey God's word, which is exactly what ours is now.

Where does it say that God told Abraham to fight? He did it because it was the right thing to do. Abraham understood God's principles to rescue the oppressed from the hands of the wicked, to provide for his own, to put away the wicked, to defend the innocent, etc.

UCG> Table 3. Differences Between Old and New Testament Saints

Mr. UCG seems to think that God made different rules, which he calls "commissions" for each OT person to follow. At times, these rules, or "commissions" would conflict with and overrule God's law, which is how he can say that some people had God's permission to kill, but others do not.

However, God's law applies equally to everyone, and whatever specific missions (which might be a better term than "commissions"), God may have given to someone, there was nothing conflicting God's law. Otherwise, God would be contradicting himself, and telling people to commit sin, if he told them to do something contrary to his law.

While we are now under grace and not under law, and we no longer have to bear the grievous burden of doing the "whole law," it's not that God has contradicted or changed the law. Christ has fulfilled the law, so we don't have to keep it (note--salvation came by faith, not by keeping the law, even for OT folks), but God's law is still true, and his word in the OT is true, to every jot and tittle, as Christ said. Because of the eternal truths of God's law and God's word in the OT, from the examples, we can derive principles, which don't contradict the NT, because God does not contradict himself.

Differences	Scripture
-------------	-----------

God authorized some Old Testament saints to use carnal weapons to kill their enemies...

God has given 1 law to all mankind--the law of God. He has not given 10 million different versions to 10 million different people; that would make his law entirely relative, based on who you are and when you live. Instead of circumstantial, as in situation ethics, it would be personstantial. That's even more relative and subjective than even what a relativist or secular humanist would argue!

There is one interpretation of scripture, not a different one for each person, or each time period, or each "age."

...because God determined that these killings were right and did not violate the Old Testament saints' commissions.

There's a simpler explanation: it was in line with God's word, and with his direct commands to them, and it was common sense, so they did it.

God gave the law (his word), and everyone was obliged to keep it, even the heathen. "Commission" makes it sound like he told everyone something a little different, which is necessary to postulate, otherwise God looks very contradictory, saying one thing and then another.

The law of Moses regarding murder flowed from the law giver to Noah, and did not in any way contradict it--which helps us to further understand what he ment. Later on in the OT God commands and helps people to do various deeds, which, again, does not contradict what he said previously, and further amplifies God's position--but it certainly does not contradict it, and God does not have to change his mind, or allow for millions of exceptions--both of allowing people to be murdered, and allowing millions to commit it--which would be the case if each justified death for each death of the 7 nations of Israel's various wars, militia actions, etc.

The entire modern view of self-defense can be derived from Genesis 9:6, the command we've been operating under since after the flood:

whoso sheddeth man's blood,.....by man shall his blood be shed,

for in the image of God made he man. Animals are not, it is OK to kill them.

A few principles we can glean from Genesis 9:6

1. Obviously, the position of no killing is incorrect, or man could not execute killers.

It follows, then, that,

--there is good killing and bad killing,

--bad killers should be killed by the good (do you think the wicked are going to kill their own (ie, Mr. UCG's notion that the heathen are the ones who are supposed to do all the killing)? Not by a long shot. They are going to gang up on the righteous and innocent.),

--being killed is bad,

Therefore, if someone is coming to bad kill you (not the good kind of killing), and since your dying is bad, and since the good are supposed to kill the bad in the instance of bad killing, you might as well be the one to kill him, since no one else is around to do it, and since he might kill you and others if you don't, which is bad, then, if you do kill him, you will not die (which is good), and he will die (which is good).

All requirements of Genesis 9:6 are met: the good do not die, the bad killers do, and they are killed by the good.

I Samuel 15:33. Refer to all scriptures in Table 2 for an explanation of why killing enemies violates the gospel commission.

I Samuel 15:2 Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt.

3 Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. ...

17 And Samuel said, [to Saul] When thou wast little in thine own sight, wast thou not made the head of the tribes of Israel, and the LORD anointed thee king over Israel?

18 And the LORD sent thee on a journey, and said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. ...

29 And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent [change his mind]. ...

31 So Samuel turned again after Saul; and Saul worshipped the LORD.

32 Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past.

33 And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the LORD in Gilgal.

I would like to know what on earth the above passage has to do with proving that killing is contrary to the gospel commission. It seems to me that God's prophet commanded the killing of God's enemies. God himself commanded the killing. How does this prove that God is against killing?!?

<p>Later in the OT God commands people to do various things, all of which are entirely in harmony with God's commands. The various deeds re-inforce what we already had learned about God's will for defense, they don't contradict it and they are not exceptions. God doesn't have to keep changing his mind or breaking his word or giving umpteen exceptions.</p> <p>We can go back even further to before the flood, where we learn from the murder of Abel that: murder is bad.</p> <p>From God's destruction of all people except Noah's family, in part because of the violence, that, the blood of the innocent demands justice (cries from the ground), and murderers are to be killed.</p> <p>It is not until Genesis 9:6 that God fills in a few more details for the reader (I have no doubt that the pre-flood people knew all the details about self-defense as well as we know them now), and we learn what is listed a few paragraphs above. For example, we learn that people are to kill murderers.</p> <p>The most important point to remember here is that God is not continually changing what is right and wrong. Nothing he says before the flood contradicts what he says after the flood, and none of that contradicts what he told Moses, and none of that contradicts what Jesus said, and non of that contradicts what will happen at the end of the world.</p> <p>God does not authorize the killing of any enemies for New Testament saints because that would violate their gospel commission.</p> <p>Wrong. Killing in self-defense is in line with God's word, and in no way contradicts the great commission.</p>	
--	--

<p>God did not give anything equivalent to the Christian gospel commission to Old Testament saints. Abraham, for example, taught the gospel to Isaac; he also taught God’s laws to his whole family. But God did not use Abraham to go to God’s enemies to bring a living message of peace and hope as well as reconciliation and salvation...</p> <p>God heard Hagar--not an Israelite--he says, whoever is of a broken and contrite heart he will in no wise cast out. She heard the message, being in Abraham’s household. The message touched those whose lives they touched, even if he did not go out of his way to reach the heathen. Noah preached reconciliation and salvation, but no one listened. God himself made the message of reconciliation available to Cain (do well). God commanded Israel to be kind to strangers, and to remember that they had been strangers, and to welcome them. That is to some extent being a living witness of God’s love and grace and mercy, which Mr. UCG says we are to be now, and which he says erroneously that OT saints were not supposed to do, and which they were to be under the law (which is more than most Christians are today, who don’t witness with their mouths, but just with their life, if even that). Furthermore, salvation was available to whatever heathen wished to follow God, and the Israelites were not to forbid them. Ruth is an excellent example of a heathen who Israel welcomed to serve God. The 7 nations may have been excluded from this offer of grace. But, of which nation was Rahab? Joshua 2, 6. If she is one of the 7, perhaps she is an example of God’s mercy even to them.</p> <p>Psalm 51:13 says, “Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee. “ That sounds to me like at least some what of a preach-the-gospel commission.</p> <p>Psalm 96:3 Declare his glory among the heathen, his wonders among all people.</p> <p>Psalm 96:10 Say among the heathen that the LORD reigneth....</p> <p>These sound like spreading the good news, and offering reconciliation to the heathen. It sounds pretty close to a “gospel commission to Old Testament saints.” I think there are more verses like these.</p> <p>...for those called now.</p>	<p>Genesis 18:19, Matthew 8:11, Hebrews 11:9</p>
<p>God revealed as much about the gospel to Old Testament saints as He deemed they needed to know to qualify</p> <p>They didn’t “qualify.” They had faith in God, which was counted to them for righteousness, even though they were miserable wretches; their faith produced good works.</p> <p>for the first resurrection and to fulfill their commissions. Old Testament saints, for example, did not understand what the name and life of Jesus Christ means to the salvation of all humanity.</p> <p>They knew there would come a redeemer who would save them from their sins. They knew he was coming, and their faith in him is what saved them. Each prophet revealed a little more about him.</p> <p>The fact is New Testament saints understand the gospel better than Old Testament saints. And to whom much is given, much is required. Therefore, God expects more of New Testament saints in obeying what the gospel fully represents than He did Old Testament saints.</p> <p>Not really. They had ot obey God’s law 100%. We have to obey God’s law 100%. God’s law now isn’t particularly different than it was back then, but part of it is fulfilled, and Jesus did it for us, so we don’t have to do it.</p>	<p>Matthew 13:17, Luke 12:48</p>

UCG> Table 4. Similarities Between Old and New Testament Saints

None of the following “commissions” contradict God’s law in Genesis 9:6, Exodus 20, etc. regarding self defense.

Similarities	Scripture
--------------	-----------

Being saved by grace through faith	Romans 4:1-25
Exercising obedient faith while keeping God's commandments	Genesis 26:5; Hebrews 11:6, 8, 33; Revelation 12:17
Believing the true gospel and seeking the Kingdom first (that is, putting God first)	Matthew 6:33, Mark 1:15, Galatians 3:8
Repenting	Luke 13:3, Job 42:6
Receiving and exercising the holy spirit How do you "exercise" the Holy Spirit? I see that there is no reference given for this "similarity," maybe because it isn't true. Furthermore, "receiving" the Holy Spirit is not an act separate from salvation. When you are saved, God's spirit comes to dwell within you. It's not like you have to go looking for him.	Psalms 51:11, Acts 2:38
Fulfilling whatever commission God gives and being God's living analogies	Isaiah 20:1-5; Hosea 1:1-11; Hebrews 11:7-8, 13, 17-19
Suffering and dying for the gospel, if necessary As did Isaiah, Jeremiah, and many of the OT prophets, but so did all the men who fought and died while battling the 7 wicked nations, etc. See more examples in Heb 11. The odd thing is, Heb 11 commends the killing and mayhem committed by numerous OT people--if God is giving us examples of non-violence, he sure messed up!	Hebrews 11:35-38, Mark 8:35 Hebrews 11:35 Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: 36 And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: 37 They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; 38 (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. Mark 8:34 And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. 35 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it. 36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? 37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? 38 Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

Jesus quoted what David did in using the shewbread when he was fleeing Saul as a support for his breaking the Sabbath when his disciples were "reaping" by eating grain, He used the OT to prove a point. If the OT has become irrelevant, JC would not have done this. Mt. 12:3, Mark 2:25

UCG> God commissioned prophets such as Isaiah and Jeremiah to warn Israel and
UCG> Judah about coming destruction.

Almost every prophet also warned the heathen nations as well as Israel. That seems another example of people spreading the message, which Mr. UCG says was not required in the OT.

UCG> Their salvation depended on their
UCG> willingness to fulfill their commission.

Where does the Bible say that?

Mr. UCG just said in his table above that salvation came to OT people by grace through faith. If they had disobeyed, they might have ended up like Jonah (another example of someone who proclaimed God's message of grace and repentance to the heathen, by the way), clobbered by God for disobedience, and God would have required the blood of the wicked at their hands (Ezekiel 33).

UCG> Doing otherwise would be
UCG> disobedience to God. God commissioned the Apostle Paul to preach the
UCG> gospel to the Gentiles.

God commanded Paul to preach the gospel to every creature, just like he also told the rest of us to do, and he specifically sent him to the Gentiles.

UCG> God commissioned Jesus to be Savior and
UCG> Messiah.

No, Jesus _was_ Savior and Messiah, and didn't need to be commissioned to be so. He was the Creator come in the flesh (John 1).

UCG> All those saints listed above but Jeremiah died fulfilling
UCG> their God-given commissions.

No. Everyone who believes in Christ (from Adam to the last man) dies fulfilling their "commission," (God's word). It's not that we have 1 mission or job in life. God doesn't give each person a different, secret mission to fulfill in life. We have a long list of commands to do, and we do them until we die. Like the prophets and other OT figures, we may on occasion be given specific tasks, but that isn't all we are to do, and those tasks don't relieve us of our other duties. We must pass along righteousness to our offspring and to others, set back sin and evil, promote righteousness, live lives pleasing to God.

UCG> Jesus gave all of His disciples a commission, the same commission Jesus
UCG> Christ had and still has as He works through those called now.

What is commonly called the "Great Commission" is only one of the many commands we have been given in both the NT and OT. One of them does not relieve us of the others. Jesus himself told us to do many more things than just one. Furthermore, God's commands to us are not contradictory--we have to obey them all. For instance, he will not in one instance tell us to carry a sword, and then tell us it is evil to carry or use a sword. That would be contradictory.

UCG> Refer to
UCG> Table 2 for what that commission entails.

UCG> Opposing Argument #2

UCG> If Jesus did not do away with the Old Testament law (Matthew 5:17-18),
UCG> then why can't a Christian use Exodus 22:2 to kill in self-defense?

UCG> Refutation #2

UCG> Refer to Argument #1 in the Main Argument section for a detailed

UCG> explanation about why Jesus did away with all Old Testament laws for
UCG> Christians concerning killing their enemies.

Genesis 9:6 was before the law. Someone could argue that, since it was not part of the law, it was not done away, meaning it is still in effect.

Mr. UCG believes in the end, we will again kill our enemies at the end of the world, which brings up an interesting point. If he believes that killing is no longer proper because it was part of the law that Christ fulfilled, when it comes back, will Christ retract his fulfillment of the law? Will the law be re-instated? Will Christ's work and accomplishments be reversed?

UCG> Opposing Argument #3

UCG> Isn't Matthew 5 in the context of revenge? Since self-defense is not an
UCG> act of revenge, how can I know that chapter 5 of Matthew applies to
UCG> self-defense?

UCG> Refutation #3

UCG> Jesus' teachings in Matthew 5:38-39 to "resist not evil and "turn the
UCG> other cheek probably apply only to revenge. Matthew chapter 5 covers a
UCG> lot of subjects and has many contexts. Revenge is only one of them.
UCG> Matthew 5:44-45 is not in the context of revenge. It's in the context
UCG> of opposing the carnal view to love your neighbor, but hate your enemy.
UCG> The context supports the premise that whatever Christians do to love
UCG> their neighbors should be done likewise for their enemies.

UCG> Some may argue, "Jesus didn't really mean for me to love all my enemies,
UCG> especially those who threaten my life. Excluding killing in
UCG> self-defense from Jesus' command to love enemies would restrict the
UCG> meaning of "enemies beyond what can be proved in the Bible.

Only because you assume you cannot love someone and kill them at the same time. God certainly has done so throughout the history of the world, even in the NT (Ananias and Saphyria, for example).

UCG> The term
UCG> "enemies applies to all people who intend harm. Enemies who tried to
UCG> kill the Apostle Paul included common criminals; business, religious and
UCG> political leaders; fellow Jews; members of other religious groups; and
UCG> people from foreign countries (Acts 9:23-25, 29; 14:1-6, 19; 17:5-10,
UCG> 21:27-30).

UCG> If you search the entire Bible to discover who are called enemies, you
UCG> will find the following categories: people from foreign nations (2
UCG> Chronicles 20:29); foreigners within one's own nation (Esther 9:1, 5;
UCG> Nehemiah 6:1); a friend, for example, Jesus' friend Judas Iscariot
UCG> (Psalms 41:9-11, John 13:18); and family members (Matthew 10:36).

UCG> Since this is Satan's world (II Corinthians 4:4), Christians live in
UCG> enemy territory. Therefore, every unconverted human being on this
UCG> planet is an enemy of God (Colossians 1:21, Romans 8:7) and a potential
UCG> enemy of every Christian because God lives in us (Colossians 1:27).
UCG> Unconverted human beings, friend and foe alike, can be stirred at any
UCG> time to attack the people of God as an enemy.

UCG> Jesus' command to love your enemies, to "do no harm (Romans 13:10)

"Do no harm" to whom? the nation? the next victim? your family?

UCG> and

UCG> “think no evil” (I Corinthians 13:5)

Thinking the truth or seeing from God’s perspective is different from evil. Evil is sinning: lust, greed, murder, hate, envy, pride, etc.

UCG> applies to all human beings. The
UCG> very next verse proves this. Matthew 5:45 says God is kind to the
UCG> unjust. This includes all human beings who are unjust, which is who the
UCG> term “enemies refers to for Christians as well. This is the way God
UCG> treats all of his enemies, and God commands Christians to do likewise,
UCG> even toward those who threaten their lives.

While most of the above is true, it is incomplete. Our mode of life and attitude toward people is to be of love, patience, meekness, tenderness, compassion, not returning evil for evil, etc. But there is a time and a season for everything, including war and killing.

We never have to hate; we can love even those we harm, and do just enough damage to render them unable to harm anyone any more, and help them and lead them to Christ, as opposed to killing them needlessly, or torturing them, or taking joy in their suffering, or maiming them for no good reason.

We are balancing love for the attacker (so he can’t do any more evil and incur more of God’s and man’s wrath, and poison himself with more sin) with our family (so they are unharmed) with other people we don’t know (who the evil doer would harm later, or who he would lead into sin and harm of others) with our nation (which would be destroyed by an abundance of the wicked and by God’s judgment) with ourselves (so we don’t incur God’s wrath for allowing the wicked to go unstopped, and for not providing for our family).

Of course, love is like faith: love without works is dead. If you say you love them but don’t provide for them, you are a liar, and worse than in infidel.

UCG> Opposing Argument #4

UCG> I can accept letting civil authorities kill me and my family for
UCG> religious reasons such as keeping the Sabbath, worshipping idols,
UCG> denying God’s name, or witnessing the gospel just as Jesus did. But why
UCG> would God allow me or my family to be killed in this violent,
UCG> criminal-infested world in what would be a one-time chance happening
UCG> such as a thief or murderer invading my home at night, or hijacking my
UCG> car? Do Jesus’ teachings really apply in these situations?

UCG> Refutation #4

UCG> The real issue in this argument is that people may be willing to die for
UCG> religious reasons such as not denying God’s name, but can’t stand the
UCG> idea of dying for what appear to be nonreligious reasons, reasons that
UCG> seem so remote from the Bible and the gospel.

The idea of dying for religious versus non-religious reasons, by authorities or non-authorities, is a non-issue with me. I can think of examples of religious persecution where I would have killed (Indonesian Christian girl who was gang raped) There are other examples where I think the people did the right thing in not killing (even though they were armed and did fight, as in Jim Elliott and the Auca Indians). I don’t know how to decide which is which. There are instances where I would kill the authorities (Robert Mugabe, for instance), and where I wouldn’t, and where I’d kill criminals, and where I wouldn’t (Nikki Cruise of the Cross and the Switchblade).

The point of being murdered for religious versus non-religious reasons is hard to argue against, because nothing in the Bible gives any distinction like this. Everyone must be righteous (not harm the innocent, etc). Everyone must keep God’s law. Everyone pays the same penalty for sin (particularly, they forfeit their life for committing violence against others, and their lives are forfeited by the victims or concerned passers-by who kill the perpetrators in defense).

