

different services in the city and really a person hardly knows what is the really right thing. Men with apparent spirituality in the pulpits urge the young men to go and even say every shot you fire boys is for your God and your Country and then pray God's Blessing on the same. We have argued it over here but of course get no farther as one can not make the other take the same view point.

But the dreadful war goes on without mercy. as casualty reports come in some girl's Brother some lovers. having been killed casts a gloom over the school to a more or less extent as it is the World over. You no doubt have heard that Bob Zule was killed Nov 9. just had a letter from Mrs High.

"Better late than never." Wish you many happy returns of your Wedding Anniversary. which also reminds me of your trip to Waterloo

317 Cobourg St.  
 Stratford, Ont  
 Oct. 4, 1917.

Dear Bro. Coffman-

Greetings in Jesus' Worthy Name. - Well it seems to have pleased the Lord to have me at Stratford, at any rate I'm here and am endeavouring to serve Him to the best of my ability and knowledge with His help and guidance. To come to the point quickly I am going to Normal School here, the attendance being 234; 14 of which are boys. The rest are girls. This of course is immaterial but I have been elected president of the literary society which meets every week. Of course the president is to a certain <sup>considerable</sup> extent responsible for the programme and general procedures of the society. Of course you know the idea of the society is to improve literary talent etc. Now it is not my intention in the least to make a religious meeting out of our gatherings but the question to me is, What about the patriotic songs? Should we as a church sing, Keep the Home Fires Burning till the Boys Come Home, or O Canada. I think

God save the King is alright, and perhaps  
 some of the others, but I wish you would  
 suggest on each song. I have not noticed  
 anything very special in the Gospel Herald  
 regards what we as public school teachers  
 should do with patriotic songs. I think  
 our stand should be decisive, logical,  
 and uniform as a church. Well I think  
 you know in what shoes I am. Of course its not  
 manners to bring up religion <sup>or argue</sup> in society and  
 rather than violate rules of society I would  
 resign. Now I'm not keen to have the office, <sup>only</sup>  
 this that as we respond to such stimulations  
 will we become educated (that is responding to the literary  
 side of the question) But one thing sure "I want to  
 live above the world, I though Satan's  
 darts at me are hurled." "I want my life to tell  
 for Jesus." Of course there is education in  
 being president of a literary society, and I  
 might say the character for morals is very  
 high here. Arguing then that religion should  
 be left out of an ordinary literary society, what  
 had I better do. I wish you would answer  
 me as most satisfactorily you know how. I think  
 you know my condition. Wishing you  
 God's Blessings  
 please answer Yours Truly  
 soon, I'll soon have  
 to act.

Nelson J Pitweller

317 Cobourg St. Stratford, Ont

Vineland Ont., Oct. 5, 1917.

Nelson Littwiler,  
317 Cobourg St.,  
Stratford Ont.

Dear Brother:- Greeting in the name of Jesus whom we love and serve.

Your letter to hand to-day. Glad to have a line from you and to know that you are pursuing your studies at the normal. This will be a good training for you as well as experience in meeting with the world in which we live and where we will expect to use our influence most in serving the Lord as witness for Him. Your problem is one that we have frequently to meet in the capacity of servants for others here in the world. We cannot always control the affairs of others with whom we associate. As the leader of the Literary society you are not made responsible for all the numbers on the program. The fact that you are the leader of the meeting does not mean that you approve of all that is said and done there, any more than does the fact that you are taking some part of the program as an ordinary member. In either case you have a fellowship with the society but of a different capacity. It is very likely that you have a program committee and they are responsible for the character of the assignments. If your position as President means that you are expected to say things and do things that are contrary to your convictions of right then you are bound to serve the right rather than to serve the society. On the other hand, if, as leader, you are free to follow your convictions and views and others are free to follow theirs, then you have the right to fill your office and let each person be responsible for the nature of the numbers which they have on the program.

As to the singing of the patriotic songs, it becomes a part of school life to have a certain amount of such songs in the course of the exercises. Those things come in our literature, and in the courses of study and also in the school music. As such, we are expected to make use of them. When it comes to matters outside of our courses of study, we have the privilege to discard them for songs of a different nature. If, in your capacity as President you are able to use your influence for the sake of variety and culture to suggest a different class of songs, then you are in perfect right to make and follow such suggestions. But, you must be careful not to belittle your influence and your faith by making yourself repulsive and your faith obnoxious to those you would expect to show a higher standard of life and a nobler ambition than is found in the sentimental patriotism that is the common stock of men today.

It is impossible for me to say exactly what you should do in these matters. You will have to gauge the conditions and act according to general principles. You must weigh the nature and value of the programs which are given. You must measure the degree of influence which they have on you and on others. You must think of the power which lies in you to make an impression for the right and use every wise way of having and exerting that influence.

Are you obliged to take the military training in your course? There is one place where I think we should draw the line. May God give you grace to stand true and let your life and powers be consecrated fully to Him. Your Aunt was here last week. She reported your being in Stratford. Success to you in all things.