UCG> I’m using the term
UCG> “religious reasons to refer to anything related to a Christian’s mission

UCG> that is worth living and dying for, such as a commission or a
UCG> commandment from God.

Life all by itself is worth living within itself, as its own justification, with no other reason being necessary, meaning dying for non-religious reasons is just as bad as dying for religious reasons.

Does that commandment include Jesus' commandment for us to carry a sword? Or the commandment to rescue those who are drawn unto death? Or the commandment to break every yoke, or to put away the wicked, or to provide for our loved ones, etc.?

UCG> I'm not referring to desires and wishes of carnal
UCG> human beings separate from the will of God just because they ask a
UCG> religious person to do something. Not healing a person or working
UCG> miracles is not a religious reason for dying because God nowhere
UCG> commands anyone to work miracles.

UCG> The argument itself suggests some wrong assumptions about Jesus, why He
UCG> was killed, and similar dangers in our Christian calling today. The
UCG> real motive driving the Pharisees to kill Jesus was recognized even by
UCG> Pontius Pilate -- envy and fear of the Romans taking away their status

Which is pretty much the same reason why the Israelites delivered Sampson to the Philistines. Sampson didn't harm his traterous brethren, although he would have been justified in doing so, but he did harm the Philistines.

UCG> (Matthew 27:18, John 11:47-53, Mark 11:18). The Pharisees accused Jesus
UCG> of violating the Sabbath or of saying that He was the Son of God only as
UCG> an excuse to kill Jesus for these other nonreligious reasons (Luke 6:7,
UCG> 20:20).

UCG> I want to say emphatically that Jesus was persecuted throughout His life
UCG> and was killed for religious reasons. Satan killed Jesus because Satan
UCG> hated God and wanted to stop God's work. God allowed Satan and his
UCG> demons to kill Jesus through the Jews and Romans to provide a Savior for
UCG> mankind, but only when the time was right. These are the true religious
UCG> reasons why Jesus died. But it wasn't why the Pharisees had Jesus
UCG> killed through the Romans.

UCG> Let's look at one Biblical example of how Jesus was nearly killed for
UCG> what appears to be nonreligious reasons (Luke 4:16- 30). During the
UCG> early part of His three and a half year ministry, Jesus visited the
UCG> synagogue in his hometown Nazareth. He was asked to stand and read a
UCG> scripture, and Jesus did. Jesus then proclaimed that He was fulfilling
UCG> the verse He had just read, and told His church audience that He would
UCG> not be performing miracles and healings in Nazareth as they had heard He
UCG> had done in Capernaum.

UCG> These church members grew so angry at this that they formed a violent
UCG> mob, grabbed Jesus, and forced him outside to the edge of a high hill
UCG> where they intended to throw him to his death. Here was a perfect
UCG> opportunity for the Jesus pictured by those who believe in killing their
UCG> enemies to draw his sword (no scripture says Jesus had a sword)

Nor did he baptise anyone that we know of, perhaps he never even fed anyone (although he made the stuff), nor gave anyone a drink of water (though he made wine), even after telling his disciples to give someone a drink of water in his name, but never did it himself.

A few more examples of what Jesus did: he did not use a computer to write anything, in fact, he did not write anything at all. I don't think he ever engaged in debate with anyone, although he did preach and teach and say some pretty tough things to religious albiet ungodly people. He never married, did not have a home, did not have a job during his ministry, depended on women to take care of him, did not have a place to stay, did not own transportation, did not have any money, owned nothing but the clothes on his back, did not stay with his

family, was a carpenter. And, of course, the examples Mr. UCG gives, he wore sandals and a robe.

These examples do not mean we should or should not be like him in these ways. We have to examine WHY he did these things, and whether or not we are to obey his example by command or by implication.

UCG> and
UCG> fight his way out of this predicament. After all, this was a one-time
UCG> chance happening not involving civil authorities or religious reasons
UCG> that could have not only ended in His death but also nullified His
UCG> mission to save the world.

He used his power to blind them to his presence. He was God. He had angels and his own word at his disposal. He did not need a sword.

It was not his time to die, and he used the resources at his disposal to prevent his death. He used the least amount of power necessary.

He knew his mission, he knew how to fulfill it, and what to do and to not do to fill his mission successfully.

UCG> Instead "passing through the midst of them, He went His way. Neither in
UCG> this situation nor in any other did Jesus ever suggest by word or
UCG> example

But by his word he did suggest that it was OK: a strong man armed, carry a sword, etc.

UCG> that He would kill anyone, including these common people of
UCG> Nazareth who threatened his life. In fact, just the opposite is true.
UCG> Throughout His life, Jesus put Himself at risk, and eventually
UCG> sacrificed His life for the very enemies who killed him,

He decided when it was time to die, and the method of his death. Until then, he did not allow anyone to succeed in their many attempts.

We do the same, only we don't have supernatural power at our disposal, so we settle on the best physical means available.

UCG> demonstrating
UCG> once again that destroying human lives was not His mission. Nor is it
UCG> that of any Christian who lives his life as Christ lived it.

It certainly is not our mission in life, but it might be supportive of our mission, and it might happen, and with God's blessings, as it has been recorded in the Bible many times.

UCG> Christians today should be able to face the same dangers that Jesus and
UCG> the Apostles faced, including crime and violence, if they hold the same
UCG> assumptions about God's sovereign control that Jesus had.

These assumptions are not one whit different from what any saint in any time period had, from Adam to the last guy saved before the end of the world. It's not that there was some magical thing that happened with the disciples that was different from other portions of scripture or other people in scripture, which is what Mr. UCG is trying to prove, so we join him in ignoring 90% of scripture dealing with this subject. (??? are you sure about that ???)

UCG> These
UCG> assumptions form the foundation for the faith of Jesus in us.
UCG> Internalizing the assumptions Jesus had is a part of developing the mind
UCG> of Christ (Philippians 2:5). Refer to Table 5 for these assumptions.

UCG> EDITORIAL: From Jesus' birth to his death, Satan and his demons used a
UCG> variety of means to try to destroy Jesus and stop God's work. Among
UCG> these means were direct temptation (Luke 4:1-13), civil authorities such
UCG> as King Herod (Matthew 2:12- 18), the Pharisees, Pontius Pilate, Roman
UCG> soldiers (Matthew 26 through 28); common people (Luke 4:16-30); and

UCG> Peter (Matthew 16:22-23, 26:51-52). Wicked spirits used these same
 UCG> means against the Apostles, and will do the same to true Christians
 UCG> today.

Just like saints in the OT resisted Satan and Satan's minions and the advancement of Satan's kingdom and the destruction of God's kingdom and God's will on earth by the various methods, and were highly commended by God in both the OT and NT. See Heb 11 for a good list of examples, which include violence and killing and weapons.

UCG> Table 5. Jesus' Assumptions About God's Sovereign Control

Assumption	Scriptural Proof
<p>First he says nothing evil will happen to you, then he acknowledges it does, but says those evil things were either the result of your sin or stupidity, or are God's will to further his kingdom. He does not make allowance for those things which God allows to come our way and leaves the outcome to us, whether we are victimized or victorious, depending on what we do (as in Joshua and the children of Israel suffering from the 7 evil nations because they failed to annihilate them, which God had commanded them to do. God did not make them disobey him, he left success in their hands, and when they failed, he did not protect them from the consequences. Which is not to say that he did not bring something good out of it (they maintained their fighting skills, they were continually tested to see if they would serve God in the face of temptations (they didn't))).</p> <p>As a rule of thumb, evil things are not God's will, because they are evil, not good, and God and evil don't go together, so every time you hear of a Christian suffering through no fault of his own, you have to say, according to Mr. UCG, it was God's will, which is baloney (there are many caveats here, including the one that suffering is not necessarily evil, and things we consider evil may be technically harmful more than evil). He offers no distinction between suffering that is God's will, and suffering that is not, except that, since it happened, it must be God's will.</p>	
<p>God sees and knows everything that happens to the saints. He sees everything visible and invisible. God knows what wicked spirits and human beings are doing at all times. And he knows what they are plotting and are going to do even ahead of time.</p> <p>Of course, he does, but that doesn't mean he is responsible for every thing that happens. He allows it because he allows true free will, not just token. What we do has real consequences that will last forever, and God is under no obligation to over rule us. Why should we be judged for deeds if we are not 100% responsible for them? We could just blame God and say, hey, you made me do it. I am not responsible.</p>	<p>Psalms 139:1-16, 34:15, Hebrews 4:12-13; Matthew 10:29-30; Isaiah 46:10, 29:15</p>

<p>God controls all forces, visible and invisible, human and spirit, in heaven and earth. No one and nothing can stop God’s plan or defeat God’s purpose for his saints.</p> <p>Which is to glorify him, but that’s pretty broad--it has no bearing on saints’ health, safety, righteousness, etc. It really is not even affected if any particular person goes to heaven or hell, or even if most people in a particular nation go to hell. God will be glorified no matter what.</p> <p>You could sin and say that since God allowed it, it must be his will, and so I can sin more, since if I do that, and God doesn’t stop me, it will be his will, too.</p> <p>The false assumption here (at least what I’m reacting to, whether or not it’s actually Mr. UCG’s view is up to him to clarify) is that everything that happens is God’s will. God leaves many things up to us, and he leaves the success or failure up to us, so that if we fail, there will be real (not just theoretical or imaginary) permanent damage done that will set back righteousness and truth, and will damage people, and some of them will go to hell; and if we succeed, there will be real benefits, that will further the kingdom of God.</p> <p>The successes or failures will be magnified as generations progress, so that a relatively small failure in the present generation may result in destruction or damage to many people, even their damnation, whereas present success, however small, may bring future righteousness, prosperity, liberty, etc.</p> <p>These are things that God has left in our hands. He has told us what to do in his word, given us principles in it to make us successful, commanded us to search it out and find the correct way, given us boundaries on how we should and should not do things, but he leaves it to us to do it.</p> <p>God would not have warned us of consequences of our deeds if this were not true.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Whatever God wills to happen is what will happen.</p> <p>Which sounds really close to: whatever happens is God’s will. Which is entirely different from: Whatever God wills happens, but he doesn’t will everything; he leaves some things to us.</p> <p>But, not everything that happens is God’s will. He allows it, but that doesn’t mean he wills it. In fact, probably most things that happen, are against his will, but he allows us to decide.</p>	<p>Daniel 4:35, Isaiah 14:27, Romans 9:17-23</p>
<p>No one has power to do anything, good or evil, except God gives it.</p> <p>God allows some evil, and he restrains some evil. He restrains enough so his kingdom continues, and maybe that’s it. Anything beyond that we gratefully welcome, but is not required on his part.</p>	<p>John 3:27, 19:11</p>
<p>God controls every detail of a saint’s life that are important to furthering God’s purpose for him.</p> <p>Says who?</p> <p>Nothing can happen to a saint (one who loves God and is called to His purpose) except God knows it and uses it to further the saint’s God-given destiny.</p> <p>But that doesn’t mean it was his will for that saint, but he allowed it and can bring something good out of it anyway.</p>	<p>Romans 8:28; I Corinthians 10:13, 12:18</p>

God wants His saints to yield to His will in every circumstance.

But they don't always yield, and when they don't, God doesn't force them, which means they violate his will. He might let them do so, but he will also let the consequences come upon them. Their disobedience brings more sin and destruction into the world--which is contrary to God's will.

Not doing so is a sin. A saint can make plans, but God determines what will actually be done.

He also determines whether or not he will allow the saint to carry out sinful plans. Based on what I see in the lives of Christians, and based on the history of Isreal, I'd say there's very little that God stops his people from doing. On a daily basis, Christians do everything under the sun that is completely contrary to God's word. I observe an entire nation of Christians routinely and uninterruptedly violating God's will, and he does not over rule them. All he does is stand aside and allow the consequences to occur, which are accruing and compounding in each succeeding generation, and will end up like Israel, a debased, depraved, wicked, God-hating unrepentant nation that will be destroyed by God's judgment, Christians and all.

"God determines what will actually be done."

Not necessarily.

God's will is based on the principles in God's word, and what might be called common sense--which is a common term meaning to understand the world, physical laws, human nature, the way things work, your own motives and desires, etc, and apply your effort and work and resources to steer all this in a direction that will produce good results that will further God's kingdom, either directly or indirectly by putting God's principles into practice.

Furthermore, even if an individual follows God's will, if those around him do not, and if the entire nation does not, that man will still suffer, but it will be for the sins of others. He will suffer the consequences of the sins of others. Which is why it is so important for the entire nation to be righteous. It maximizes the benefits one has for being righteous, and minimizes the damage caused by the wickedness of the wicked.

It's not just if you don't sin, you'll be OK. You must actively study and understand God's principles, the laws of physics, human nature, etc, and put them into practice, and then you have good success, and if you do not, you will have failure and misery, and not God's will at least in those areas where you were indiligent, slothful, unwise, etc.

Faith without works is dead. You believe that God will provide for you as you work, and will prosper your way (that is, your efforts), he will not simply dump it in your lap.

Mr. UCG feels we should not use force and should not deal with physical problems (at least in the case of defense) in the manner we would deal with any other physical problem: with whatever it takes to overcome the problem while incurring the least effort, expense, damage, etc.

"God determines..."

But, only to the extent that a person allows God to direct his steps.

Proverbs 16:33, James 4:15, Matthew 6:10,
Luke 22:42

<p>As a rule of thumb it is not God's will for evil to happen to people, but it is a result of reap/sow, cause/effect. For example, compare 2 situations 150 years apart. Two women teaching in a school the same course, the same grade level, the same area. In 2001 one is raped and murdered, the one in 1851 is not. Was it God's will for the one but not the other? I don't think so. The latter is victimized (reaping evil) because of a complex but traceable process (sowing) of widescale rejection of Christ, so that non-Christians and evil doers come to positions of power and influence, and pervade society, and so God's principles are not enacted that would put away evil doers or scare them into non-action. The woman's fate is not God's will, it is quite the contrary to God's will, but it is a consequence of human sin, both omission and comission, and of circumstances (time and chance happeneth to them all), the criminal happened to be passing by looking for a victim, and saw her, and of her actions--she had no weapon, failed to sufficiently bar the door, etc. She did absolutely nothing sinful, and God chose not to intervene. He can certainly bring good out of it, but it was not his will. In fact, it is contrary to his will.</p> <p>In some cases it's hard to say whether or not it was God's will, as in the case of the Columbine girl who was murdered after saying she believed in God, because so much revival and repentence has come from it. Perhaps it was not something that God allowed, perhaps it was specifically his will (maybe not the entire shooting, but their selection of her).</p>	
<p>God can change how he accomplishes His will based upon need at the time (prayer, repentance, need to circumvent unplanned attacks).</p> <p>Prayer certainly changes things, but prayer also needs faith; preparation, foresight, and armed resistance are some of the works of faith (faith without works is dead).</p>	<p>Matthew 2:12-16, Numbers 14:11-24, II Kings 20:1-5</p>

<p>God has promised protection to his obedient saints, to set a hedge about them so that nothing can hurt them or their families. This protection is broken only when God allows it for His own purposes. God also expects His saints to pray for that protection daily, as well as not do anything that would knowingly endanger themselves. Refer to Table 6 for God's promises of protection.</p> <p>Part of God's provisions and promises are carried out by us and others--if we do not utilize the tools God has given us, we will suffer the consequences. If you walk in the traffic, God will not necessarily protect you. Although I certainly hope he will.</p> <p>If you pray for protection but do not arm yourself to protect yourself, its about like praying for God to provide your daily bread, but not working to have money so you can buy the bread. Or, staring at blood gushing out from a bad cut, and, instead of applying direct pressure, you loudly quote, "I am the Lord the God that healeth thee!" You are going to die unless someone with a little better common sense comes along and saves your hide. (Maybe they have to be a heathen, eh? since a fellow Christian couldn't help, but would have to stand there quoting Bible verses with you, exercising faith!)</p> <p>Likewise, in addition to staring at your blood as it runs down, you could pray, anoint yourself with oil, begin fasting, read the Bible, etc, and you'd still bleed bleed to death like the idiot you are, because you did not deal with the threat on the level it was presenting itself with sufficient physical means to over come it. You could even quote Ephesians 6, and rebuke the devil (who, by the way, would probably be rolling on the floor laughing at you), but those tactics wouldn't work, because your bleeding is not a spiritual problem.</p> <p>You could, further, apply a small bandaid, wipe up the blood, spray on some antiseptic, take aspirin, read a medical book, etc, but it wouldn't help, because you are not dealing with the problem in a manner that will fully solve the problem.</p> <p>Only when you deal with the problem in a physical manner using enough knowledge and means to stop the bleeding completely will you live.</p>	<p>Job 1:10, 12; Psalms 91:5, 10-12; 121:7-8; Matthew 6:13; Luke 4:9-12</p>
<p>God has given human beings the power of free will to choose between good and evil, life and death. Christians can choose to obey or disobey God. Christians can make mistakes and have accidents.</p> <p>But, I thought God directed their steps and would keep them from doing anything contrary to his will, and they only do things that God gives them power to do, so, he, God gave me the power to rob the bank! Who are you to condemn me? After all, it's God's commission to me. I'll give some of it to the poor.</p>	<p>Deuteronomy 30:19, Hebrews 3 & 4, Luke 13:1-5, Ecclesiastes 9:11-12</p>

God expects Christians to do their part, as authorized by God's word, to help themselves, including asking God for discernment as to what to do. But God is not dependent on human effort to protect His saints.

Phillipians 3:15; Matthew 8:30, 12:14-15; Mark 1:35; John 11:53-54; Genesis 20:1-7; Matthew 2:12-18

No, but he told us to defend ourselves, and if we don't, he is under no obligation to do what he told us to do.

Nor is his kingdom dependent on our success or obedience to him. If we all quit now and never obey him again and no one is ever converted again, he will still be glorified. If we all reject Christ and go to hell, he will be glorified, but that's not what he wants, and it's not what we want. But, he isn't going to force his will on us.

In a similar fashion, because of our deeds, beliefs, the state of our nation, etc, we might suffer horribly, but that's not necessarily his will. But again, he isn't going to force his will on us. If we insist by our own wills, or by our misguided beliefs that lead us into unnecessary suffering at the hands of the wicked, God is under no obligation to protect us. Any more than he is under obligation to protect us if "we suffer as an evil doer." I have no doubt that many times he protects us in spite of our ignorance and evilness, but not always.

If you do something contrary to God's will and suffer the consequences, God can bring something good out of it and work it for his glory, whether you are raped, robbed, murdered, your children are taken away and taught to hate you and God, your home is destroyed, you are thrown in jail, your country falls into the hands of the wicked, etc.

Mr. UCG's position seems to be: All that happens is God's will, as long as we obey God, and therefore we don't have to do certain things to meet certain physical needs, because God will take care of them as long as we obey him.

We have limited responsibility for meeting our physical needs; God will meet them as long as we obey him.

My position: People suffer and die (or at least do not prosper to the full capacity available to them) against God's will because they don't follow God's principles, not because of any sin of their own (although they certainly do suffer and die because of their sins).

Pvb 11:14 Life and death is based on wisdom, at least in some circumstances, not in just being a righteous person.

Pvb 12:11 Food, wealth, and provisions in general are the results of work, knowledge, and understanding.

Pvb 12:24 Your position in life, high or low, is based on your diligence, not on your sinlessness. There are people who God put in power and abased to accomplish certain tasks (Joseph), but he was diligent. Most of us God lets us go where ever our efforts take us.

Pvb 13:4 Wealth is based on diligence, not anything else.

As a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

Pvb 19:15, 20:4 The idle suffer hunger. It doesn't say unless they are righteous. But what if he didn't know it was time to plow? He'll starve anyway.

Pvb 20:18 Goals are met by wisdom and fail by lack of it.

Ecclesiastes 9:11-12 time and chance. Sometimes it has more to do with being in the right or wrong place at the right or wrong time than anything else, whether it's good or evil.

<p>Pvb 24:30-34 Wealth and benefits come from understanding, knowledge, work</p> <p>Pvb 27:12 Wise men foreseeeth. You suffer needlessly; God wants you to be wise, but if you are not, you will suffer for no reason, you will suffer against God's will and plan for your life, but he won't fix it for you.</p> <p>Ecc 4:1, 5:8, 7:16 The evil oppress and destroy, and no one comforts the victims, and God does not rescue them. (Maybe because he expects us to do the work, but we are too busy thinking it's his job!?)</p> <p>Ecc 9:10 It is not a sin to cut with a dull knife, but wisdom helps you know to sharpen the knife. It isn't a sin to use a dull knife, but you will suffer, against God's will, and he won't intervene, and it will be entirely your doing. God does not "give you the power" to use a dull knife--it's your own stupidity, ignorance, laziness, and unpreparedness (no whetstone).</p> <p>Ecc 11:8 Remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many.</p> <p>Hosea 4:6 My people perish for lack of knowledge, not because it is God's will, he is telling them this because he is not happy about it (in this case, it appears to be related to sin).</p> <p>Luke 16:8 Jesus commends the unjust steward because he wisely prepared to meet his physical needs, instead of just expecting God to take care of him. The children of this world are wiser than Christians, who have notions about living life that don't work on planet earth, and are entirely contrary to God's word.</p>

UCG> Table 6. God's Promises of Protection for Saints

God's Promises	Scripture
<p>Every last one of these are OT promises. If we apply some of Mr. UCG's arguments, then perhaps Christ fulfilled all of these and none of them apply any more, or maybe they apply only in the future at the end of the world. Maybe, if there aren't any references to these exact promises in the NT, they are now no longer applicable, and Christians are just expected to make it without these promises of protection.</p>	
<p>You will not fear any danger by night or an arrow during the day.</p>	<p>Psalms 91:5, New Century Version</p>
<p>Nothing bad will happen to you. See NOTE 1 below.</p>	<p>Psalms 91:10, New Century Version</p>
<p>He (God) has put his angels in charge of you to watch over you wherever you go. They will catch you in their hands so that you will not hit your foot on a rock.</p>	<p>Psalms 91:11-12, New Century Version</p>
<p>The Lord will protect you from all danger. He will keep you safe. He will protect you as you come and go. Now and forever.</p>	<p>Psalms 121:7-8, Today's English Version</p>
<p>If a man's ways please the Lord, He (God) makes even his enemies to be at peace with him.</p>	<p>Proverbs 16:7, King James Version</p>
<p>This was written by Solomon, who had peace only because his father David killed and pushed back the enemy. God made Israel's enemies be at peace with them by using David and his men to wipe out God's enemy. David wiped out God's and Israel's enemies because he had faith in God, that God would help him, and that is was the duty of all saints (Ps 149) to remove the heathen.</p>	

Have you (God) not made a hedge about him (Job), and about all his house (family), and about all [the property] that he has on every side. (What God did for Job He does for all of His saints.)

Job 1:10, King James Version

If that's so, then why would not the other OT things God does for them apply: help them fight, arm them, etc. The point is, Job applies just as much as does Psalm 149. But, we can see varying degrees of "shielding" that God does. What we see in scripture is that God provided beyond the ordinary protection for those he was using to accomplish certain tasks. Until we go to heaven, we will never know the countless number of times God has protected us. But, from the perspective we can see, we are just as vulnerable to forces of harm and destruction as everyone else. After all, if Christians were safer than everyone else, people would become Christians just for the safety factor. But that's not how it works. Christians in this country feel safe probably for the most part because this is a fairly safe country; but I don't think it will stay that way for long. If you think Christians are safer than others, then prove it with statistics.

For those of us who have not recieved some sort of special protection, God provides us protection in part by giving us instructions on how to live (forsee evil, prepare, be armed, be wise, put away the wicked, deal swiftly with wrongdoing, etc).

Frankly, it's hart to explain how to balance trusting God with living smart. You have to combine Job with Proverbs. I think the bottom line is, you live as though your health, longevity, life, wealth, etc are entirely in your hands, and trust God to "bring it to pass," "bring something good out of it," and give you grace where you suffer because of yours and others' misdeeds, mistakes, etc. And, the Lord do what seemeth him good.

1Sa 3:18 And Samuel told him every whit, and hid nothing from him. And he said, It is the LORD: let him do what seemeth him good.

2Sa 10:12 Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God: and the LORD do that which seemeth him good.

UCG> NOTE 1: God's protection does not mean the saints won't go through trials, or even die. Many saints were murdered by one means or another.

Nor does being armed guarantee protection.

UCG> For example, God knew exactly what was happening when Cain murdered the first saint Abel,

I think Adam and Eve were the first saints. Abel was third.

UCG> but God still allowed it. God's promises of protection mean that God has set a hedge of protection about His saints just as He did Job, until God puts them through a test either by his direct orders or by allowing an unplanned trial to happen and then working it out to the good of His saints now or at the resurrection.

But, there are also things that happen that clearly are not God's will, but that he allows as consequences of ours, our forefathers, and other's actions, as in the children of Israel were supposed to kill the 7 nations, but did not, and suffered, and Lot's daughters' deeds are still causing grief, death, and suffering today.

God works through us and our efforts to accomplish his will. As in the case of illness. Sometimes he heals us supernaturally, sometimes he uses other people, like doctors, sometimes he uses us, we find some home remedy; sometimes the illness runs its course and God is with us through it; sometimes we never return to our former state of health.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Wicked spirits were probably the ones who stirred the angry mob in Nazareth in an attempt to destroy Jesus the way they did so many times during his human life. Though it appeared that Jesus was almost

UCG> killed because of his refusal to work a miracle, the real reason was
UCG> religious: demons were trying their best to destroy God's work by
UCG> killing Jesus through these deceived human beings. God probably sent an
UCG> angel to stir confusion in the mob, and Jesus took the opportunity to
UCG> escape.

UCG> EDITORIAL: As a Christian for 29 years, I have experienced more
UCG> persecution from private individuals for what appeared to be
UCG> nonreligious reasons than I have from those in authority for religious
UCG> reasons. For those who can't imagine how people could kill someone over
UCG> such trivial matters as occurred in Nazareth, I have a personal example.
UCG> A person in one company I worked for tried to get me fired and destroyed
UCG> my reputation through false reports and rumors. I never did anything to
UCG> deserve these attacks.

UCG> I found out later the nonreligious reason for these attacks -- envy that
UCG> I made a higher salary. The person directly persecuting me had
UCG> emotional problems, as acknowledged later by company management. I
UCG> believe that demons were working through my persecutor to get at me
UCG> because I am a son of God. I also believe that if we'd lived in the
UCG> more lawless times of Jesus, more violent means would have been used to
UCG> get rid of me. As with Jesus at Nazareth, God intervened to save me
UCG> from those trying to destroy me.

UCG> Opposing Argument #5

UCG> Jesus didn't have a family to worry about protecting when He was in
UCG> danger. If he had had one, it would have been a different story. Men
UCG> may put themselves in danger, but should they ever allow their wives and
UCG> children to die because of their faith in God?

[A father certainly should protect his family and not expose them un-necessarily to danger. However, there are times when it is necessary, such as with missionaries, or pioneers who places their families in danger of Indians, wild animals, weather, etc, or of those who have stood against evil societies, like Detrich Bonhoeffer, \(who, by the way, repeatedly attempted to assassinate Hitler\), George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, etc.](#)

UCG> Refutation #5

UCG> No physical human being, including all the wives and children who've
UCG> ever lived, could possibly be worth more than the life of Jesus Christ.
UCG> He was very God in human flesh. If Jesus had died before His time,
UCG> salvation would have been lost for all mankind. He had to die a
UCG> particular kind of death for His sacrifice to count, and dying at the
UCG> hands of a criminal or angry mob would not have done it. So let's don't
UCG> devalue Jesus' life by comparing the danger He was in to that of anyone
UCG> else.

[Certainly not.](#)

UCG> Many of the Apostles and prophets had wives and children who were in
UCG> danger because of the work their husbands or fathers did for God.

[As did our the founding fathers of our nation in fighting the evil British government while attempting to establish a nation based on biblical principles; they greatly endangered their wives and children.](#)

UCG> Many

UCG> women in the Apostolic church were in as much danger of death as the
UCG> men. The Apostle Paul in particular, though not married, ran into every
UCG> kind of danger we do today, and not just martyrdom from civil
UCG> authorities. He suffered from “perils of robbers, perils of countrymen
UCG> (II Corinthians 11:23-27).

UCG> From all the Biblical evidence available, Paul did not use carnal
UCG> weapons while in danger.

It does say he fought with beasts, though we don't know what exactly he ment, whether animals or human, literal or figurative, he says he fought. Notice nowhere does it say he figuratively prayed to idols or slept with prostitutes, which, if fighting were such an evil thing, it would be equally wrong to say he did it, even figuratively. Some people in the Bible did literally fight, some did not. Both can be equally pleasing to God, depending on the circumstances. Sometimes it's wrong to fight, sometimes it's wrong not to fight. You have to understand God's word well enough to know the difference.

UCG> Neither did anyone else in the early church.

Jesus' example:
sword, armed man

Apostles' example:

early church example:

“ensamples to us” is what is said of OT examples and all others based on ... (?)

I'm not familiar enough with the early church to argue either way, nor do I know how he defines “early.” See Foxe's Book of Martyrs for examples of Christians who used weapons and violence to defend themselves and their families. See Early American history to see lots of examples of Christians using weapons and violence to defend their families, and their God-given rights.

UCG> This didn't stop them from giving their lives to obey God.

Nor does using weapons stop someone from giving their lives to obey God.

UCG> Instead they
UCG> devoted themselves to preaching and modeling the gospel of peace for all
UCG> people, and served God as instruments of reconciliation.

If we take this to be our example, we may do nothing but preach the gospel--leave our families, have no job, travel from place to place preaching, own no property, no spouse, no transportation (we want the purest example, that of Christ). Obviously not everyone in the NT followed Jesus or the disciples' examples, and they had God's blessings in doing so. ... They were told to carry swords, they may not have worked much, may not have had homes or wives (Peter did), or children.

UCG> Opposing Argument #6

UCG> Even if you can prove that Jesus set the example of living the gospel of
UCG> peace toward His enemies, this can't mean Christians are to follow
UCG> Christ's example to this extreme.

Obviously this is a ludicrous argument--a red herring--for anyone claiming to be a Christian, ie, follower of Christ. If you don't follow his example and his commands and his word, then by definition you are not a Christian.

UCG> After all, Jesus' mission was different from His disciples.
UCG> Dying was a part of Jesus becoming our Savior and Messiah; we
UCG> aren't called to that mission.

We may not have that same mission to be Saviour, but we have the curse of death, and that makes dying part of living, so in a sense we are

on a mission to die, although we don't know when or how.

By the way, Jesus didn't **become** Savior and Messiah, he **was** Savior and Messiah, and was born so.

UCG> Anyway, you can't

UCG> really know exactly how to follow Christ's example. Do we wear the same

UCG> robes and shoes, observe Hanukah, or fast 40 days and nights as Jesus

UCG> did (Luke 4:1-13, 11:37-54)?

Robes, shoes, and Hanukah are what Jesus did, and there's no reason why we shouldn't do them unless we have a clear reason to not. Then again, it might be better to say we follow his example to the extent that we follow his commands and the commands of scripture, we have the mind of Christ, we conform to his character and image, and we follow his examples in those areas where his example is commended to us.

Since sin and righteousness are not involved in shoes, transportation, clothing, lodging, property ownership, etc, and we are not commended to those examples (although we are commended to a simple lifestyle with few encumbrances and little entanglement with the things of this world), we don't have to follow them religiously. I would say weapons and deadly force also do not involve sin and righteous (although weapons are somewhat different, in that Jesus commanded us to carry a sword without leaving it to our discretion), but since there is a contention over it, we have to discuss it.

Just as, some day environmentalist Christians (an oxymoron, if there ever was one) may say that we should follow Jesus' example in no transportation (whether animal or mechanical) because it "destroys the earth" (Revelation), and no home, because it disrupts natural habitat, causes trees to be cut, makes for bad run off; and only 1 set of clothes, because of the damage to the earth caused by textiles and oil based clothes like nylon, and no family because of overpopulation, etc. We should do something drastic so we die young, to hold down the population, we should only use small open motorless boats to keep from polluting bodies of water with gas and oil, and to keep from disturbing the wildlife in or near the water. We should depend on others to support us so we don't contribute to the system of usury and slavery and exploitation.

The critical note here is, following these "examples" would violate certain commands and/or principles Jesus gave us. Just like not using violence when necessary also violates certain commands.

UCG> Refutation #6

UCG> This argument is false for two main reasons. First, following Jesus'

UCG> example, even to death, is a command, not an option (Luke 9:23, I Peter

UCG> 2:21).

Mr. UCG implies that using deadly force means we are not following Jesus example even to death, but that is far from the truth, and far from several examples in the Bible and in "Church history." Jesus himself states that using deadly force may bring about our death by deadly force, which is certainly not avoiding death, and if it is possible to use deadly force and follow Jesus' example at the same time, Mr. UCG has no argument. Carrying a deadly weapon was also explicitly commanded by Jesus himself, so this aspect of deadly force also in no way violates Jesus' example and commands to us, in fact, it follows it.

Furthermore, the Bible doesn't say we must die for righteousness. We can also live for Christ, but perhaps this violates following Jesus example of dying for righteousness? Maybe if we don't die for righteousness, but in a car accident, or by heart attack, or killed by a mugger, we are not dying for righteousness sake, and therefore are not following Christ's example. I don't think Mr. UCG believes this, but it interesting to point out when discussing Jesus' example.

I Peter 2:21

There are three basic points related to this and verses like it:

1. We do it and agree with it, making no effort to spiritualize or marginalize it to fit our beliefs;
2. It is not contradictory to defense, deadly force, or to owning and using weapons;
3. These verses do not cover all there is to the subject; there is more to it than just these verses.

For example, if verse 18 was all we ever read about slavery, we could easily conclude that slavery is OK, and a slave would never be correct to run away or fight against slavery in any way. And, by extension, maybe we could never leave a job because of adverse working conditions, or perhaps you could never vote out bad politicians (If you believe that the government is the master and we are the slaves. According to our constitution, the government is our public servant, and we are the masters.) We could also conclude, since he doesn't tell us slavery is bad or that we should try to eliminate it, that it is wrong to try to end slavery. I doubt if Mr. UCG supports that position, but it applying his arguments to other issues does reveal flaws in his reasoning.

If verse 13 was all we ever read about obeying the law, we would conclude that we must obey every single law there is, no matter how much it tells us to sin or to disobey God. However, we know from Acts 5:29 that the Bible tells us, "we ought to obey God rather than men," and when the law tells us to break scripture, we break the law instead.

UCG> Second, Jesus doesn't ask His disciples to do the impossible.

UCG> Jesus promises to reveal to His disciples how to follow His example in

UCG> every area of life (Philippians 3:15, Galatians 1:15-16).

Paul said the believers should follow him as he followed Christ, and as long as he was true to the gospel.

Examples are clarified by commands and scriptures. To understand them you must compare with scripture, and study to show yourself approved, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. At least one of us is not rightly dividing the word of truth.

UCG> Sometimes Jesus' example is obvious; for example, Christians know they

UCG> should pray and love others as He did. For the more difficult areas of

UCG> Jesus' life, Christians should follow one basic principle: If Jesus'

UCG> example is consistent with clear, provable scripture about righteousness

UCG> and sin, do it. I don't wear the same robes and shoes, fast 40 days and

UCG> nights in the wilderness, or observe Hanukkah as Jesus did because no

UCG> scripture says to do such things.

But scripture does commend fasting and prayer, and modest adornment.

UCG> Refer to my three main arguments for

UCG> proof that for Christians killing in self-defense is a sin.

UCG> Jesus is different from His disciples only in the level of His status.

UCG> Jesus is God, and He will always have a higher status than His

UCG> disciples. In every other way, Jesus and His disciples are sanctified

UCG> as one together in their calling (Hebrews 2:11-14). Jesus is a model of

UCG> the gospel as a way of life that all Christians follow now and all

UCG> humanity will follow in the Kingdom.

UCG> Jesus commissioned Christians to follow His example

But that's not all. If all we do is follow Christ's example, we are disobeying what Christ himself said: he said we should also do and teach others to do all that he commanded. Further, we are to do more than just what Christ exemplified, and what Christ commanded, we are to obey ALL the commands of scripture, and that is not a few. Furthermore, there are other people in the Bible we are to follow besides Christ (Paul, for example).

UCG> so that those called

UCG> now can qualify for the first resurrection and bring the message of

UCG> salvation to all the world as a witness and as a means for God to call

UCG> some now. A part of Jesus' example is not killing in self-defense.

It's hard enough to make a case for what we should do based on what Jesus did, not to mention making a case that we should not do something because he did not do it, particularly since neither he nor any scripture tells us not to, and he did tell us to do something conducive to it (carry a sword), his instructional examples include instances of it (a strong man armed), he refers positively to instances of

people (???) who did (David? but he also committed adultery), and other scriptures clearly tell us we must do it, and commend us to those who did, and commands us to do things requiring them (break every yoke, put away the wicked).