Yours in faith,

*S. F. Coffman*

Waterloo, Ont. Oct 30, 1917.

Mr. S. H. Coffman,  
Vineland, Ont.

Dear Friend:

Well as I would like to have a little information I thought I would write to you and see what you have to say about it.

As you know we are in very critical times just now and those of us that want to stand and hold to that which we believe to be right are asked some very funny and hard questions.

As my Boss is heart and soul in the War and thinks its right he asked me what a man should who saw a big brutish man abuse a little boy or girl and we should happen to come along right at the time he says according as he thinks the man that would stand by and still let the fellow go on abusing the child would be

nothing short of a Murderer of course he says he has scripture that tells him this and says that they had Wars in the olden days or Old Testament times so I would like to know what kind of an answer would or should be sufficient for him and then he also said that Christ used force when he drove the people out of the Temple and says therefore we have a right to go and fight.

Could you tell me whether the Teacher's Training Course that our Church <sup>is getting out</sup> is finished or at least the first part of it and where we could get it if it is finished.

I hope I aint troubling you too much.

I remain as ever

Yours truly,

Shannon H. Bumbacher

over

My Address is

Shannon H Bumbacher,  
General Delivery,  
Waterloo, Ont.



Vineland Ont., Oct. 30, 1917.

Shannon W Brubacher,  
 Waterloo Ont. Gen. Del.  
 Dear Brother:- Greeting.

Your letter received and noted. In reply will say that we may be very thankful indeed that we are so greatly favored by the Government as to receive the recognition that has been granted us in being exempted entirely from military service. We should not only be thankful but should devote our attention more fully to the general interest of the welfare of the country and of our fellow-men in all other lands where there is so much suffering.

With reference to the questions that are constantly brought to us, and many of them are preposterous conditions which are so exceptional that no one would know what to do or what he would do under the circumstances, these questions can only be answered in a general way. The only authority which we have as to the nature of our conduct under trials is that which is given in the New Testament. When we look within its pages we find what we should do when we are oppressed or persecuted or cheated or mistreated in any way. We are to suffer for righteousness sake. It makes no difference how just may be our cause or the occasion of our claiming justice, if we must do wrong in order to maintain justice, we are to suffer instead of doing the wrong thing. It is evident that if a big man were to punish or abuse a little child, the only one who could deal with the big man would be a bigger man, and it certainly would be unfair for another bigger man to abuse the big man and take advantage of size in order to deal with him. But, that is human reason. Scripture teaches us that we should show mercy and in the spirit of shewing mercy we should use every means possible to rescue the child and having failed in that our arguments of force would avail but little. Where our powers and rights are limited, God says, "I will repay." As far as our affairs with the oppressive nations is concerned, the Jews gained greater victories through prayer than they ever gained by conquest of arms. If it was right for the Jews to fight it was just as right for them not to fight but to pray instead. We should deal fairly with the Scriptures. In the New Testament we have a significant lack of instructions concerning the use of or application of the principle of force and bearing carnal weapons. Because of this it is impossible for us to know how to carry on warfare in a Christian manner. In fact we are not told how to fight and revenge, but we know how to loose and to suffer, and we also know how to look forward with hope to the time when, by the Power of Christ the kingdoms of this world will become kingdoms of peace and be possessed by the peace-loving and merciful saints of Christ.

The book on teacher training is not yet prepared. It may be some time before it is ready. Any class that is now organized may use any text they think most suitable and may have their papers examined by our own Committee. Correspond with Bro Reist, Scottdale for information concerning examinations.

Yours in faith,

Ridgeway Feb 25 - 16

S. F. Coffman

Dear Bro I am appointed Secretary of a committee of five brethren authorized by our church to formulate something as a standard for us as non-resistant people, to be guided by in regard to this present war, as helping in the free will offerings such as Red Cross. Patriotic funds etc. What is your belief as a church or individual concerning this matter as you see it in the scriptures. ~~And what~~ Please give scripture reference for same

Yours in Love

Jesse D Winger

Vineland Ont., Feb. 29, 1916.

Jesse D. Wenger,  
Ridgeway Ont.

Dear Brother:- Greeting in Jesus' name.

Your letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> Inst received last evening. I note your inquiry regarding the attitude of our Church on the question of supporting the free will funds in connection with the military affairs of our country.

We certainly regret the whole situation which has been thrust upon our land and upon other lands, and pray that such conditions may soon be changed to conditions of peace and good will to men. As a church, we have taken no action as to what attitude we should take in regard to these funds, - the Patriotic fund and the Red Cross fund. I think it is important that our non-resistant people should have a common attitude toward these funds. I have had conversations with members of some of the other non-resistant congregations and they are all troubled with the same questions. When you have decided on your position I would be very glad to hear your decision.