UCG> Refer to Table 7 below for ways Jesus and His disciples are one.

UCG> Table 7. What Jesus and His Disciples Have in Common

Similarities between Jesus and His Disciples	Scripture
<p>Jesus and His disciples are under the same conditions in the world: as sheep among wolves, as lambs for the slaughter, facing danger and death from wicked spirits who often work through carnal human beings as they proclaim and live the gospel daily. Among those dangers are “perils of robbers, perils of countrymen, perils of the Gentiles, perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, perils in the sea, perils among false brethren.”</p> <p>This is true whether you are armed, unarmed, or disarmed (by the local Phillistines, the UN, or home grown anti-gun politicians).</p>	<p>John 15:18-19, 17:18, Matthew 10:16-17, Romans 8:36, Acts 8:32-33, Revelation 17:6, II Corinthians 4:11, 11:23-27; I John 4:17.</p>
<p>Jesus and His disciples must qualify for (be worthy of) eternal life and their future positions in the Kingdom of God by fulfilling their commission of modeling and proclaiming the gospel.</p> <p>Jesus had to qualify?!? No, Jesus had life in him (John 1:4), and he always was (“before Abraham was, I am.”), he is the one who is Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, and the Creator of all things that were made. He certainly has no need to qualify. He came to give us eternal life, not to earn it for himself. Neither did he have to follow or model any example, he was the example. He was the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6), which we must follow (if any man will follow me...).</p> <p>You qualify for eternal life by following Jesus’ example and proclaiming the gospel?!? I don’t think so. Salvation comes by faith in God through Jesus Christ. His atonement granted us God’s forgiveness of our sins, so we are cleansed in his sight. When salvation comes to you, you are born again, and then by your faith in God, you exercise good works, which include following Jesus’ example and proclaiming the gospel...and carrying a sword!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A part of that qualifying to inherit glory...</p> <p>It is not qualifying, it is obedience based on faith. Nobody qualifies for eternal life or anything else except hell. (there is none righteous no not one).</p> <p>...is suffering pain and if necessary, death, from whatever enemies may attack them while serving as witnesses and soldiers in this spiritual war, just as the prophets did.</p> <p>And as did many others, some of whom are commended in Hebrews 11, who fought and died fighting for God and country and the innocent and the righteous. Again, whether you are armed or unarmed, you will suffer these things, just as did all the OT saints, who, if they were not armed, most of the time they had the opportunity to be armed, yet they suffered all the above.</p>	<p>II Timothy 2:12, Romans 8:17, II Corinthians 9:27, Hebrews 1:9, Revelation 3:4, II Thessalonians 1:5, Mark 8:35, Luke 20:35, Matthew 10:37-39, Ephesians 4:1.</p>

UCG> Opposing Argument #7

UCG> How does God expect a Christian to defend himself in a life-threatening situation? Doesn’t God want me to do what I can for myself like David did when he brought five stones with him to kill Goliath?

UCG> Refutation #7

UCG> God expects a Christian to do everything he can within God's law to
UCG> defend himself and his family.

Which is precisely my position, as well. We use all the tools God has placed at our disposal, and leave the results to him. Of course, those tools include those given us in Genesis 9:6, Exodus 20, Jesus' commands, Hebrews 11, Nehemiah, Esther, Psalms, Proverbs, etc.

UCG> Whole books are written on the subject of
UCG> safety and security. A Christian should follow all normal security
UCG> guidelines to protect his family the best he can, for example, using
UCG> locks and security systems if he can afford it; not going into dangerous
UCG> areas of town, especially at night; knowing how to contact the police in
UCG> a emergency; considering a plan for escaping your home if uninvited
UCG> visitors are there.

Agreed. You meet each threat on the level at which it presents itself with enough where-with-all to overcome it or avoid it using the least amount of force necessary, or by superior cunning (else while he is a great way off, he sends ambassadors desiring conditions of peace--OT principle). If you do not meet threats sufficiently to overcome or avoid them, you will suffer the consequences.

UCG> Sometimes, however, a Christian is helpless to do anything.

Agreed. Even for those who choose to engage in self defense--being armed doesn't guarantee safety--our trust is in God, not in our weapons or efforts or abilities.

UCG> For
UCG> example, for Shadrach, Mechach, and Abed-nego, bowing down to an idol to
UCG> save their lives was not an option (Daniel 3:1-30). They had to allow
UCG> God to take care of the danger, and God not only protected them, but
UCG> rewarded them for their faith.

During the vast majority of persecutions, God did and does not protect Christians. There are only a very few examples where God has protected individuals. Heb 11:36-38. In these cases, God's grace is sufficient, and he is with us through all trouble. Often, the degree of suffering is up to the person or persons involved, how prepared are they to avoid it, escape it, or fight it?

Being armed is no guarantee of safety, any more than being unarmed guarantees the increased likelihood of God intervening for you.

UCG> In the same way, a Christian point blank shooting to death another
UCG> human being is not an option, unless God authorizes it.

Very true, which he has done, in the cases of defense, capitol punishment, and war.

UCG> Above all
UCG> things, a Christian should seek God's protection for himself and his
UCG> family through daily prayer, and seek to please God. This is the only
UCG> way anyone can have full assurance in times of danger.

Absolutely true. The assurance is that God is with us, and he will work it out for his glory no matter what happens to us, and we will be with him in heaven in the end. We have no assurance of safety no matter what we do or don't do.

UCG> God nowhere in the Bible tells us exactly how to deal with crime or
UCG> threats of violence, any more than He told Jesus or the Apostles how to
UCG> deal with the demon-inspired violence of angry mobs in their day. Jesus
UCG> did the best He could with God's help, and used spiritual, not carnal
UCG> weapons. Jesus believed in God's Biblical promises of physical
UCG> protection, and true Christians today can claim these same promises.
UCG> Refer to Table 6.

God's promises also can be stood upon by those who use weapons (Psalm 18 and 91 are nice ones, for example).

UCG> The Christian man should be willing to use physical force to restrain a
UCG> criminal, if it comes to that,

But, that is resisting evil, (which you do not advocate, and which you argue against, because you use other scripture to understand the extent or application of this command, but don't apply the same method to other verses which you take to mean use no deadly force), and...

1. Jesus never did that. His examples to us did not include using physical force to resist anything. The apostles and disciples also never used physical force to restrain or resist anyone, at least not that is mentioned in the NT. Nor did anyone else in the "early" NT church.

Jesus used a whip, but not at all in defense; he used his weapon as an offensive one, attacking those who had no inkling to bother him at all.

Even if he never actually touched them, although he did over turn their tables, he used his weapon in a method that made them believe he would use it. Wouldn't it be deceitful or hypocritical or making people think you are sinning (like making a pass at a woman even though you have no intention to commit adultery with her, or going into the bank and using your finger in your coat pocket and telling them to stick'em up) (if deadly force is sinful) to make someone think you are going to use a weapon, even if you never do? Perhaps it would be giving the appearance of evil? Or it would be giving the ungodly reason to blaspheme Christ and Christians, because Christians are such hypocrites, saying one thing but (appearing to) do another?

2. Using physical restraining force is also not part of Jesus' commission to us. (Neither is brushing your teeth.)

Furthermore, you interpret Ephesians 6 to mean that we cannot use physical warfare/fighting/wrestling to defeat our enemies.

Therefore, by your standards in determining that deadly force is wrong, you should also conclude the same for non-deadly force.

UCG> but not with the intent to kill him.

But just about any effective method could turn deadly, and then what? Even if you just wrestle with them in an attempt to subdue them, you could accidently break their neck; but then again, Eph 6 says you can't wrestle against flesh and blood! Perhaps the only methods available are those that could not possibly result in death? If you accidently kill someone, especially if you intentionally tangle with them, do you think God will let you off the hook? Even the law charges you with something if you kill someone while fighting with them.

UCG> He

UCG> should also be willing to give his life for his wife and children, if
UCG> doing so will save them. Jesus used physical force to chase the
UCG> moneychangers out of His Father's house, but He did not kill them, nor
UCG> does it say He ever touched them. Merely appearing intimidating plus
UCG> God's help may have been all it took.

(Frequently Misapplied Verses Applied to Jesus Cleansing the Temple with a Whip, to Demonstrate the Fallacy of Said Misapplications.)

So, he gave the appearance of doing evil! 1Th 5:22 Abstain from all appearance of evil.

He was resisting evil Mt 5:39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.,

He was wrestling against flesh and blood Eph 6:12 For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.,

He was not obeying every ordinance of man (that allowed them to be in there) 1Pe 2:13 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;

He was not being as a sheep to slaughter who opens not his mouth Isa 53:7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.,

He was using a whip, a carnal weapon to pull down the spiritual strongholds of thievery and covetousness 2Co 10:4 (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;),

He did not turn the other cheek to those who were being an affront to God and to his temple Mt 5:39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.,

He was using a whip, a physical weapon, and maybe that's why he was whipped during his trial and crucifixion; something like, they that take the whip will be whipped with a whip Mt 26:52 Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.,

Jesus was fighting as if the temple was part of a worldly kingdom that was being delivered to the money changers, instead of a heavenly one that God would defend without Jesus doing anything [Joh 18:36](#) Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

He was completely in violation of Romans 13:

- 1 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. (the offices of the priest and the high priest were established directly by God, and these officers of God had directly sanctioned the temple sellers and money changers)
- 2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God (since these priests were ordained of God, and Jesus was resisting both them and their works, Jesus was resisting God himself): and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation (Gulp! Does that mean Jesus was damned?).
- 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil (the priests who allowed the money changers and sellers were a terror to evil, but Jesus drove out the money changers). Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same (the priests did not praise Jesus, therefore he was not doing good):
- 4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good (what the priests do is good, and therefore since Jesus fought against their ordinances, he was fighting against good). But if thou do that which is evil (Jesus was obviously doing evil, so he better have been afraid), be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God (whatever the priests did was of God), a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil (Jesus was doing evil, and the priests later executed wrath on him when they killed him; Jesus deserved to die).
- 5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake (Jesus violated his conscience in addition to incurring the wrath of man).

He was not living peaceably with all men as much as lieth in him [Ro 12:18](#) If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. (he had infinite capacity to live peaceably, but the problem is, a righteous person cannot live peaceably with wickedness--he must either seek to drive it out, or it will drive him out, or he will become complacent in the face of it, and, hence, complicitous.

I hope the above paragraphs amply demonstrates that Mr. UCG is twisting scripture when he uses the above quoted verses in attempting to prove that Christians may not use deadly force. If Mr. UCG's interpretation is correct, then Jesus contradicted himself, broke his own words, and did not follow his own example when he drove the money changers from the temple. He died as a sinner reaping the consequences of his evil deeds.

UCG> Opposing Argument #8

UCG> Even the world doesn't think killing in self-defense is murder. Why is

UCG> this wrong for a Christian to do?

This is an obviously ridiculous argument for Christians, who seek to conform themselves to the image of Christ no matter what the world thinks.

UCG> Refutation #8

UCG> The world believes many things are right, but God says they are sin (I

UCG> [John 2:15-16](#)). A Christian can't go by what the world thinks is right or

UCG> wrong. He must go by the Word of God ([Deuteronomy 8:3](#), [Matthew 7:21](#)).

UCG> And God says all killing unauthorized by Him violates the sixth

UCG> commandment and is murder.

Neither does it authorize the killing of animals, so should we also be vegetarians? Or perhaps we can eat meat as long as they are killed by someone else, namely the heathen, who supposedly are the only ones who can kill people.

To answer the question, we can go back to [Genesis 9](#), where God tells Noah he may eat meat. The problem is, this chapter also authorizes killing people in defense (by implication), capital punishment (directly), and war (by implication).

We can also infer from the NT that killing is OK, because it talks about eating meat as if it's OK, without warning about not killing, which is precisely the case when it talks about war, killing, weapons, as if nothing is wrong with them. To fully elaborate on killing animals, including cruelty to animals, you have to go back to the OT (maybe you can be cruel to animals since the NT doesn't say anything about it?), which is also what you do for the fullest understanding of killing people. The NT builds it's foundation on the OT, and you almost have to understand the OT to fully understand the NT.

A few examples from which you can infer that killing people is OK:

Heb 11; no one goeth awar; a strong man armed; put on the armor of God--if weapons were evil, he could not use this analogy. It would be akin to saying, take unto you the whores of God, or take unto you the idols of God, or join yourself in the drunkenness and thievery of God. Evil and sin are completely incompatible with God, because his character is totally contrary to them, and he doesn't even accept "the appearance of evil" or "the garment" spotted, etc. He would not allow his name to be associated with something evil.

Since weapons are almost exclusively for killing or maiming, or threatening to do so, I have a hard time seeing killing could be universally evil without weapons also being evil, much like idols are always evil, since idolatry is always evil, and never under any circumstances is ever correct, making idols always evil. Saying "take unto you the idols of God" would be linking God in partnership with the devil. Maybe the devil is Jesus' brother after all.

Jesus commanding his disciples to carry a sword, and then telling them after his resurrection to do all things he had commanded them before, and then to teach the world the same things, would be equally evil to telling them to carry an idol, and to teach everyone in the world to carry an idol.

Jesus telling the story about the strong man armed would be like telling a dirty joke to make a point about sin being wrong.

Jesus quoting or commending OT people in using weapons would be like commending adultery and murder, as opposed to commending forgiven whores and murderers, ie, David and Rahab for their faith, good works, and righteousness.

UCG> Refer to Argument #1 in the Main Argument

UCG> section for more detail.

UCG> Opposing Argument #9

UCG> Does it really make any real difference what view a Christian has about

UCG> killing in self-defense?

UCG> Refutation #9

UCG> Whether a Christian is for or against killing in self-defense implies
UCG> differences in basic assumptions that need to be considered when taking
UCG> a position on this issue. Those who believe in killing in self-defense
UCG> have an entirely different set of beliefs about Jesus Christ, how to
UCG> follow His example, and the Church's gospel commission than those who do
UCG> not believe in killing in self-defense. Refer to Table 8 for examples
UCG> of these differences in assumptions. I have based these differences on
UCG> the views presented in this paper. Not everyone has all of these
UCG> assumptions.

UCG> Table 8. Differences in Assumptions

He should have titled it: A Straw Man Created To Misrepresent The Position Of Those Who Believe In Armed Defense, To Make Their Position Appear Untenable

Assumptions of Those Against Killing in Self-defense	Assumptions of Those for Killing in Self-Defense
---	---

<p>Jesus commissioned his disciples to go into all the world as His instruments to bring the gospel of peace, reconciliation, and salvation to all God calls. Destroying life under any circumstances is contrary to that commission. (Luke 9:56)</p> <p>But, didn't you say previously that whatever killing God allows is proper?</p> <p>I would agree with UCG's statement except to say that destroying life is wrong, except where God gave us exceptions: defense, capital punishment, and war.</p>	<p>Jesus' commission to help save and reconcile humanity includes all people except enemies who are an immediate threat to their lives. Christians may kill these enemies at will.</p> <p>Correction: Jesus' commission to preach the gospel of reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ includes everyone--all the world, including those who are an immediate threat to their lives.</p> <p>We are to win them to Christ, although it is our prerogative to neutralize threats they may pose to us. We may do nothing out of anger or hatred; we may kill only as outlined in scripture: defense, war, capital punishment. We may choose not to exercise our prerogative.</p> <p>For example, Jim Elliot was armed, when he and the others went to the Auca Indians. He chose not to kill, but he did fight them, nevertheless, he was martyred.</p>
<p>God will make it possible for Christians to be living analogies of the Kingdom and millennium in taste and type as they bring the gospel of peace to all nations. Not fulfilling this commission is contrary to obeying the gospel. (Anyone not familiar with the concept of Christians being living analogies of the gospel can refer to the _____ booklet "God's Holy Day Plan.")</p> <p>Would it be too much to ask to be referred to a Bible verse revealing this concept? If this concept is applied in such a way as to violate scripture dealing with defense, then the concept should either be modified, applied in a way that does not violate scripture, or tossed out the window.</p> <p>Furthermore, where in the Bible does it say we are supposed to live like we are in the millennium, since we are not in the millennium? There are different circumstances and different rules between then and now. Instead of inventing lofty sounding theories about how we are supposed to live, that don't work, why not just do what the Bible says, like, carry a sword?</p> <p>How about if we try to be a type and analogy of how it will be at the end of the world? We can go around on a horse slaughtering all of God's enemies. What's to say we should be typing the millennium instead of the end of the world? (Of course, I don't believe this, but if Mr. UCG makes an argument for the one, why should we not also be like the other one?)</p>	<p>Jesus' commission to His disciples has nothing to do with being living analogies of the gospel of peace by picturing and modeling the Kingdom of God in taste and type.</p> <p>We are God's body, doing his work in his stead on earth, bringing the message of reconciliation to God through Christ; we are to love our neighbors, and the brethren, including those who put ridiculous words in our mouths that we never said.</p> <p>Furthermore, what does picturing and modeling mean? We are to obey scripture, not make up concepts that cause us to violate scripture.</p>

<p>Under no circumstances would Jesus or His early disciples have killed anyone during their human lives. (For Jesus, Luke 4:16-30, Matthew Chapters 26-28. For the Apostle Paul and other saints, Acts 9:23-25, 29; 14:1-6, 19; 17:5-10; 21:27-31)</p> <p>Probably not, but they made provision for it, and they never told us not to, and scripture makes it a necessary part of living on planet earth. Death is come into the world, and we have to deal with it in ways acceptable to God. They also would probably never have been bank president, owned stock in a company, gone on a polar expedition, taken a cruise to the Bahamas, etc. Their examples are good, but we can't stop there, because that is not all of scripture. We obey all scripture, not just those parts conducive to Mr. UCG's interpretation.</p>	<p>Jesus would have killed all persons not in a position of civil authority if they threatened His life, and so would the Apostles and disciples in the early church.</p> <p>Jesus killed lots of people in the OT, including all but Noah's family (it was not his will for them to die, but to preserve life on the planet, he had to), and he will kill even more at the end of the world, but his purpose in coming was to save people and reconcile them to God.</p> <p>In the NT he killed Annanias and Saphyra. His purpose was to reconcile to God, and so is ours, and while our purpose in life is not to kill, God has made a provision for us to do so when necessary to save life, to put away evil, to rescue the oppressed and those drawn to death, to break yokes, etc.</p> <p>At the end of the world with the 12 apostles sitting on 12 thrones judging the 12 tribes of Israel, Jesus will not only kill all the wicked, he will judge them, and cast them into the burning lake of fire.</p>
<p>God controls all events that happen to a Christian, planned and accidental, and promises to protect them if they don't carry a carnal weapon. (Romans 8:28, I Corinthians 10:13; see also Table 6 for God's promises of protection.)</p> <p>Romans 8:28 And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose.</p> <p>I Corinthians 10:13 There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.</p> <p>I don't see anything in these verses expressing the concept, "only if you don't carry a weapon." Apparently, Mr. UCG just made it up out of thin air, or from his preconceived opinion.</p>	<p>God will not necessarily protect Christians and their families unless they are armed and ready to kill.</p> <p>I agree with this one to some extent.</p> <p>Luke 11:21 When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: (even if he is a Christian, he might not keep his palace if he is not armed)</p> <p>22 But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. (believer or not)</p> <p>Pr 22:3 A prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself: but the simple pass on, and are punished. (if you prepare for evil, to deal with it, you will have success. Just because you are a Christian doesn't mean you will not suffer from the evil of others. That includes matters like self defense.)</p> <p>Lu 16:8 And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. (Christians are in la-la land, thinking God will protect them from everything, and they don't have to deal with problems in the same way the unsaved do.)</p> <p>Lu 12:39 And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. (it doesn't say if he were a believer he could just keep on snoozing, because God would stop the thief/rapist/murderer.)</p>

<p>God commands Christians to use only spiritual weapons and engage only in spiritual warfare. (II Corinthians 10: 3-4, Ephesians 6:12, Matthew 26:52)</p> <p>Correction: God additionally commands us to deal with physical problems, feed the hungry, care for the saints, the sick, be salt and light, work, occupy, etc. None of these are “spiritual” deeds. You can’t feed the hungry with “spiritual” food, or heal the sick with “spiritual” medicine. They will starve to death and die, and it will be your fault, because you did not use what you had to help them.</p> <p>If we can use only spiritual warfare and spiritual wrestling, then any physical wrestling using any physical item is wrong, including Mr. UCG’s position of wrestling without using deadly force.</p>	<p>God allows Christians to use both carnal and spiritual weapons in their warfare. Christians are wrestling against flesh and blood just as much as against wicked spirits.</p> <p>Correction: We use spiritual weapons against spiritual enemies, and physical weapons against physical enemies. We don’t use physical weapons or Ghost Buster plasma guns to blast demons or to root sin out of people, nor do we do silly things like beat people to remove evil thoughts, or who are possessed in attempts to exorcise them, which would amount to using physical means to solve spiritual problems. These require spiritual weapons.</p> <p>If we were spirits without bodies, it would be possible to use only spiritual weapons. But, we live in a physical world, and we have to deal with problems in this world in a way that will overcome them.</p> <p>If you are in the path of a flash flood, you don’t kneel and pray, you run like crazy to high ground, while asking God to help you to make it. That would be using spiritual methods to fight spiritual battles. (Actually, all it would be to only kneel and pray is very stupid, and not spiritual at all, because faith (that God will help you and preserve you) produces works (running like crazy).)</p> <p>Our warfare is spiritual, but it does not forbid using physical means against physical problems: doctors, medicine, watering the lawn...and weapons.</p>
<p>Jesus’ command to love enemies and bring the gospel to all the world applies to all human beings and to all situations. (Matthew 5:44, Mark 16:15)</p> <p>My position exactly.</p>	<p>Jesus’ command to love your enemies applies only to not seeking revenge. Jesus’ command to go to all the world with the gospel applies only to friendly people and those in authority. God left all other situations and categories of people for the individual to decide what to do as the individual pleases.</p> <p>Correction: We are to love everyone and are forbidden to seek personal vengeance. We are to win everyone to Christ. We never do as we please, because we are no longer our own, being bought with a price. We seek to conform ourselves to his image, as revealed in his word.</p>
<p>God must be the one to authorize the killing of any human being. (Genesis 9:56, Exodus 20:13)</p> <p>True. And he did, in Genesis 9:6 (see v. 5-6), and elsewhere.</p> <p>These commands were given initially to believers only, not to the ungodly, because there were no ungodly around at the time (Gen 9:6) to carry it out according to Mr. UCG’s version which says the heathen must carry out these commands. In Ex it was given to the nation of Israel, and not to the heathen nations around them, so how could they do this if they were forbidden to kill? They would have to hire some Caanite to do the job, but then what’s the difference if they pay someone, or they do it themselves? God gave them an impossible commandment.</p>	<p>God really doesn’t care whether or not Christians kill their enemies, and certainly does not need to authorize such acts. Christians decide for themselves which enemies to kill at their discretion.</p> <p>God wants us to live peaceably with all men as much as lieth in us, he authorizes us to kill under certain conditions. God gives us his word and his wisdom to know when it is time to kill, and when it is time to save alive.</p>

<p>God wants Christians to view every unconverted human being who threatens their lives as future sons of God who will repent, not as enemies to destroy. (Luke 23:34)</p> <p>Mostly true, however, he does expect us to defend those he has given into our care, including our families, the innocent, the helpless, the widows and fatherless, etc. We are to bring justice whenever it is in our power.</p>	<p>God does not want Christians to view every unconverted human being who threatens their lives as deceived or as future sons of God, but as enemies to destroy.</p> <p>And so we should “deal gently with the young man,” as David did with his errant son Absalom, yet with a view to defend the innocent and helpless, and to put away the evil among us.</p> <p>We view every person, including dangerous ones, as those made in the image of God, but, since God has given them life, he can take it, using us in instances he has authorized.</p>
--	---

UCG> Furthermore, according to end-time prophecy, America will lapse into
UCG> near anarchy (Isaiah 3:5),

Where is some evidence that this refers to America or the end times? It is generic for any nation that rejects God, not just for America or the end times. Who can prove we are in the end times?

There's nothing that says the end will happen any time soon. We may go 1000 years before the end of the world, and whether we live or die depends in part on what we do--our fate as a nation and as individuals is not inescapable, and it is at least partly in our hands.

UCG> and experience much crime and violence (Hosea
UCG> 4:2). Family members will put each other to death (Matthew 10:21-22,
UCG> Luke 21:12, 16). Church members will betray each other, probably to
UCG> prison or death (Matthew 24:10). A Christian's life as well as that of
UCG> his family will be in great danger.

UCG> The danger will be so great, no one will be safe in their homes or in
UCG> public, no matter how many carnal weapons they carry. Members will then
UCG> be forced to take a stand on this issue because the enemies who threaten
UCG> their family's lives won't be just criminals -- it'll be family members,
UCG> church members, and neighbors. At that time only prayer, faith, and
UCG> obedience will make any difference to Christ's disciples, the same way
UCG> it did in the Apostolic church.

It also says the dragon will make war with the saints. It might be a one-sided, unresisted slaughter, or it might be an actual, war where both sides fight, as in: “there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels fought, and the dragon fought,” and the devil was whipped and kicked out. While the angels fight Satan and his demons in heaven, perhaps we will be fighting the devil's minions here on earth; only we will lose, I think. The Bible really does not tell.

Rev 13:10 It seems there would be no need for swords if there were no struggle; although they took Jesus with swords, and martyrdom does suggest one-sided slaughter, but that may be a contemporary understanding. Are there any instances of martyrdom in the Bible where there was resistance? On this point we need more information. Perhaps the definition of martyrdom is being murdered for Christ's sake, period. Maybe there is a further restriction based on complete non-resistance. That certainly is not the case in Foxe's Book of Martyrs, as some of the martyrs engaged in armed resistance.

UCG> ...the danger will be so great... (above)

This is no different than it is now--there are many times when, for whatever reason, we are not able to defend ourselves, and are in the same predicament. But, that has no bearing on whether it's right or wrong to use weapons.

dragon Rev 12
beast Rev 13
beast Rev 17:14
supernatural victory??
Rev 19:11, 19:19

The slain martyrs could just as easily have been slain in battle--or where they beheaded? Maybe they were captured in battle and beheaded. Isn't beheading a Moslem practice? (also French).

People using violence and weapons: the 2 prophets call down fire and burn up people. Again, God would not help people do evil things: and he gave them power to commit whoredoms with all women, whosoever did not love their husbands; or, to drink themselves drunken; or, to steal all things whatsoever was not dedicated to the Lord, etc.

UCG> Part II

UCG> 5. BRIEF LESSON IN LOGIC

UCG> Introduction

UCG> This section describes the basic rules of practical logic that will be applied in Section 6, Refutation of Major Arguments for Killing in Self-Defense. Sections 5 and 6 are intended only for those people who are interested in a technical understanding of the principles of logic that should be applied to all doctrinal issues, including killing in self-defense. An understanding about logic can be used as a tool to guard against deception and demolish false doctrinal arguments (2 Corinthians 10:4-5, New Century Version).

UCG> Many of the doctrinal arguments I hear from members of the _____ supporting positions contrary to what _____ taught violate one or more of the principles of logic. Though I know only God can inspire an understanding of His truth and deception is as much a matter of attitude as it is logic, I believe that less doctrinal error would occur if more people would at least consider more carefully the logic of their arguments.

UCG> Principles of Practical Logic

UCG> All logical arguments contain three elements: facts, premises, and conclusions. Facts support premises, and premises support conclusions. If the facts or premises are wrong, whether through false assumptions or faulty reasoning, then the conclusion is wrong. Proving an argument requires verifiable facts, sound premises, and correct reasoning to the conclusion.

UCG> All logical arguments are either deductive or inductive. An inductive argument consists of a limited number of specific instances and a conclusion drawn from those instances. The conclusion of an inductive argument can be only probable, not certain, because the sample taken is limited. Someone may discover more facts that contradict the conclusion. Therefore, when someone introduces new verifiable facts, a Christian should consider them and change his conclusions accordingly (Proverbs 18:13,15).

UCG> Gallup polls are an example of the use of inductive logic. Gallup may take a survey of 10,000 people out of 1 million possible and draw a conclusion from the 10,000. If 75 percent of the 10,000 say they will vote for Clinton for President, then Gallup may conclude that 75 percent of the total 1 million will vote for Clinton.

UCG> Inductive arguments provide the facts supporting deductive arguments. A

UCG> deductive argument starts with a general assumption (major premise),
 UCG> applies an instance or principle (minor premise), and draws a
 UCG> conclusion. If the premises of a deductive argument are true, then the
 UCG> conclusion must be true and logically correct. Proving the premises
 UCG> true and logically correct is the hard part. I will give examples of
 UCG> deductive logic when I cover syllogisms.

UCG> Two ways exist to format an argument for clear presentation and testing.
 UCG> The first is by stating the conclusion, then the reasons for the
 UCG> conclusion. These reasons are best worded as “because statements. They
 UCG> are the reasons why the reader should accept the conclusion. Then
 UCG> follows all the necessary evidence that supports each reason. The
 UCG> advantage of this approach is that each part of the argument is clearly
 UCG> delineated. Refer to the Main Argument section for an example of this
 UCG> format.

UCG> A second way to format an argument is through a syllogism. All
 UCG> legitimate arguments can be translated into one of three types of
 UCG> syllogisms: categorical (all or nothing), disjunctive (either/or), and
 UCG> hypothetical (if...then). A categorical syllogism contains a major and
 UCG> minor premise. The major premise contains a major term and a middle
 UCG> term, the minor premise a minor term and middle term, and the conclusion
 UCG> the major term and minor term (no middle term). Refer to Table 9 below
 UCG> for an example of a categorical syllogism.

UCG> Table 9. Categorical Syllogism

Categorical Syllogism	Formula	Premises	Terms
All humans are mortal.	All A is B.	This is the major premise.	The major term is <i>mortal</i> . The middle term is <i>humans</i> .
I am human.	C is (an instance of) A.	This is the minor premise.	The minor term is <i>I</i> . The middle term is <i>human</i> .
Therefore, I am mortal.	C is B.	This is the conclusion.	The minor term is <i>I</i> . The major term is <i>mortal</i> . The middle term <i>human</i> is missing.

UCG> If I can provide any instance of a man who isn't mortal, or prove that I
 UCG> am not human, then the conclusion is false. Since I don't believe there
 UCG> is any such proof, I will conclude at this time that the conclusion is
 UCG> logically sound. Disproving the premises doesn't mean that the
 UCG> conclusion is necessarily false, just that I can't draw that conclusion
 UCG> from those premises.

UCG> A disjunctive syllogism starts with a major premise declaring that one
 UCG> of two options is true or not true. This syllogism uses the either/or
 UCG> format. If I can prove that option A or B is true, then the opposite
 UCG> must be false. The trick with this syllogism is proving that no other
 UCG> options exist; otherwise the whole argument is wrong. Refer to Table 10
 UCG> below for an example of a disjunctive syllogism.

UCG> Table 10. Disjunctive Syllogism

Disjunctive Syllogism	Formula	Premises	Terms
Either God allows Christians to kill in self-defense or He does not allow them to kill in self-defense.	Either A or B.	This is the major premise.	The major term is A. The minor term is B.
God allowing Christians to kill in self-defense is true.	A is true.	This is the minor premise.	The major term A is true.

Then God not allowing Christians to kill in self-defense is not true.	B is not true.	This is the conclusion.	The minor term B must be false.
---	----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------

UCG> A hypothetical syllogism uses the if...then format. It starts with an assumption in the major premise, provides evidence for the assumption through the minor premise, and draws a logical conclusion. If the two premises are true and logically connected, then the conclusion must be true. The trick is to prove that the if...then clause is logically connected and that the instance is verifiable. Refer to Table 11 below for an example of a hypothetical syllogism.

UCG> Table 11. Hypothetical Syllogism

Hypothetical Syllogism	Formula	Premises	Terms
If the president committed unconstitutional acts, then he should be declared guilty.	If A, then B.	This is the major premise.	A is the major term; B is the minor term.
The acts contained in the 3 articles of impeachment are unconstitutional.	A is true.	This is the minor premise.	The major term A is true.
Therefore, the president should be declared guilty.	Then B.	This is the conclusion.	Then the minor term B logically follows.

UCG> Finally, arguments with faulty reasoning are called fallacies, and each fallacy has a technical name. I will be naming fallacies when I refute arguments. Refer to Table 12 below for the fallacies used in this paper.

UCG> Table 12. Fallacies

Fallacy	Definition
Faulty generalization	The major or minor premise is not complete or accurate because of inaccurate facts, an insufficient number of relevant facts, contradictory facts, or inaccurate or incomplete definitions.
Either/or	Assumes that only two options exist when more than two options can be proven to exist. Example: Give me liberty or give me death. Compromise is another option. <i>That depends on with whom you compromise and what the compromise is. We do not have the option to compromise with sin or evil, and we had better be very careful when we compromise with evil people, because we may end up accepting and allowing evil to flourish and grow (Lot and the Sodomites, for example.)</i> <i>If the Americans had compromised with the British ("liberty or death" is Patrick Henry's quote) we would not have won independence from them or secured our rights and liberty.</i>
Faulty comparison	A faulty generalization also applies to a faulty comparison. Assumes that two things are alike in all important ways because they are alike in a few ways. An example would be saying that an apple and a grapefruit are the same fruit because they're both round.
Jumping to conclusions	Drawing a conclusion with little or no evidence.
Loaded words	Presenting emotionally charged words to arouse anger, fear, or other emotions, with no supporting argument.
Strawman	Trying to divert attention from the real issue by focusing on an irrelevant issue.

UCG> This subsection provides the reader help in applying the rules of
UCG> practical logic to the issue of a Christian killing in self- defense.
UCG> For each argument, I have provided five pieces of information: the
UCG> argument as stated, the argument translated into a syllogism, the
UCG> fallacy, why the argument is false, and what would have to be proved to
UCG> make the argument true. Under Arguments as Stated, I quote arguments
UCG> from some who believe in killing in self-defense. I reference the
UCG> complete detailed refutation in the Main Argument section.

UCG> Argument 1

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> The sixth commandment [you shall not kill] is referring to murder. Very
UCG> many of the translations use the word “murder for the word “kill, and it
UCG> was clearly understood by all that the presence of the word “kill here
UCG> was invested with the meaning of murder. So the premise must be that,
UCG> if lethal self-defense is a sin,

What if it's an unintended consequence? You ment to use force, but not to kill them, but they die? Are you still a murderer?

UCG> then that sin must be murder. To
UCG> determine if self- defense is indeed murder, we must first define what
UCG> constitutes murder. Murder involves premeditation (Num. 35:20).

Capitol punishment and war are both premeditated.

Self defense can be premeditated (Mt 24:43 **But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up**). He would have been waiting for the sucker, ie, it was premeditated, and Jesus commends him!

UCG> Self-
UCG> defense is not a premeditated action. Murder also involves secret
UCG> actions (Deuteronomy 27:24). A man engaged in self- defense has no
UCG> interest in hiding anything.

Unless self-defense is illegal, or the weapon used is illegal, as in increasingly many places.

UCG> His only interest is survival. Above all,
UCG> murder is a function of the state of the heart -- it involves hate
UCG> (Numbers 35:20, Matt 15:19, I John 3:15, Matt 5:21-22).

What about the goring ox? It is treated the same as murder. There is no hatred, only irresponsibility.

UCG> Lethal
UCG> self-defense is not done out of any deep-rooted hatred, nor any desire
UCG> for vengeance. It is done only out of fear and self-preservation.

UCG> Always, the determination of murder is in the intent of the heart. We
UCG> know that it is the heart that God looks on; it is no different with the
UCG> application of self-defense. It is the heart that is the determining
UCG> factor.

Not always. Goring ox example.

UCG> Deuteronomy 19:4-5 The negligent man who killed with no hate in
UCG> his heart is not imputed with blood upon his hands. He is not a
UCG> murderer, because his heart was not corrupted. Murder is something that

UCG> comes forth out of the heart (Matt 15:19). I know of no one who would
UCG> argue that self-defense is a product of a hateful disposition.

UCG> The only of the 10 commandments that could apply to such an action (as
UCG> killing in self-defense) would be “Thou shalt not kill. If lethal
UCG> self-defense is sin, then that sin must be murder. Which of the other
UCG> commandments would self-defense break. Of course it breaks none of
UCG> them.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> This argument has two parts. The first is a hypothetical and the second a
UCG> disjunctive syllogism.

UCG> Refer below for the hypothetical syllogism.

UCG> If killing in self-defense is not premeditated

If you know ahead of time it is. Two verses in proverbs commend us for preparing ahead of time (forseeth evil), so this could not be correct. Therefore, “premeditated” is not relevant to murder.

UCG> , conspiratorial,

If someone helps you, it is. A two-fold cord is not quickly broken. Again, we are commended for working with others. Why should this not also apply to self defense? Therefore, “conspiratorial” is also not relevant to murder.

UCG> and

UCG> motivated by hate,

You can hate someone and still kill them in self defense, although your case might be harder to prove. Such as, the battered wife who hates her husband.