The position which I have personally taken and have recommended to others is as follows:

Whereas, The patriotic fund was inaugurated for the purpose of increasing the stipend allowed by the Government to soldiers and their dependents, and the instigation of such a fund was the desire to increase the number of voluntary enlistments in the various military organizations called for and authorized by the government for active service in the war, and

Whereas this fund is not specifically a charity fund designed to relieve

*the poor and suffering but is given to all equally, who have besides the*

support of the Government in the pay of the soldiers and allowances for their dependents whether they are in need or not, and thus constituting the patriotic fund a bonus for all who take active part in military service.

Therefore, the contributing of money to the Patriotic fund would be uncalled for, as far as the relief of suffering is concerned, and a direct encouragement of military service; and hence, not an obligatory Christian charity, and is also opposed to the principles of those who believe in the principles of Jesus, the Prince of Peace, and who endeavor to follow his example in promoting peace and good will among men.

2. Whereas, the Red Cross society was inaugurated and organized for the sake of ministering aid to the helpless and neglected and suffering, whether on the battle fields or in any other place or from any other calamity, and since this organization has proven that its object is perfectly humanitarian and in the spirit of Christ who ministered to all men and nations without respect to national boundaries, and,

Therefore, Whereas, the Governments have their staffs of medical men of their own with their respective armies who care for and restore those who may be of military service to them, and the Red Cross work being independent of the military organizations of all countries and ministering to those who are in special need,

Therefore, those who give assistance as they may feel justified to give either in funds or materials, whether in times of war or in times of other calamities may consider their act as partaking of the Spirit of Christ who was the friend and succor of all who suffered, regardless as to the cause of their infirmities or suffering.

This is my own personal view and it may be of some assistance to you. May God bless you in your work for Him. Shall be glad to hear from you.

Yours in Him,



7/19th Regiment  
Falls View  
Ont.

Mr. F. Goffman

Dear Sir,

I may possibly  
be up Friday to Vineland  
to see you, Hattie + I  
get married Dec 10<sup>th</sup>. +

I want to know if you  
will marry us, Hattie

wants a ring, and as I  
am not a member of the  
Mennonite Church. I was  
wondering if you would  
perform the ceremony, If  
you will, let me know  
what you think anyway  
Hoping to hear from you soon

I remain yours  
truly  
Charles Hubler

---

*Tell me what you think of this. Bro. yours in Christ P. Jordan*

# Should a Christian Go to War?

The writer, Rev. Wm. L. Pettingill, is one of the great Bible teachers of America, and for many years the President of the Erie Side Bible Conference, Dean of Philadelphia Bible School, and President of the Annual Bible Conference held yearly in that City.

At the beginning of the War I took this view of the subject, and preached a sermon on those lines; but as Mr. Pettingill has stated the case so sanely, sweetly and scripturally, I feel that his message should be sent to the boys at the Front, and placed in the hands of those having loved ones there.

PASTOR PHILPOTT.

*"Home" was first*

God has bestowed two great gifts upon the human race. One is Civil Government, and the other is the Christian Church. Government is here mentioned first, because it antedates the New Testament Church by more than two thousand years.

Both of these institutions are divine, but it would not be correct to call them both Christian. The Church is a Christian institution, but the Government, though divine, is not Christian. This distinction is not without a difference. It is far more important than may at first sight appear, and it has a very real bearing upon the question heading this article.

The Government and the Church are like each other only in the fact that both come from God. As to their mission in the world, and the divinely appointed means for the accomplishment of this mission, there is sharp contrast. Failure to keep this fact in mind has always led to confusion, and must of necessity do so. Union of Church and State would never have been thought of but for this failure, and at this moment, because of it, there is division among Christians concerning the attitude they ought to take toward war.

*Gov. is man, resp. to for man.*

Ought a Christian go to war? Some say No, others Yes. On either side are men equally godly, equally devout, equally sincere and brave. Still others—also devoted Christians—are in doubt and perplexity.

One of these answers is wrong; both cannot be right. The appeal, for the loyal Christian, must be to the Bible. For him, the Scriptures are the Court of Last Resort.

But both sides do appeal to the Bible, and each side brings forth therefrom supposed warrant and support for its contention. This comes from a mischievous habit, all but universal, of using isolated texts, found here and there in the Bible, and building doctrines thereupon, while ignoring other passages plainly bearing upon the subject under consideration, not to speak of the context surrounding the very Scriptures used. This is not the way to treat the Bible, nor is it the way to learn the truth. The right way is to let the whole Book speak, and to withhold our conclusions as to what it teaches until we have listened to all it has to say.

The Church has one purpose in the world, and one only. That purpose is to evangelize the world. Her risen Lord's command, at the beginning of her career upon earth, was "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Lk. 24.47). "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Ac. 1-8). Thus her work is cut out for her, very simply, very definitely. She is to "preach the gospel to every creature"—just that, and nothing more. She is not expected to convert the world, nor to educate the world, nor to civilize it, and certainly not to govern it. Individual Christians have many other duties—they are to "do good," being "rich in good works" (I. Tim. 6:18)—but the Church as such

is in the world only as an evangelizing messenger. When-  
ever she has remembered that, and occupied herself with her  
divinely given task, she has thrived and prospered; when she  
has forgotten it and turned to something else, she has lan-  
guished and failed.