UCG> then it is not murder. (If A, then B.)

UCG> Killing in self-defense is not premeditated, conspiratorial, and
UCG> motivated by hate. (A is true.)

UCG> Therefore, killing in self-defense is not murder. (Then B is true.)

UCG> Refer below for the disjunctive syllogism.

UCG> Either killing in self-defense is not a sin or it is murder. (Either A
UCG> or B)

Then again, if you break one commandment, you are guilty of breaking all of them.

UCG> Killing in self-defense is not murder. (B is not true)

UCG> Therefore, killing in self-defense is not a sin. (A is true)

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> The hypothetical syllogism has a faulty generalization.

UCG> The disjunctive syllogism has an either/or fallacy.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> In the hypothetical syllogism, the definition for murder is not

UCG> Biblically accurate.

True, but you are the one who presented the faulty definition in the first place. God's definition of murder is more simple: killing except in those cases where God allows it, or in certain accidents, or where you are responsible for the killing.

UCG> Refer to Argument # 1 in the Main Argument section

UCG> for more detail on what constitutes murder from God's point of view.

UCG> In the disjunctive syllogism, another option exists. Killing in

UCG> self-defense breaks at least the first commandment because it violates

UCG> Jesus' command to love our enemies and to fulfill Jesus' commission to

UCG> obey the gospel now.

We preach the gospel; how do we obey it other than by accepting Christ, which is the obvious meaning of obeying the gospel in I Peter 4: 17? What we must obey is scripture, and all things whatsoever Jesus commanded us, including to carry a sword.

Also, as long as we use God's definition of love, which includes an equal dose of love for the innocent, and justice for the wicked, we can love our enemies and kill them at the same time, under the right circumstances.

UCG> Anytime a Christian violates Jesus' commands,

First, you fail to prove that self-defense violates God's word, which is what you assume when you state self-defense violates the 1st Commandment. Second, using your logic, I can suggest that your brand of pacifism violates the First Commandment, since it puts your ideas above God's word, which approves of self-defense.

UCG> he

UCG> puts another God before the true God (Romans 6:16). Refer to the Main

UCG> Argument section under Argument #1 for more detail on Jesus' command to

UCG> love your enemies and under Argument #2 for more detail on Jesus'

UCG> commission to Christians today.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to disprove my argument on God's definition of murder.

We agree on the definition of murder for the most part, except for the exceptions God has made for killing: defense, capital punishment, war.

UCG> Would

UCG> have to prove that killing in self-defense does not violate Jesus'

UCG> command to love your enemies, especially how point blank shooting

UCG> another human being expresses love toward enemies,

Clearly self-defense expresses love towards those we are protecting, which is one of the things we are commanded to do in scripture. At least in the instance of protecting and rescuing others, self defense obeys scripture. I don't think anyone would argue that point. The question with which we are grappling is, is self defense loving towards the evil aggressors, who we are also commanded to love, in addition to the ones we are protecting. The answer is yes.

UCG> or how those who

UCG> threaten our lives are not enemies,

This assumes we kill them because they are our enemies, which is false. We do not kill our enemies, we kill those who are an immediate and unavoidable threat, while committing evil.

Moslems and others kill people simply because they are their enemies.

UCG> or how Christians can fulfill the

UCG> gospel message while killing someone. In addition, verify that God

UCG> authorizes such killing.

Love does not always do what seems best for an individual; these are things that Christians are supposed to do. Most of them are to work repentance by chastisement, at least 1 is where the wicked are suddenly cut off, and the decision of if, how, and when this happens is left up to the Christians involved.

All these add up to one thing: we have a duty to stop sin.

2 Thes 3:14 a brother is to be punished, to make him ashamed

Corinthians 4 or 5 ?? a brother is to be turned over to Satan so his flesh can be destroyed, to save his soul

Matt 18:17 if a brother trespasses against you, first you, then 2 or 3, then the church, if he won't hear, treat him as a heathen and a publican (to turn him from his ways)

the two witnesses of Rev: they call down fire to destroy anyone who tries to harm them. These people destroy those they are commanded to love, and they do so at God's command, and using God's power. If loving people ment never doing them harm, or if it ment you could never be the one to cut them off from life so they no longer have a chance to be saved, these 2 witnesses could not do this. This example is further evidence that it is possible to love someone and destroy them at the same time, sealing their fate for eternal damnation, which is definitely not doing them any good.

Even these witnesses do not use deadly force as anything but a last resort, having plagues to call upon those who do not obey God, to give them a chance to repent.

I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he turn and live.

God loves the wicked, but still kills them when necessary (the instance of God doing this does not prove that we can do it, without more supporting arguments, but it does show the falseness of the argument using Jesus' greatest commandment). Love is not irreconcilable to killing.

Mercy:

does not mean allow wickedness. Mercy is to make a way for the wicked to be cleansed, and to give him a chance to accept it, even though he does not deserve it.

Love:

is to want what is best for a person--but love will not necessarily (depending on the circumstances, a parent will force a child, a person may force their loved one) force what is best on a person.

Righteousness:

is to hold someone to God's standards.

Justice:

is to ensure the penalty of unrighteousness.

Self defense is a gift from God. It reveals his love for us, in that he has given us the means to preserve our lives. It also reveals his hatred of evil, in that he has empowered us to destroy evil under certain conditions. Self defense also reveals the nature of the conflict between good and evil (and the nature of evil, that it will not stop until it has destroyed the good), in that they are irreconcilable, and mortal (only 1 will leave the fight alive) enemies. Self defense also offers a picture of the future of the wicked: if they do not repent, they will be destroyed.

Self defense also helps us to do God's work, in that we can share God's gift (life, self defense) with others, the helpless, the needy, the oppressed, and those who are about to be unjustly destroyed.

The question we are debating is: is it possible to love the wicked (which God commands us to do), while at the same time destroying

them (which he has made provision for, and which we are sometimes required to do to carry out his various commands).

Can we reconcile love with destruction? How can destruction be loving?

It has to do with evil. There can be no love in destruction of the righteous. However, when it comes to evil (the wicked, and sin), it must be reformed or destroyed, or it will corrupt or destroy the good. That's what evil is: destruction of good.

The only loving thing to do is to reform it (which benefits the reformed one) or eliminate it (which does not).

It would not be loving to let Satan into heaven. He would destroy it and corrupt everyone. He probably had his chance (or warning like Cain had) to repent, but he refused, and he crossed the line of destruction (no return) and now his fate is sealed, just like those who die in their sins.

That's one of the key aspects of death: it is the point of no more chances to repent.

It is not just destruction, it is destruction of the wicked who have crossed the point of no return. This is the only loving option in the long run.

Further examining loving and killing in the same instant.

It is not loving to let someone do evil (not to mention to the receiver of the evil). They must be stopped.

It is not unloving to harm someone to stop them from doing evil.

It is not unloving to destroy the wicked (benefits others, not them):

--it stops them from further evil

--it doesn't do them any good

--we have no hatred towards them and do not wish them to go to hell

--we do only as much damage as is necessary to stop them

--they have refused the opportunity to turn from their evil deed

--love does not always work in our best interest. We may have to give up our desires, hopes, dreams, comfort, security, safety. Nor does it always work in the best interest of the wicked. They may forfeit their lives.

Jesus lost his life because of his love for the wicked. Perhaps sometimes, because of love, the wicked die for the righteous.

--In the OT there were commanded to love their neighbors, just like we are (Le 19:18,34, De 10:19). They were not under a different standard than we are now when it comes to being required to love. Similarly, we are not under a different standard than they were then regarding self defense. Self defense was no more contradictory to their commandment to love than it is now for us in the commandment we have received to love.

--we do whatever is necessary to stop them. They have chosen their own fate--they know the consequences. Having smelled the sulfur, seen the flames, heard the screams, they nevertheless have opened the gates of hell and stepped in. God himself has decreed, "let no man stay him."

--we accept one of the perogatives God has given us: to destroy the wicked in defense

--"God is love," according to the scripture, he destroys the wicked, therefore, love and destruction of the wicked cannot be contradictory. Luke 18:27 God destroys his enemies even though he loves them

--you can't do them good while they are trying to harm you; allowing them to harm you or others later on does them no good

--love your enemies (Luke 6:27,35, Mt 5:44) must be balanced with love the brethren--you are not loving them if you allow them to be destroyed.

--there is a point, beyond which love destroys evil, and it is not in the best interest of the wicked (any more than it is in the best interest of the devil (then again, God doesn't love him, and doesn't command us to love him either, but the same goes for the unbelievers, who we are to love) to cast him into the lake of fire, or all the unbelievers, but it is just and righteous. We love them, but we no longer allow them to remain unhindered.

The only way I can comprehend this is by faith. I know that God is love, and he does nothing that is unloving, unrighteous, or unjust. He has commanded me at the same time to love my enemies, but, on occasion, to destroy them (they will be "suddenly cut off").

I can easily see that destruction of evil and the wicked is love...of the righteous and the innocent. I don't quite see that it benefits the individual, except that, once a person crosses a certain line, their chance for repentance is gone, and their only remaining future is destruction. God is loving, just, and righteous at the same time every time. He doesn't do one thing that is just and righteous, but not loving, and another thing that is loving and righteous, but not just, any more than he would command us to do something that would be anything but loving, just, and righteous at the same time. [Note, he did give us permission to do something that he told us not to do that is unloving: divorce. Just so you don't become so high and mighty in your postulations.]

In the case of eternal damnation, this point is at death.

In the case of defense, this point is when they pose a threat that cannot be avoided. We still love and pity them, and if we can avoid killing or harming them, we do, but they have made the choice and crossed the line to destruction, and in obedience to God's commands to put away evil, and to provide for our families, and to break every yoke, and to defend innocent blood, and to rescue those who are drawn unto death, we exercise the prerogative God has given us, and destroy them.

The only real sticking point is that I must love my enemies, but there may be occasions when also I must destroy them. That is a problem only so long as I focus on the one single person, and use a human definition of love.

It is no longer a problem once I see the overall picture that includes the victim, the nation, God's judgment for sin, God's judgment on those who stand by and allow sin, all the wicked, all the righteous in general, how God deals with the wicked, etc.

Furthermore, it is no longer a problem once I see love from God's perspective, and understand that his definition of love includes destruction of the wicked and the unrepentant.

This sticking point is no more difficult that it would be if my mother or father or wife or children were to go to hell. It's hard to see love in that, but God is love, and in his perfect love he has decreed this to be correct, and so I accept it by faith. I trust in his infinite love and wisdom.

God allows the wicked to continue only for so long, and then they are cut off. The point at which he allows us to do this is when they are an imminent threat. Death for them is the consequence for their evil, and it is their sudden cutting off.

Killing in this way seems to be a judgment for sin. Maybe not.

...

--the wages of sin is death...
committing evil will bring harm or death.

(Not on the agenda, but all this brings up an interesting point: is it proper to kill someone in defense if they are not engaged in evil; such as, their threat to you is unintentional, or if they don't know they are a threat, and the only way you can stop the threat is by killing them.

Such as, someone driving a car is about to crash into you, and the only way you can stop them is by killing them.

Unborn babies that pose a "threat" to the mother's life.

An airliner full of innocent people, and a couple terrorists who are fixing to crash into a building full of people. Here's a tricky one, especially when you tie it in with the others. Is it OK because the government is going to do it? Why would it not be wrong in this case, when lots of lives are involved, but it's not OK in the lifeboat game? What's the difference? What if the passengers were all tied up and had not chance at all to resist, and the plane was going to kill lots of people?

The above examples border on the lifeboat game. You don't have the right to kill someone just to save your own hide, when they aren't

doing anything wrong. You have to all work together to survive. If you don't, that's too bad.

How about if someone has the only food around, and the only way you can take it from them is by deadly force.

The above example would seem to lead to murder and anarchy: you could do whatever to stay alive, and commit every sin in the book. This example seems to reinforce the idea that killing must involve evil, or it is wrong.

What about if someone is ignorantly participating in evil, such as participating in gun confiscation or food confiscation or in sending people to internment camps.

...

Love does not equal mushy feelings or allowing people to do whatever they want. Loving people is viewing them from God's perspective and doing what is best for them from God's perspective, as opposed to doing what in in our self-interest.

Parents with an unBiblical view of love may let their children do whatever, in the long run they are destroying them. God and loving parents chasten those they love, which for the moment is painful, but in the end brings peaceable fruits of righteousness.

UCG> Argument 2

UCG> Argument as Stated

Has God's character changed.

Have God's commands changed.

UCG> For some reason people might often feel it was all right to defend one's
UCG> self in the time of the Old Testament (it is unreasonable... to read of
UCG> David and conclude that here was a man who took no physical action in
UCG> the event of a threat to his life), and yet that somehow the death of
UCG> Christ changed that. Some feel that, although it was perfectly
UCG> acceptable for a man to take an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth
UCG> in earlier times, we are now to look to God for our deliverance and our
UCG> vengeance. David lived under (the law that says to love your neighbor
UCG> and bear no grudge - Lev. 19:18, Deut 32:35) every time that a foreign
UCG> power invaded the realm of this people. And David rarely exhibited any
UCG> reluctance in defending those who were under his care.

UCG> I believe Gen 14:12-16 also provides us with a clear directive in the
UCG> case of self-defense. Lot is taken here by the various kings that
UCG> attack Sodom, and Abraham -- a man under the same requirements as we for
UCG> eternal life -- goes to war in order to retrieve him. I don't know how
UCG> anyone could characterize this as being anything other than
UCG> self-defense. Of course, there are those who might argue that Abraham
UCG> simply sinned in this affair, but it is apparent that he didn't, for
UCG> Christ assuredly would never have accepted Abraham's offering of the
UCG> spoils had this been the case (verse 20). In Exodus 2:17 we find Moses
UCG> stood up to help the daughters of Jethro against the shepherds that
UCG> habitually drove these women away from watering their flocks. Was Moses
UCG> declared to be a sinner? Of course not. What he did was a good and
UCG> noble thing. I don't know how one could characterize this as anything
UCG> other than self-defense.

The problem with all these rambling arguments is that he has an intuitive sense of the arguments he wants to make, but he has not spent sufficient time to postulate the underlying principles in an exhaustively thorough and logical sequence. Sometimes he just has it all wrong, but he's instinctively pointing in the right direction.

UCG> In Nehemiah 4:11-14, Nehemiah, while praying to God, does not neglect to
UCG> set the Jews in preparation to fight for their loved ones and their
UCG> homes. This is after the fall of Judah here, so one cannot make the
UCG> argument that this was God's physical government, and hence they were
UCG> given the command by God to do this as his civil government. God's
UCG> government by this time was being looked forward to as the coming
UCG> church, not the Jews. We see the same principle applied in the Book of
UCG> Esther. And then, of course, we have the example of David, a man who
UCG> was a spirit-begotten child of God just as any of us are, a man to whom
UCG> the same standards and commandments apply.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If God allowed the Old Testament saints to kill in self-defense, then
UCG> God allows New Testament saints to kill in self-defense. (If A, then B)
UCG> God allowed Old Testament saints to kill in self-defense. (A is true.)
UCG> Then God allows New Testament saints to kill in self-defense. (Then B
UCG> is true.)

improved syllogism

If self defense was pure, holy, and just in the OT,

and if God has not changed his mind,

then self defense is equally as holy, pure, just, and righteous.

UCG> Fallacy

The fallacy is in what aspect of the example we follow: do we look to the human or to the divine element. If we follow the divine, we are looking to God, who is the author and finisher of our faith.

Examples are a fallacy unless you demonstrate God's specific blessing and help in what you are wanting to follow; then it is not just an example of what a person did, but an example of what God has blessed, and by extension, what he approves of, and what does not contradict his word, and therefore, we can follow it. Furthermore, we corroborate these with God's word and find no contradiction--only harmony.

The examples illustrate and don't deviate from what God clearly said repeatedly, in Genesis 9:6, Exodus, Nehemiah, Judges, what Jesus said about carrying a sword, what the 2 witnesses do, etc--combine these examples and commands with God's explicit help and blessings in these matters, add God's commendations for those specific acts in the NT, and you develop a clear understanding of God's view, which is unchanged. This gives us a continuity of God's character, of the definition of good and evil, and of his commands to us.

The examples I point out illustrate harmonize with the commands of scripture, making for a non-contradictory picture of God's will, and an unchanging picture of God's character. Mr. UCG sees disharmony between commands and examples, between OT and NT, and between what God tells one person and the next person, and so he must invent things like contradictory "commissions" for different people and following the millennium and God's kingdom in type and example, and other devices to explain the contradictions.

...

Instead of comparing different groups of people, compare God to himself at different times.

Of course, even comparing people can be valid, because those people are living under God, who does not change.

You can show that God is unchanged in a matter by finding his character by the way he deals with different people at different times. We come to understand what he loves and what he hates; so we know how to behave.

UCG> Major premise has a faulty comparison.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> EDITORIAL: This argument makes a one-on-one comparison between Old
UCG> Testament saints and New Testament saints in regards to God's standards
UCG> of salvation.

Salvation has always been the same, since Adam and until the last day salvation has been by faith in God through Jesus Christ. Self defense nor OT examples of self defense have any bearing on salvation. It is a matter of how should we live and function on planet earth.

UCG> It ignores differences between Old Testament saints and
UCG> New Testament saints such as 1) Old Testament saints were not required
UCG> to be baptized

They were baptized under the cloud in Exodus.

UCG> and 2) did not have to accept Jesus Christ by name as
UCG> savior.

They did not know his name, but they had faith in him, and they had available to them dozens of facts about him: where he was going to be born, his conditions, his death, etc.

Those who did not come to God by faith, such as the Saducees and the Pharasees, went to hell, even though they kept the entire law.

UCG> These differences don't affect the issue of self-defense, but do
UCG> prove that God did not make the exact same requirements for salvation.
UCG> The fact is God is inconsistent concerning the standards of salvation
UCG> for Old and New Testament saints.

No, he required different works in some ways, but salvation was the same. The OT welcomes the heathen (except for a few), the NT commands us to go into the highways and hedges and compell them to come in whatever the cost.

UCG> Old and New Testament saints are different in what God commissioned them
UCG> to do. Refer to the Main Argument section under Refutation #1 for
UCG> differences between Old and New Testament saints and under Argument #2
UCG> for Jesus' gospel commission.

His only possible hope of offering a counter to the obvious fact that God allowed self defense in the OT is to prove that God changed his mind between the OT and NT.

Here are some important caveats about examples (monogamy vs polygamy). There were examples of multiple wives in the OT, can we do it in the NT?

A man is to cleave unto his wife, and they 2 shall be one flesh.

Christ and the church: 1 Christ, 1 bride.

The priest is not to marry a divorced woman.

God allowed multiple wives .?

Indirect evidence:

There was strife between Hagar and Sarah.

Rebekah and Leah had separate tents, and so did Jacob.

Scriptural suggestions:

Ex 20, thy neighbor's wife.

many OT and NT references making it obvious that God's intention are for 1 wife, just as it is evident that he intends marriage to be permanent, even though he allows for divorce in some cases.

God blessed them in obtaining multiple wives?

He told David he would have given him as many as he wanted.

A man was supposed to raise up seed unto his brother. I don't recall an exception if he was married. Was Onan married?

(?) There is no positive command to do so, there is no detailed description of how it ... (maybe there is? Use all the same arguments in favor of self defense as against polygamy) as in Gen 9:6.

Should be implemented (as in Exodus), no one in the NT is commended for having multiple wives (as in Heb 11 for self def), and Jesus did not tell them to marry multiple wives (carry a sword), and God's creation was 1 man and 1 woman.

UCG> NOTE: I didn't consider the example concerning Moses because Moses
UCG> didn't kill anyone; nothing can be proven pro or con about killing in
UCG> self-defense from that example.

Agreed, particularly since God does not speak either favorably or unfavorably about this example, so we both agree to leave it alone. However, there are many other examples where acts of self defense are highly commended, or even personally blessed by God, and these shed abundant light on God's view of it.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to prove that Jesus Christ authorized New Testament
UCG> Christians to kill their enemies just as He directed Old Testament
UCG> saints and that this authorization is consistent with Jesus' gospel
UCG> commission to His disciples.

This is based on the assumption that it is inconsistent.

God's character has not changed, JC kills in OT, and on white horse in NT.

UCG> Argument 3

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> Jesus chased the moneychangers out of the temple with whips. Therefore,
UCG> it's all right for Christians to kill people in self- defense.

Jesus using the whip is the use of violence and destruction. It produced fear in those there, damaged their property: probably their tables were damaged, their money may have been lost, the animals and birds may have escaped. It was not peaceful, non-resistant of evil, etc. It was not sticky kindness, all of which are (false) attributes occasionally attributed to Christ to prove that he disapproved of self defense.

He was violent in defending the temple. Perhaps he would also condone violence in defense of the temple that is the human body. There are, after all, many examples of where we are called the temple of the Holy Ghost, and since evil men were using God's temple in a way that was contrary to God's design and intention and commands, Jesus used violence and force to stop them from their activity, and forcibly remove them, and scare them enough so they would not do it again when he was around.

He used violence.

He threatened the use of physical harm, if he did not actually use it. I think it is safe to assume that if he drove them out with a whip, it was because he actually whipped them. How do you “drive” someone out by only menacing them? “Drive” implies force.

He physically resisted evil, using the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish the task--which is precisely the principle we use.

What he did was not in defense of anyone.

He used an offensive weapon.

Jesus' action is not enough by itself to validate self defense, nevertheless, it lends support to the argument.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If a person chases someone with a whip, that person would kill them in

UCG> self-defense. (If A, then B.)

UCG> Jesus chased the moneychangers with a whip. (A is true.)

UCG> Jesus would kill in self-defense. (B is true.)

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Jumping to conclusions.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> Jesus' chasing the moneychangers with a whip does not mean that He

UCG> killed them. No scripture in the Bible says that Jesus killed anyone

UCG> when he was a human being. This argument could be given to support using

UCG> some sort of physical force. Refer to Refutation #7 in the Main

UCG> Argument section.

Jesus used a weapon, violence, and force to defend God's temple.

We are to follow Jesus' example.

As a follower of Jesus' example, we can also use weapons, violence, and force to defend God's temple (our bodies).

(Jesus defended God's temple with violence, therefore we can defend God's temple with violence.)

Jesus used a weapon in an offensive manner.

We are to follow Jesus' example.

Therefore we may use a weapon in an offensive manner.

A discussion regarding the extent, timing, etc. of the weapons, violence, and force is in order, but not the basic conclusions.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to prove that Jesus killed or intended to kill the moneychangers.

It seems inconsistent to approve of weapons, violence, and force, but then to oppose deadly force. Weapons are made to kill (not whips, but swords are).

“would have to prove...” Whereas, if you used it as evidence to support the use of weapons and violence against evil, not just for defensive purposes, you could make the case, which would be part of a larger case which would include deadly force as part of the acceptable parameters for weapons, violence, and force.

UCG> Argument 4

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> God provided for killing in self-defense in the Old Testament law. See
UCG> Ex. 22:2. To argue that such an act of self-defense is contrary to the
UCG> laws of God is to argue that God Himself is not consistent.

However, when we look at being armed and being Christlike, we see no contradiction, any more than God being both loving and just at the same time is contradictory.

“God Himself is not consistent”

It would be more precise to say he changed his mind, which is not OK, or he changed the rules, which may be OK, depending on what exactly changed.

There may be a problem if something God calls unrighteous in one instance, is good in another. That is situation ethics, where nothing is really righteous or evil, just more convenient at times. God would be calling good evil, and evil good, which is a complete violation of God's character. He never changes. *Isa 5:20 Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!*

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If an Old Testament law allows killing in self-defense, then New
UCG> Testament Christians can kill in self-defense. (If A, then B.)

UCG> A law allowing killing in self-defense is in the Old Testament law. (A
UCG> is true.)

UCG> Then Christians can kill in self-defense. (Then B.)

The following is a little more carefully focused:

If God allows killing for self-defense in the OT,
and if he has not changed his mind,
then he also allows killing in the NT.

or, how about:

If killing in self-defense is righteous in the OT,
and if God has not changed his mind on the definition of righteousness,
Then killing in self-defense is still righteous.

Jesus supernaturally escaped situations where others would have had to defend themselves, or be killed; but because his purpose was to die for the sins of the world, and he had a scheduled method and a scheduled time, and nothing was going to interfere with that schedule.

We have no such unalterable scheduling. We can die before our time in a way that is not according to God's will. *Ec 7:17 Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish: why shouldest thou die before thy time?* (MAKE A BIG ISSUE OF THIS). the innocent are destroyed by the wicked, the wicked destroy God's people

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Faulty generalization.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> The major premise assumes that all laws in the Old Testament are

It is not just based on the OT, but on many things, including God's character. Self defense predates the law (Gen 9:6), and antedates the law. Self defense is an unbroken thread that runs from the beginning to the end.

UCG> applicable to New Testament Christians. The fact is God is inconsistent
UCG> in what he gave in the Old Testament law for physical Israel and what he
UCG> expects of Christians, and Jesus sometimes explained why. For examples,
UCG> refer to Table 1 in the Main Argument section for Old Testament laws
UCG> Jesus changed. Refer to Main Argument section under Argument #1 for a
UCG> discussion about why Jesus changed Exodus 22:2.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to prove that all Old Covenant laws, especially Exodus 22:2,
UCG> apply to New Covenant Christians, and that Jesus did not change these
UCG> laws.

Have to show that the principle carries through (or that it is part of an unbroken line from the beginning to the end)

Have to show that self-defense is part of his righteousness or character; and he has not changed himself.

--evidence that it has

--it has not been rescinded

--it was well established

--it was based on principles and commands still in effect

--it has not changed

--it is reinforced in the NT

UCG> Argument 5

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> There is a huge difference between a man who wants to slap you on the
UCG> cheek and a man who wants to rip your head off. We must not lose the
UCG> balance of perception here. What have I lost if a man slaps me on the
UCG> cheek a couple of times? Nothing. What have I lost if he rips my head
UCG> off? Considerably more. There is a difference that should be
UCG> recognized here.

Mr. UCG fails to present the logic of the argument: that there is a difference between an insult, which will only hurt your pride, and a deadly attack, which may leave you mangled or dead, and our response must be gauged by the attack. If 20 people attack you, that requires a different strategy than if 1 person attacks you.

My position would be to say that you meet each threat on the level it presents itself with sufficient force or intelligence to overcome it. If someone insults you, that takes nothing but a little humility to overcome. If someone attacks you, you do what is necessary.

As sheep to the slaughter...

Ro 8:36 reference to Ps 44

Ps 44:22 -5 -7 & 9-11

Isa 53:7 this is answered in why he did not fight when Peter struck off the ear and Jesus corrected him

Jer 51:40, 33-40 God is going to slaughter them in judgment

Acts 8:32 reference to Isa 53

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> I don't need to supply a syllogism for these assertions because they are
UCG> not worth arguing about. Everyone already agrees with it. In persuasion
UCG> this is called emotional appeal, not logical appeal. It focuses on
UCG> benefits and harms rather than facts.

Since he does not present the argument properly, he cannot argue against it, but focuses on extraneous matters, such as choice of loaded words.

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Loaded words. Loaded words such as "rip my head off create emotion
UCG> apart from any argument. May be persuasive for those who already believe
UCG> in killing in self-defense.

UCG> Strawman.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> This argument is not a matter of right or wrong, or true or false. Most
UCG> people would agree that being killed is more hurtful than being slapped.
UCG> As I will explain in my own argument, this can be a personal factor that
UCG> an individual has to consider when making a decision; I will consider
UCG> personal factors myself. But personal factors don't necessarily
UCG> contribute to logic.

The argument is that Jesus was not addressing violent attacks, only an insult or minor tiff, It was pride vs humility, not life vs death. You don't provide for your family's pride, but for their needs, all of which revolve around providing life.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Nothing needed to prove the point. The argument focuses on an issue that
UCG> doesn't need proof.

This "rebuttal" is not a rebuttal at all: it ignores the main points and focuses on an easily beaten minor point related to word choice, and then implies that every point defending self defense is easily shot down along with the easily beaten argument.

He has constructed an argument representing our view that is ridiculous and easily shot down, then he sweeps all our arguments together with the dumb argument, and then easily dismisses all the points.

UCG> Argument 6

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> Nor must we forget that those who do not provide for their own
UCG> households are worse than infidels (I Tim. 5:8). We are to love our
UCG> wives, and give our lives for them (Eph. 5:25). Protecting one's
UCG> household from criminal attack is part of providing for it. And are we
UCG> to think that one giving his life for his wife applies to everything
UCG> else except truly giving it, in a act of self- defense?

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> Either you kill in self-defense to protect your family or you're worse than

UCG> an infidel. (Either A or B.)

UCG> You do not kill in self-defense. (A is not true.)

UCG> Then you are worse than an infidel. (B is true.)

Either you protect your family using all means God has made available, or you are worse than an infidel.

You do not protect your family when it is within your means to do so.

Then you are worse than an infidel.

Mr. UCG does not disagree with the above statement. The point of contention is whether or not deadly force is one of the means God has made available.

There are often instances where you or your family are threatened, and the use of or threat of deadly force is the only means that will successfully defend. By not using this means, you are turning your family over to the wicked for the destruction of the flesh; you are failing to fulfill your God-given duty to provide for your family, and you are, therefore, worse than an infidel (and stupider, because an infidel at least has enough common sense to protect his family).

Standing by while the innocent are destroyed is murder.

Allowing your family to be killed is not providing for them.

You kill your wife (as David killed Bathsheba's husband), or the murderer by your action or inaction. Make up mind who you will kill, because the choice is literally in your hands. You make your choice whether you want to or not. Your family is depending on you to make the right choice. The murderer would like you to believe the arguments presented by Mr. UCG.

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Either/Or.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> Some ideas in this argument are Biblically valid: Christian husbands
UCG> should protect their families and give their lives for them. On the
UCG> other hand, this is the same false argument that Joe Tkach Sr. used to
UCG> try to get rid of the Sabbath. Mr. Tkach said a man should work on the
UCG> Sabbath because his first priority is to provide for his family.

This clearly violates scripture: it sets up a false contradiction, trying to present a contradiction and then resolve it by nullifying one portion of scripture. As a rule of thumb, anyone who uses this strategy of argument is trying to do something or advocate something that is clearly contrary to scripture, but they need some sort of justification. What these people should do, since they don't care what God thinks, is to stop their pretences, throw away their Bibles, and do whatever the heck they want, and quit looking for someone else (God, for example) to blame it on.

UCG> This argument assumes only two options: either you kill to protect your
UCG> family or you're an infidel.

The choices Mr. UCG allows you:

Either you allow them (your family) to be killed, or you are a murderer (of the criminal).

It would be more accurate to say: either you kill your family (by omission) or you kill the criminal (by commission).

Ask yourself: Do you kill the innocent, righteous, and helpless, or do you kill the wicked?

UCG> The argument assumes that no occasion
UCG> exists when God expects a Christian to put his family second. The fact

UCG> is that Jesus tells Christians that they must be willing to forsake all,
UCG> including family, to follow him (Luke 14:26-27).

There is no disagreement that our family, and our own life and safety come second to Christ. The question is, does God consider it our duty to him, and part of our service to him to allow ourselves and others to be murdered. There may be times when the answer is yes. But, Mr. UCG would have us to believe that it is every time.

(This is addressing instances where you have exhausted all other options and have only 2 choices left. It is ridiculous to suggest that pro-gun people would resolve a threatening situation any other way.)

Exactly when is the time to live, and when is the time to die, I can't say. What I'm attempting to do is show that it is pleasing to God when we defend those who are about to be murdered, and when we put away the wicked.

UCG> Luke 14:26-27 is saying that I must be willing to put my family second
UCG> before I do such things as break the Sabbath, worship idols, or deny
UCG> God's name. The real issue is this: does God want me to kill others to
UCG> protect my family? I am not saying Luke 14:26-27 proves by itself that
UCG> Christians shouldn't kill in self-defense, but until the real issue is
UCG> proved conclusively, the argument as stated is invalid.

Luke is saying you must put God's word above everything else--including family, self, and your pet beliefs about things, including pacifism. It is rather silly to use this scripture to support pacifism, since the Bible clearly tells us to defend our family: we would be disobeying this verse if we did not protect them.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

First, state the argument correctly.

UCG> Prove that a Christian killing in self-defense is right to start with,
UCG> especially that killing to protect one's family does not violate God's
UCG> command to love your enemies or to obey Jesus' gospel commission.

Done, elsewhere.

UCG> Argument 7

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> Jesus told his disciples to carry swords with them (Luke 22:38).
UCG> Therefore, killing others in self-defense is right.

Stated better:

Jesus told us to carry an offensive, deadly weapon. He probably wouldn't mind if we used it, with discretion.

Swords are weapons used for killing; would he tell them to carry it without using it, and if he did, would it be a sin (if self defense is wrong, ie, sinful, it seems it would be sinning to obey this command, but then you would also be sinning if you disobeyed)?

Would he tell them to carry an idol but never pray to it?

Would he tell them to carry the price of a whore, but never
spend it on a whore?

Would he tell them to carry pornography, but never look at it?

If he told them to carry a sword, he could not consider weapons evil, or what they are used for to be always and inherently evil, as is idolatry, lust, etc.

If at least some killing is not wrong, then self defense, based on other scriptures, is probably one of the most justifiable types of killing, and would qualify as acceptable and proper, if not downright required and necessary.

We are to avoid the appearance of evil, avoid what will make our brother stumble, avoid the very garment spotted by sin (anything remotely

related to sin and evil), and have nothing to do with the unfruitful works of darkness.

Jesus would never command his disciples to do evil or have anything remotely to do with evil, therefore, anything Jesus told his disciples to do or to have is not evil.

Jesus told his disciples to carry a sword.

If he went around doing good, then maybe carrying a sword enables one to do good, also.

Furthermore, Jesus told his disciples to teach everyone to do all the things he had commanded them to do, which, of course, includes carrying swords.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If Jesus tells his disciples to carry swords, he intended all His

UCG> disciples to kill others in self-defense. (If A, then B.)

UCG> Jesus told his disciples to carry swords. (A is true.)

UCG> Then all disciples should kill others in self-defense. (Then B.)

If Jesus tells his disciples to carry swords,

then he intended his disciples to carry swords.

He did, we are Jesus' disciples, and we obey him.

Therefore, we should carry swords.

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Jumping to conclusions.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> The major premise assumes that the reason Jesus told the disciples to

UCG> carry swords was to kill their enemies. Nowhere in the Bible does it

UCG> say why Jesus told his disciples to carry the swords. Nowhere does the

UCG> Bible say that the disciples used swords to hurt anyone, except for

UCG> Peter, and Jesus told him to put his sword away (Matthew 26:51-52,

UCG> Compare Revelation 13:10). Some believe Jesus was referring spiritually

UCG> to carrying the Word of God as a sword.

Precisely because they do not wish to accept what he said in plain English. Some people also believe the moon is made of cream cheese. You can categorize all these people together: they ignore plain English because it contradicts what they want to believe.

Furthermore, if the sword Peter was carrying was spiritual, then I suppose he cut off the high priest's servant's ear with words. Quite impressive! Maybe he literally talked his hear off! Then he took his words back, and put them into his scabbard. But I bet they never fell to the ground (Samuel).

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Prove Jesus intended the disciples to use swords to kill others in

UCG> self-defense.

Perhaps he told them this do demonstrate that weapons and killing are OK for all generations to come.

He knew how people would construe and misconstrue what he did and said. He also warned against inappropriate use, and helped Peter to focus on the goals of Christians: not primarily the sword, but the Word (gospel).

UCG> Argument 8

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> If you won't kill others to protect your family, then you aren't much of
UCG> a man.

One of the basic duties God gave to a man is to protect his family. If you do not protect your family, you have not fulfilled one of the basic duties of a man.

No one disagrees with the above statement.

The point of dissention is, is using deadly force an acceptable part of protecting your family.

Once you carefully examine other aspects of self defense, it becomes apparent that it is not a matter of if you will use deadly force or if you will kill, but who will it be: your lived ones, or the wicked attempting to destroy them.

From observation it appears that men are inherently warriors and protectors, and if this is true, it is because God made it a part of their nature, just like he made women maternal and nurturers. If a man does not protect his family, he is going against the natural, sinless instincts God built into people to preserve them.

If you don't do what men naturally do, then maybe you are not a man, or you are not behaving the way a man should behave, and the way God expects them to behave.

As a caveat, arguing that what is inherent and natural and instinctive (for a man to protect his family, for example) is also right, can lead to fallacy, because our fallen nature will naturally lead us into things that are sinful (particularly sensual sins related to sexuality, food, alcohol, self centeredness, etc).

This caveat is precisely why we must look to scripture for guidance. When we find an instinct that is validated by scripture, meaning it is a God-given instinct, we can then seek to fulfill it to the extent allowable in God's eyes. We can be grateful, therefore, that God has given us the instinct of self preservation and preservation of others, "to keep flesh alive," (Genesis 9 ?), which sometimes, unfortunately, includes shedding blood (Gen 9).