The principle of conduct for the Church is grace. When  
the apostle Peter asked his Lord how often he should forgive  
a brother who had sinned against him, the Lord replied, "I  
say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times  
seven." And again he said, "Take heed to yourselves: If thy  
brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent,  
forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in  
a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying,  
I repent; thou shalt forgive him" (Mt. 18:21, 22; Lk. 17:3,4).  
Christians are forbidden to go to law with one another; rather  
than do this they are commanded to take wrong or suffer  
themselves to be defrauded (I. Cor. 6:1-8). And, as touching  
his relations with unbelievers, the Christian is, so far as is  
possible, "as much as in you lieth," to live peaceably with all  
men, avenging not himself, but leaving his cause with him  
to whom vengeance belongeth. If his enemy hungers or  
thirsts, he is to minister to his needs, thus being not overcome  
of evil, but overcoming evil with good (Rom. 12:17-21). If,  
for conscience toward God, a Christian endure grief, suffering  
wrongfully, this is thankworthy. "For what glory is it, if,  
when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? but  
if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this  
is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called"  
(I. Pet. 2:19-21).

*Non-Resistant*

So much for the Church.

Civil Government had its beginning immediately after  
the Flood. When Noah came forth out of the Ark, he received  
at God's hand a new commission, including the institution,  
for the first time, of Human Government—the rule of man  
by man. "And surely your blood of your lives will I require;  
at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand  
of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the  
life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his  
blood be shed" (Gen. 9:5, 6). Here is the Magna Charta of  
Civil Government. Capital punishment was here authorized  
and commanded by God himself, and this authority and com-  
mandment have never been withdrawn or modified. They  
are in full force to-day. And, as Dr. C. I. Scofield, in his  
Reference Bible, points out, "the highest function of Govern-  
ment is the judicial taking of life. All other governmental  
powers are implied in that."

We have seen that the principle of conduct for the Church  
is grace. In Civil Government the ruling principle is not  
grace, but justice. Mercy is always to be exercised by the  
Church—and also by the individual Christian so far as his  
personal interests are concerned; but righteousness is the  
basic principle of Government. This is seen in the judicial  
system. Our courts are established, not to show mercy, but  
to administer justice. If a judge on the bench should forget  
this, and should freely forgive every prisoner brought before  
him for trial, he would be impeached and removed from office,  
and rightly so. To forgive a murderer is gracious, but to  
execute him is righteous. Forgiveness is a Church function;  
justice is a state function. Forgiveness is Christian; righte-  
ousness is governmental.

*Law  
+  
Justice?*

"God forbid," said a Christian recently, "that I should ever  
stain my hands with the blood of my fellow man!" Yet it  
might become that same Christian's duty, in simple obedience  
to God's Word, to act as sheriff in hanging a murderer. It  
surely is somebody's duty, and the man who performs that  
duty should not be stigmatized as a wrongdoer, but rather  
honored for faithfulness in office.

*what is  
Christian  
duty?*

Another important contrast between Church and State is  
that, while the Church is forbidden to use force in the per-  
formance of a mission, the Government is divinely authorized  
to compel obedience to its decrees. During the Middle Ages  
the Church forgot or ignored this distinction, and the bloody  
scenes of the Inquisitions, as well as the unscriptural exploits  
of the Crusades, resulted. In modern days the State forgets  
or ignores this distinction whenever she moves to abolish  
capital punishment. Men need to have a care, lest they seem

*Church can be  
justified from  
Church to State  
Society.*

*Jews were Govt and Church combined.  
Christ put away the Govt. + established Justice.*

to set themselves up as being more merciful, if not wiser, than  
God!

The New Testament Scriptures do not set aside these dis-  
tinctions between the Christian Church and Civil Government.  
It is still true that "the powers that be are ordained of God.  
Whoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance  
of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves  
judgment. . . . For he is the minister of God to thee for  
good. . . . He beareth not the sword in vain; for he is  
the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him  
that doeth evil. . . . For this cause pay ye tribute also:  
for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this  
very thing" (Rom. 13:1-6).

*Stated  
Church  
Scripture  
Rom 13*

Every Government official, then, is an ordained minister  
of God. He himself may forget it, but that does not alter the  
fact. He may be an unfaithful and unworthy official, but for  
that he must in the last analysis answer to God. From the  
King, or President, or ruler of whatever name or title, to the  
policeman on your beat,—every public servant is a minister  
of State in the service of God. And in his hand God has  
placed, not an olive-branch, but a sword! This word, "he  
beareth not the sword in vain," is God's warrant for the  
policeman's club or revolver, the soldier's bayonet or rifle, the  
army's big siege gun, the modern equipment of an efficient  
navy, and indeed anything and everything that is necessary  
for the full performance of the work assigned to the Govern-  
ment by God himself. The Government is set in the world  
to maintain itself in righteousness. It is to be not "a terror  
to good works, but to the evil, . . . a revenger to execute  
wrath (that is, the wrath of God) upon him that doeth evil"  
(Rom. 13:3, 4).