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If you won't kill others in self-defense to protect your family, then
UCG> you aren't a man. (If A, then B)

UCG> You won't kill others in self-defense to protect your family. (A is
UCG> true.)

UCG> Then you aren't a man. (Then B is true.)

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Loaded words. This is emotional appeal, not a logical argument. Good
UCG> for persuasion but not for proof.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> The assertion is based on emotion, not fact, and can't be used to prove
UCG> anything. Its only use is to persuade those who already think the same
UCG> way or to inject fear in opponents because nobody wants to be thought of
UCG> as a coward.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Create a real argument with evidence.

It is not an argument, it is an assumption that defending is inherent in a man's nature, and an assumption of a man's inclination and duty, that he is supposed to protect his family.

Most men would take it as an insult to suggest that they exclude the possibility of deadly force in defending their family, because they instinctively know they are supposed to protect their families, using deadly force if necessary.

They would also probably consider it rather silly to not use deadly force, but to be required to call someone else to do it for them.

It is as much a failure of a man to protect his family as it is a failure of a mother to not love or care for her babies. A man not protecting his family, by deadly force if necessary, is like the young woman who was at a party, birthed her baby in the bathroom, dumped the baby in the trash, and then when out and partied some more.

UCG> Argument 9

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> Christ Himself makes reference to this judgment [of stopping a thief
UCG> from breaking into your house] in Matthew 24:43. The thief is not
UCG> allowed to break in by the goodman of the house. I'm not sure how this
UCG> could be accomplished except by some threat or manifestation of physical
UCG> force -- self-defense.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> Whatever Christ says in a parable is literally true for Christians to
UCG> follow. (All A is B.)

UCG> Christ said in Matthew 24:43 parable to stop a thief from breaking into
UCG> your house. (C is A.)

UCG> Christians should kill to prevent thieves from breaking into your house.
UCG> (C is B.)

Christ would not commend us to actions that are evil

Christ commended us to the example of an armed man

being an armed man is action that is not evil

If an armed man is not evil, but blessed, faithful, and wise, we can conclude that everything connected with his is also wise: arms, use of arms (an inherent part of which is deadly force) defense of property and family with deadly force.

Similarities work both ways.

If the kingdom of heaven is like an armed man guarding his home, then also an armed man is like the kingdom of heaven. This armed man is faithful, wise, and blessed (the one who watches).

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Faulty comparison.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> First, no reference is made to killing a thief.

This parable flows from what they understood in Exodus, where killing a thief is approved. Notice in Exodus it doesn't say they slaughtered with hilarious abandonment, because the focus is not on killing, but on stopping the evil, which is accomplished by stopping the evil-doer. If the evil-doer dies, too bad, it is their just desert, and good riddance, but God doesn't want us to be bloodthirsty. Neither does he want us to be pacifists.

UCG> This is assumed. Most
UCG> importantly, the point of Christ's parable has nothing to do with
UCG> thieves and self-defense at all. It's about staying awake spiritually
UCG> to guard our spiritual garments so we're prepared for Christ's coming.
UCG> Interpreting the parable literally to support killing in self-defense
UCG> makes about as much sense as saying that God is a thief (Jesus compares
UCG> Himself to a thief in Matthew 24:43) and concluding that Christians
UCG> should be thieves too. Both conclusions violate the parable's intended
UCG> meaning.

The Bible clearly says thou shalt not steal. On the other hand, it also clearly says we are to defend our family.

v.43 also has a thief, which in this case is clearly a bad thief, and the man stopping him is clearly a good man. There is no equivocation on who is good and who is bad.

If you wanted to be accurate, God's coming is compared to the coming of a thief: no one knows when it will be: and it is this one single aspect that is being compared to God's coming.

The hour is technically what is coming, and when it will come is what will be sneaky, not God (Mr 13:26 And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory. Revelation 1:7 Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen.). In any event, Mr. UCG's attempt fails to negate the idea that Jesus is shedding a good light on a good man armed. Additionally, Jesus is the good man. And, Jesus is heavily armed--he could call 12 legions of angels, in Revelation, he's going to slaughter everyone opposing him, etc.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to prove that Jesus intended a literal meaning in this
UCG> parable and that the literal meaning is for Christians to kill a thief.

It would be foolish to build a case entirely on this one parable. No one is trying to do that. But, taken in context of all the other evidence throughout the entire Bible, this parable adds one more brick to the case that defense is approved and sometimes required by God.

UCG> Argument 10

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> As it invariably does with this topic, I imagine that the confusion
UCG> originates primarily with the words of Jesus in Matthew 5:39, due to a
UCG> misunderstanding of the things that Christ was talking about.

UCG> God tells us here about turning the other cheek, and to resist no
UCG> evil. There are those who even go so far as to take this to mean that
UCG> no resistance whatsoever is to be offered against one who would kill you
UCG> or your family, but if this verse meant that we are to resist absolutely
UCG> no evil, then we must conclude that James was proclaiming disobedience
UCG> to Christ when he instructed us to resist the Devil. Obviously, there
UCG> are forms by which we are supposed to resist evil. The understanding
UCG> comes in the context of this verse.

UCG> A quick look at verse 38 shows us that the subject is vengeance. And
UCG> then a quick look at verse 40 shows that Christ was talking about
UCG> vengeance in the context of a court of law.

No, it doesn't. Court is just one of the examples, the others are physical assault, legal assault, compulsory work, giving, and lending.

He starts in the context of the law: eye for an eye, which they had heard all of their life, then he broadens it to encompass far more than what the law entails.

UCG> Christ is telling the
UCG> people, "Look, you go to the civil authorities, and whatever happens
UCG> there, you accept it. You don't go and take your own vengeance, for
UCG> "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. (Romans 12:19) As
UCG> Romans 12:17-19 says, we are not to recompense evil for evil. We are to
UCG> live peaceably with all men as much as it is possible. We are to be
UCG> this meek and uncontentious type of people that, if it occurs that we
UCG> are taken up before authorities,

UCG> we are to accept that authority as the
UCG> will of God (Romans 13:4-5). We are not to go out and seek retribution
UCG> on our own apart from this God-ordained authority.

Such nonsense. He is telling them, if someone hurts you, don't go to court and demand equal retribution (cheek for cheek), or just take out his cheek at that moment, instead, continue making yourself vulnerable to them.

UCG> This is what Christ is talking about. He's talking about submission to
UCG> civil authority as the will of God as opposed to going and extracting
UCG> our own vengeance in a matter. He is encouraging the rule of law in the
UCG> land, not the rule of self-indulgence. And there is a deeper meaning for
UCG> us as Christians, that we are to submit, no matter what, to this
UCG> authority when we are taken before them. We are not to behave ourselves
UCG> unseemly.

Baloney. These verses have nothing to do with submitting to authority.

UCG> To further bolster this concept, it is interesting to note that every
UCG> one of these things that Christ cites in this passage of Matthew 5 are
UCG> things that happened to him during the course of his crucifixion. He
UCG> was struck on the cheek, his cloak was taken from him, he was compelled
UCG> to walk the distance to Golgatha, bearing a very great burden as he
UCG> went. These verses in Matthew 5 are very much a prelude to his
UCG> crucifixion, and the persecution Christ accepted at the hands of the
UCG> civil authority.

So what? Are you saying Jesus' statements have no bearing on us because they were prophecies of his crucifixion? That is wrong. I have heard just about every controversial verse in the Bible tossed out the window because of some "context" or other, or some "cultural context," etc.

UCG> And from that time forth we see the people of God suffering such
UCG> persecutions, as Christ had warned (Matthew 10:16-18).

UCG> Every example we have in the Bible, the men of God conducted themselves
UCG> according to the teachings Christ lays out here in Matthew 5. Paul, it
UCG> is interesting to note, in Acts 23 -- after being struck on the
UCG> cheek reviles those who struck him. And then he learns that it was at
UCG> the orders of the high priest. Upon learning who it was that he's
UCG> dealing with, Paul immediately reverts to the attitude that Christ
UCG> espoused in the sermon on the mount but not until he knew who he was
UCG> dealing with.

Implying he was not having a Christ-like attitude before? I don't think so.

UCG> Those who were not in authority did not receive the same

UCG> deference that Paul displayed to the authorities.

He was smitten contrary to the law, but, he showed respect to the one in authority.

He did not retract his objection to being smitten contrary to the law, he just apologized for being rude to the high priest.

UCG> Other scriptures that relate to Matthew 5:38-41 are also commonly used
UCG> to support the notion that there should never be any resistance given to
UCG> an attacker. The aforementioned Romans 12:17 is one of them, but the
UCG> very fact that the word 'recompense' is used here means that it is a
UCG> reference to revenge, a repayment of evil for evil. Recompense is a
UCG> word that by its nature involves a deliberated action and self defense
UCG> is not deliberated.

UCG> "...self defense is not deliberated."

Not always, but it certainly can be, and deliberated self defense is no worse than undeliberated, as is demonstrated by the goodman, who, if he had known when the thief was going to come, would have deliberated the defense of his house and stopped the thief, possibly killing the thief in the process.

UCG> Recompensation again is a matter of the heart, a
UCG> matter of bearing a grudge. It is, in fact, about the same subject that
UCG> Christ is referring to in Matthew 5 and that subject is personal
UCG> vengeance. Self-defense is not an avenging one's self; it is survival.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> NOTE: I assume that the only real issue in this extended argument is
UCG> that all principles in Matthew chapter 5 concern only revenge. I also
UCG> assume that Matthew chapter 5 principles apply to all human beings.
UCG> Therefore, the syllogism focuses on the issue of revenge.

UCG> If Matthew 5 applies only to situations involving revenge, then
UCG> Christians cannot apply Matthew 5 to killing in self-defense. (If A,
UCG> then B)

UCG> Matthew 5 applies only to situations involving revenge. (A is true.)
UCG> Then Christians cannot apply Matthew 5 to killing in self-defense.
UCG> (Then B.)

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Faulty generalization.

because it does not include v. 44 and the "love your enemies" command.

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> Matthew 5 certainly applies to situations involving revenge. And Matthew
UCG> 5:38-39 probably applies only to revenge. But to say that Jesus'
UCG> command to "love your enemies (Matthew 5:44) does not apply to killing
UCG> in self-defense would limit the meaning of godly love and restrict the
UCG> term "enemies beyond what can be proven in scripture.

It has nothing to do with the definition of enemies, but of love, and the question is, it is possible to love someone and do them physical harm, or even kill them.

God certainly does; he loves people, but harms and kills them, casts them into hell, causes them to be deformed, etc.

He enables us to do the same in several ways: we spank our children (and God spans us), it is hurtful, but it is also for their benefit, and in the long run it is in their best interest.

God enables us to spiritually and emotionally harm, to turn them over to the devil for the destruction of their flesh; to dole out emotional and social harm if they sin and refuse to repent, which includes kicking them out, and not socializing or eating with them.

(SURRENDERS THE POINT, FALLS BACK TO V. 44) Furthermore, as Christians in gov't we are commanded to bear the sword against the evil in Pvb and Rom 13, and there's no reason why we shouldn't also in carrying a personal sword. See Dobson's Love Must Be Tough book.

UCG> For more detail,

UCG> refer to Argument #1 and Refutation #3 in the Main Argument section.

If someone slaps you, there is no damage and no harm, perhaps other than to your pride. If they slap the snot out of you, perhaps you will have a nose bleed and a bruise, but your life is still unthreatened. Notice, you are still conscious enough to turn your cheek. Also notice that he didn't say, bend your neck so he can cut your head off. While it may be a situation where you might be inclined to defend yourself from harm, it is not a situation where your life is threatened.

But, I think the above response inadequately addresses what Jesus was saying.

The law said, eye for an eye, tooth for tooth.

Jesus restated that into: resist not evil.

The specific examples Jesus gives us:

--someone smites you on the cheek,

--someone sues you for your coat,

--someone makes you go a mile,

--someone asks you for something,

--someone wants to borrow something.

Each example is progressively more difficult to see the focus on self, the first is most easy to see.

We could generalize the examples he gave by saying:

--don't try to do back to someone what they have done to you.

--don't hurt people the way they have hurt you.

--don't exercise your right to pay someone back for what they have done to you (this is the definition of forgiveness),

--go beyond what is required, expected, or hoped for, so the person can see that what you do is voluntary, and is for their benefit, not yours.

Another way we could restate and generalize the examples:

--If they give offense to you, don't return it,

--If they take away your goods, don't turn against them, but express continued love by giving to them what is not required.

Don't turn away the needy, allow them to maintain their dignity, don't make them grovel.

Conclusions for our behavior we can draw based on his examples:

--Don't have your focus on yourself--focus on others and how you can help them;

--don't be in a hurry to defend your rights or honor or dignity or pride;

--defer to others;

--give beyond what is required;

--be generous.

All the above aside, we need to not be so quick to generalize or spiritualize what Jesus said.

All his examples revolve around interacting with people in such a way that is not self-centered, but other-centered, and ultimately lead us to showing others love, so we can win them to Christ.

If we just love our friends and relatives, even the sinners do that, as Jesus said. How do we exemplify the love of Christ if we punch someone out when they ask for it; if we fight tooth and nail in the court room (how Christ-like are Christians in divorce court?); if someone forces us to do labor we don't want to do; if we don't give generously; and if we lend with a jaundiced eye?

Turning the cheek is certainly in the context of revenge, but scripture points out further meaning than just revenge. It also deals with showing the love of Christ (Luke 6:35-36), and suffering reproach for his name's sake (II Cor 11:20-21).

Also consider Job 16:10, Ps 3:7.

Jesus himself did not always "resist not evil," when he was going to be thrown off the cliff, when they were going to force him to be king, when they were going to stone the woman taken in adultery, when he healed the sick, cast out devils, and raised the dead, when he drove the money changers out of the temple, when he called the lawyers, scribes, and pharasees snakes, and told them they were going to hell, and on and on.

The only time he did not resist (John 18:23) was during his trial and crucifixion. Then he gave his back to the smiters (Isa 50:6).

Since there were times when Jesus resisted evil, and once when he did not, how do we know when we should and when we should not? I can't give any more definitive an answer than to say, when we can better show the love of Christ, and when the kingdom of God is better served by us turning our cheek ("to fulfill scriptures," "to fulfill all righteousness") then let us turn our cheek. However, when God's kingdom is better served by resistance to evil, which I think is most of the time (if we follow Jesus' example, there was only once when he did not), we will fight against evil, put away the wicked, bind the kings of the heathen in chains, break every yoke, free the oppressed, rescue those who are drawn unto death, etc. You will have to know God's word, and be sensitive to his will to know the difference.

UCG> EDITORIAL: Concerning the Apostle Paul's reaction to the High Priest in
UCG> Acts 23:1-5, these verses cannot be used to prove the issue of killing
UCG> in self-defense one way or the other because no Biblical example exists
UCG> of Paul ever killing anyone. On the one hand, I agree that God expects
UCG> Christians to defer to those in authority to a greater degree than to
UCG> those not in authority.

Defer how? Based on what scripture?

They are to be respected, but they are required to follow God's law the same as everyone else. Furthermore, they are our public servants, so they must obey us. Furthermore, they are empowered by the Constitution, so they must obey it as well.

UCG> On the other hand, I disagree with what the argument implies: That God
UCG> commands Christians to allow those in authority to abuse and kill them,
UCG> but fight and if necessary, kill all not in authority who threaten our
UCG> lives. I also disagree with the implication that Christians should
UCG> apply the sermon on the mount to those in authority, but not to ordinary
UCG> people.

Me, too. There is no distinction between those in or out of authority. We can resist one as well as the other. This was the reasoning of the Founding Fathers of our country.

UCG> A more likely explanation for Paul's behavior is that he was a former
UCG> member of the Sanhedrin, so he knew that those Sanhedrin members were
UCG> breaking their own rules by slapping him. Paul was justified in being
UCG> upset at the obvious injustice and hypocrisy against him, and as he
UCG> usually did, he rebuked his assailant. Sometimes godly love demands
UCG> rebuking people who are in the wrong. Jesus did not passively give in to
UCG> others on some issues (Luke 11:37-54), but contended with people, just
UCG> as Paul did when doing so was justified. On the other hand, if Paul had
UCG> killed someone, he would have contradicted his whole life and teachings
UCG> as well as that of Jesus.

Only according to your unBiblical view of things. If he had been the goodman of the house, and had stopped a thief, it would not have been bad. How could Jesus contradict himself?

UCG> What is Needed to Prove Argument True

UCG> Would have to prove that killing in self-defense does not contradict
UCG> Jesus' command to "love your enemies.

UCG> Argument 11

UCG> Argument as Stated

UCG> Even if you can prove that Jesus set the example of not killing His
UCG> enemies in self-defense, this can't mean Christians are to follow
UCG> Christ's example to this extreme. After all, Jesus' mission was
UCG> different from His disciples. Jesus didn't kill His enemies because that
UCG> was a part of becoming our Savior and Messiah. Christians aren't called
UCG> to that mission. Anyway, you can't really know exactly how to follow
UCG> Christ's example. Do we wear the same robes and shoes, observe Hanukah,
UCG> or fast 40 days and nights as Jesus did (Luke 4:1-13, John 10:22)?

Jesus does kill his enemies, not in self-defense, but in judgment, by the millions at the end of the world, and a few selected individuals here and there, such as Annanias and Saphyria. *Re 17:14* These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.
Re 19:11 And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.

UCG> Syllogism

UCG> If Jesus had a mission different from His disciples, then Jesus'
UCG> disciples don't have to follow His example in not killing in
UCG> self-defense. (If A, then B)

UCG> Jesus had a mission different from His disciples. (A is true.)

UCG> Then Jesus' disciples can kill in self-defense. (B is true.)

It's not just that he had a different mission. He did not fight in the garden so he could fulfill scripture, and be the lamb of God to take away the sins of the world.

UCG> Fallacy

UCG> Faulty generalization

UCG> Why Argument is False

UCG> The main reason this argument is false is that Jesus directly commands
UCG> His disciples to follow His example (Mark 10:21, I Peter 2:21).

He also told them to do and teach all the things he had commanded them, including carry a sword. He also commended them to scripture, which we are to obey, and which is profitable for doctrine, and instruction in righteousness, which gives examples, commands, etc, some of which require deadly force.

UCG> For
UCG> more detail, refer to the Main Argument section under Refutation #5.

UCG> What is Needed to Prove this Argument True

UCG> This argument directly contradicts the Biblical directive to follow
UCG> Christ's example and cannot be proven true. Would have to restate the
UCG> argument and prove that Jesus would have killed His enemies and we
UCG> should follow that example.

*** end of text edited text ***