*Weapons  
in hand  
Govt;  
not of  
Church  
man Kin.*

But now someone objects. "What you have said," he re-  
marks, "is all true, but it has nothing to do with the Chris-  
tian's relation to war. The Christian is a citizen of heaven,  
and he therefore ought to have nothing to do with Civil Govern-  
ment at all. Human Government is a thing of the world,  
and Satan is the prince of the world. The Christian is a  
stranger and pilgrim here. He ought to detach himself from  
all governmental affairs. He ought not to hold office, and he  
ought not even to vote."

There are many who take this position, and it is an un-  
scriptural position. True it is that Satan is the prince of this  
world, and that the Christian is called to a life of separation  
from everything under Satan's control. But it does not follow  
that the Christian is therefore to separate himself from all  
participation in Civil Government. Civil Government is not  
a Satanic institution. We have already seen that it is divine;  
it is from God; it is His gift. And a wonderful gift it is. Any  
Government at all is better than no government, or anarchy.  
The thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, from  
which we have quoted, was written when Paul who wrote it  
was under the Government of Nero! yet he even then de-  
clared that the power was of God.

*Chosen  
Govt. in  
Church  
Rom 7:10*

According to the reasoning of our objector, no Christian  
ought to accept public office of any kind, or even vote. And  
if it should happen—as, thank God! it often does—that a  
public official should become a Christian, he ought straight-  
way to resign! If a soldier in the trenches should turn to  
God, he ought immediately to desert! There were Christian  
soldiers in the apostolic churches: why were they not com-  
manded to leave the army? Why did not the apostle Peter  
tell Cornelius the centurion to resign his commission? It is  
true that John the Baptist told soldiers to "do violence to no  
man," but that he was referring to their personal dealings  
with men rather than to their acts as soldiers is clearly  
shown by the words he immediately added, "and be content  
with your wages."

According to our objector, no Christian ought to be a  
public school teacher, since the public school is a Govern-  
ment institution, and the teacher is therefore a minister of  
State. Following out his logic, Woodrow Wilson, being a  
Christian, ought never to have become President of the  
United States; or, having accepted the office in ignorance,  
he ought now to lay down the reins of Government, and no  
one ought to take them up but an unbeliever, an enemy of the  
cross of Christ!



The objector himself would likely shrink from this conclusion, for he is probably thankful if he is able to send his children to a Christian teacher, and that the chief magistrate of this nation, in the present time of crisis, is a God-fearing man.

*I am but not by the name!*

"Do you believe in war?" asked one man of another.

"What do you mean?" said the person addressed. "Are you asking me whether war is ever necessary or right?"

"Yes," said the questioner. "That is what I mean to ask."

"Well," said the other, "I will answer your question by asking you one. If you were walking down the street with your wife, and a gang of thugs were to suddenly come out of an alley and begin beating your wife with clubs, would you do anything about it?"

*Ed. J. Fustler*

"Why, certainly, I should."

"What would you do?"

"Why, I should stop it if I could."

"Would you employ force, or would you confine yourself to moral suasion?"

"I shouldn't stop for moral suasion. I should use a club myself if I had one or could get one."

"Would you use a gun?"

"Certainly, if one was available."

"Well, then, you believe in war. For that would be war on a small scale. If a policeman was near, he would, as he should, help you in protecting your wife from death or injury, and also in arresting the thugs and seeing that they were punished. You have only to multiply the number of thugs to make the affair a riot, or an insurrection, or civil war, or international war."

*Not proper of church & have not proper of church & have not*

Every prison or jail, every brass button on a policeman's uniform, every courthouse, or judge, or constable, or bailiff, or lawyer—all these are insignia of war, the necessary and legitimate occupation of Civil Government in the protection of its people in their rights. That is the ruler's job.

Let it be remembered that it was not to an unbeliever that God first committed the authority to govern his fellow men. Noah was a man of faith. He was as much a citizen of heaven as is the New Testament Christian, but that did not prevent him from being a citizen of earthly government, nor did it deliver him from the responsibilities connected therewith.

The United States is at war. Through no fault of our own, we are engaged in conflict with a malicious and dangerous foe. We were among the signatory powers in the Belgian treaty, and the obligation is upon us as much as upon others to protect Belgium from her enemies. The Lusitania victims, or very many of them, were our fellow-citizens, and our Government was in duty bound to protect them from their fate so far as that was possible; now that they are beyond our help, the government at Washington is obligated by the authority derived from God himself to protect other American citizens from a similar fate.

And Christians ought to help. It is inconsistent and unscriptural to have enjoyed the blessings of peace under the Stars and Stripes, and then to refuse to help in lifting the common burden pressing upon the nation in time of war. To be perfectly consistent, the Christian who thus refuses to do his share ought to live on a desert island, where there would be no government to need his assistance, or to give him assistance when he should need it.

The Government is acting under the sanction of divine authority. It must maintain itself in righteousness, or it will surely be repudiated and destroyed by divine power. It need not, and it ought not, to wait for its subjects to "volunteer" to come to its help. It would be just as reasonable to expect the Government to wait for its citizens to "volunteer" to pay their taxes. Universal service is the righteous method, for under it every man must "do his bit."

Vineland Ont., Nov. 30, 1917.

P. J. Jordan,  
188 Maple Ave,  
Hamilton, Ont.

Dear Brother:-

Your enclosed tract received and read with interest and with a certain degree of surprise at the method that men take to support such an unchristian institution as war. Rev. Pettingill is no doubt an able scholar and a man who knows his Bible, and the statements that he makes concerning both the Church and the State are perfectly correct. I am not presuming to know the Bible better than he nor would I undertake to prove that he is wrong in his position; nor undertake to persuade him that he is wrong. But, to me it appears that he has linked the individual to the state in such a way that the state has greater authority over him than has the church, and the word of the Government means a greater duty than the Word of God.

I was pleased with the description which was given of the Church and the duty of the Christian. The life of the christian as set forth by the author is a non-resistant life. How can he follow the teachings of Christ for the Christian and then violate them for the sake of the State? Moreover the State is not the first institution. The home is the first and the Church the next and the State the third. Adam and eve and their family constituted the home and their worship of God by sacrifices and prayers was the beginning of the Church. When the powers of the State began to appear under the conditions of the increasing population and antagonistic elements of Cain's offspring there was war and murder and strife which caused God to destroy the world, and begin again with the family.

What shall we say of the state government and its attitude toward the destruction of life when we have the first precedent in the case of Cain and Abel? There was a case of Civil Government with mercy, for others were forbidden to kill Cain. Lamech was disobedient to the law of God which prohibited the taking of human life, and there was more fear of man in his heart than there was fear of God. The law of God was evident in force and understood by Lamech that no human life should be taken by man. If God changed his law in the days of Noah it was done as a manifestation of His Divine opposition to the destruction of life and not His approval upon the exercise of that privilege in the hands of man. It was added because of unbelief in the same sense that God added the law to the Children of Israel, and granted divorce to them.

Government is of God. In Heaven it is found in its ideal condition. It is an intuitive characteristic in man who is created in the image of God. It is natural to all men, and hence a gift from God. If all governments were of God, why should any government fight against another? The fact is that while the gift of government and the ideal government is of God there is a possibility of that gift being perverted and the methods of God either neglected unknown or misapplied. In earthly governments there is very much of human nature revealed and human passions hold sway, and it often occurs that a "Fox" like Herod, becomes the minister of God. In this respect the author is correct when he says that Governments are not christian. they are ministers of God to make tolerable the existence of right.

The question resolves itself into this, -To what extent can the Church co-operate with the Governments of the world in carrying out the Divine Ideals of Government? Jesus did not help the Government of the Jews or Romans while He was in the world, except that He paid tribute. He submitted to the indignities and injustices of both powers. We have no record that any of the apostles ever sought affinity with the governments or were placed in official positions. It is true that there were soldiers among the converts, - the Centurian in Caesarea, - but we are not aware of what course he pursued after his conversion. We are aware of the fact that the Apostles did not obey the mandates of the Government of Jerusalem when they were forbidden to preach Christ. The apostle Paul did not submit to the persecutions ordered by governments in various parts of the country. He fled when occasion made it necessary to submit to injustice or to cease his work of righteousness. The Christians were then and are now in conflict with the governments of the world. They cannot agree on all points, and are in conflict. In this case, is it possible for the Christian to say, "The Church is Christian, the State is not Christian, therefore I will or may be disobedient to the Church for the sake of supporting government which is of God."

The Christian need never deny or resist government for to do so would be disobedient to a principle of the Word. But it must be that the follower of Christ must stand opposed to many things which those who are responsible for the carrying on of earthly governments demand. We will help the government in everything that is righteous. We have the principles of government in the church and are told to make use of them. Even in matters of law, we are told to take these matters before the church rather than before lawyers, for the judgment of the Christian is more correct than that of men who are not Christians. We have regulations for conduct, fellowship work and ministry and are organized to do works of mercy. We support the idea that Government is of God. But we cannot say that every law is of God and every law-maker and executive is therefore a godly man and his laws to be obeyed as of God. To do so would place the church in the unenviable position of being subject to the whims of every Government.

If human laws and judgments and decisions were infallible then we would not hesitate to support them. But there are differences of opinion and in judgment, and in forms of government and so on, so that we may question the course of many governments. Shall we take up the sword at the command of men? Government fights against Government and Christians fight against Christians and every man who is a Christian does right because he obeys his government and fights for it in the sense of its righteousness. This idea is rather preposterous. It is impossible for any Christian to always obey even what his government considers right. It is not required of any Christian that he slay his fellow-man because his country demands it. God's law comes first; the principles of the Church, with love and peace and mercy come first. He cannot separate himself from the church and become an individual subject to the decisions of the government for right or wrong for the time being and then go back again to the church to serve her in righteousness of another character. We are in the world and not of it. We are in the Church and a part of it always, and a part of Christ, inseparably. We cannot be a part of the Government then and do contrary to the teachings of the Church. We cannot fight and kill, for it is not the business of the Church. We must save life and not destroy. The Jews represented Church and state in one body. When Christ came He separated them and henceforth they are separated as law and grace, and will remain so until He comes and establishes a government that is righteous and one which we will all obey.

Vineland Ont., January 19, 1929.

John H. Moseman,  
Lancaster Penna.

Dear Brother:- Greeting. in the name of the Lord.

After writing you, the pamphlet, "The Dawn" came to hand. I have not had the time to read it carefully until today, and then, perhaps I have not imbibed all that it might insinuate by a more careful reading.

In the main, I think that the article on "The Out-lawry of War" is correct. The peace that the Lord gives to the Church and that which He gives between man and God, or, the believer and God, is not secured by any man without God nor without the Spirit of the God. Lasting peace among men must be had through the possession of the Holy Spirit and in the realm where evil men and men in the flesh are not. I believe that the fullest attainment of peace will only be had after the flesh and the present world are passed away and the New Heaven and the New Earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness are in evidence.

We do not have perfect peace in the Church, but we have a better peace than the world has and more enduring, because of the Holy Spirit, and the Word which dwells in the heart. Our nature has been changed by regeneration, the flesh is considered dead, and its lusts are considered crucified; therefore the believer lives after the Spirit, not fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. The peace which the believer has is not one which exists, but is one which is created for him by the new conditions within his heart and life. The adjustments are not on the outside but on the inside. The same conditions may continue on the outside, but do not affect him because of new conditions within.

Regarding the interpretation of the prophecies and the world affairs to which the author refers, there is plenty of room for diverging opinions. One can always read prophecy better after events occur than beforehand. God has always used war as a judgment for the sins of nations, or for the sins of men in the world on a wholesale basis. If war is used to punish Israel, or Babylon, it becomes a national judgment. When God calls the world's nations to war it is because of wide-spread sins. It is evident that God's call upon all the nations to beat their tools of industry into weapons of war is for the purpose of a world judgment for sin. The world undoubtedly merits such a judgment at any time, but it is evident that God withholds judgments of that character for mercy's sake, just as he does the final judgment. But, that day will surely come. The time is imminent, but we can not tell when it is due. Many thought the last war to be that call, and hence will look upon present efforts of national import the step to a new kingdom of peace. As suggested by the author, the nations are not discussing peace from the standpoint of a religious duty nor from the standpoint of Gospel principles. In fact, the present movement is not sought to eliminate war, it confesses only to the elimination of war as an international settlement of disputes, leaving each nation free to use war as a method of self defense. This is not the basis of peace for the world, and hence not the age of no more war.

I cannot personally agree with the author as to the character of the present dispensation, heading up in a Roman hierarchy of peace. World kingdoms of prophetic times were Asiatic, most of our modern prophets make the European. For centuries Asia has slumbered but has not been dead. The dawn of wakefulness is just as probable as the revival of the decadent members of a non-prophetic organization in territory outside of the centre of prophetic visions.

There is another element in the nature of the universal kingdom of peace that the author seems to overlook. It is his contention, and I think rightfully, that the Lord's call for war, is a time of judgment for the world. What shall be the nature of the kingdom of peace? Will it result from the righteous will of the people? or from the general acceptance of the Gospel of Christ over the whole world? or because of the power of the Church in the political affairs of the world? or, from the over-ruling power of Jesus Christ in the world when He comes again? It cannot be either of the first three conditions, because they are incompatible with the nature of the work of the Church in this age. It must be the third, for prophecy thus designates the character of His kingdom. In that case, universal peace will be the result of the over-ruling power of Christ, and not because of the will of men. Kingdoms will be subdued by the law of Christ and by the power of his rule and authority. Peace will come because He demands it. Nations will learn war no more because He will not permit it. Men will be at peace, and all nature be at peace because it is His will and law. The end of a thousand years of peace and righteousness will come, the nations of the world gathered together under the leadership of the released Satan to compass the camp of the saints about to destroy them, but the nations that rose in arms again were destroyed. Then everlasting peace will be ushered in.

The matter for consideration is, that the reign of Christ for a thousand years of peace <sup>will be</sup> ~~is~~ an enforced peace for all the ungodly in the world. It will be a ~~de~~ time of enjoyable peace for the saints and all who love righteousness. It cannot be a continuous peace because it will not be a universal heart peace and because it is a peace that is subject to the elements of world and flesh. It will be an age of the final testing out of human nature under the most advantageous conditions, and will find the heart of man the same in nature, deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and only subject to the will of God by regeneration and the indwelling of his Spirit and presence.

War is a scourge of God. It was so from the beginning. Cain was a refugee from the scourge of destruction from the hand of man. The bloody age continued under Lamech and the descendants of Cain. The flood wiped out men but not war. It will be war to the last day before the great white throne sums up all the affairs of this world and ushers in the New Heaven and Earth.

What part men may have in the present world affairs to encourage peace among nations, is also presented by the author. The province of the Church is two fold, - preach the Gospel of salvation by faith and regeneration as an essential to the kingdom of Christ, and second, to do good unto all men, especially to them of the household of faith. The doing good is not an expression of the way into the kingdom, but a token of the character of its citizens. Regeneration is the way into it. This is the only message the Church has for the world. Legislation will not make the Kingdom. It is better to encourage the nations of the world to be at peace than to engage in war. It is a means of temporal blessing and present good. We are to pray for peace and opportunity for good. But we are not told to bring about the kingdom in this manner. War will come soon enough to the world when they have done their best to preserve peace.

I trust that you will be able to value this expression of my sentiments concerning the articles. Perhaps no two persons will agree on any subject. Our mentalities differ and hence our disagreements even when we love each other and endeavor to be at peace. Shall I return the pamphlet?

This leaves us in usual health, and may the same blessing be with you. Our Bible school has enrolled 87 to the present time. Pray for us and the work here.

Yours in faith

Goshen, Indiana, April 25, 1917.

Dear Brother:

Greeting.

The Executive Committee of the Indiana-Michigan Conference has appointed Bro. S.S. Yoder and myself to prepare a writing stating the position of the Mennonite Church on the question of "WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE OF THIS CONFERENCE ON MILITARISM"?

We are anxious to have the best possible statement of the Mennonite Church on this question and are, consequently, sending a copy of the first draft of our write-up to a number of representative brethren for suggestion and criticism.

Will you please read and freely suggest anything you think should be added or eliminated to the enclosed write-up? It is our hope that the Mennonite Church may in future generations continue to hold sacred the principles of non-resistance and non-militarism as taught by Christ in the New Testament.

May I hear from you right soon? Thanking you,

I am

Yours very truly,

JEH/MRA

John E. Hartzler

RESOLUTION

1. From the days of Christ until the present there have been bodies of Christian believers who accepted the teaching of Christ in a literal interpretation that carnal warfare was both anti-christian, wrong as well as unnecessary. They believed that it is a direct teaching of Christ that men should love their enemies and that they should do good to those who spitefully use them. They believed that the only way to overcome evil is with good.
2. The Mennonite Church in America has always held this doctrine as one of the principal tenants of the Christian religion. This is evidenced by the records of our numerous district conferences, also the Mennonite General Conference. We recognize the contradiction of "Christian Nations at War". We believe that there is no such thing as "Christian Sword" and a "Righteous War". We believe that the command which came from the Master, the Prince of Peace, nearly 2000 years ago is still obligatory- "Love your enemies", "Resist not evil", "Do good to them that hate you".
3. The Mennonite Church believes that war, no matter how lofty its motive, how great apparently are the heroic sacrifices, is nevertheless the result of ignorance, jealousy, greed, pride, hatred, lust, treachery and falsehood and that those who thus engage themselves are void of the finer virtues of love, gentleness, goodness, meekness, faith, charity and helpful service. We agree with Napoleon that "War is the business of barbarians" and with Sherman that "War is hell", and with Hooker "The truth is good men cannot be good men and fighting men. They must have the devil in them".
4. Because of the above principles, the Mennonite Church believes that it is our duty to pray for our rulers; to pay tribute without murmur or protest; to feed the hungry and to clothe the destitute; to relieve the suffering so made by the devastations of war, whether they be of our own countrymen or those of the enemy and to exercise the spirit of helpfulness and service.
5. We further believe that as Christians, we should not criticize our rulers, and those in authority but earnestly pray that God may give them wisdom to so conduct the affairs of state that the awful carnage which is now going on may speedily end; that the day may not be far distant when "He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plow shares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they have war any more". Isa. 2:4.
6. We believe that it is wrong for Christians to join the army or navy whether by voluntary enlistment or conscription, and that Christ would have us forfeit our property and lives rather than take up arms for the purpose of killing our fellowmen for whom Christ died.  
*cite ancestors of faith as evidence*
7. With the above as a premise and the absolute faith in Christ and His principles of Peace, we plead that we, as a church, with those of similar faith, be exempt from all military service. We further plead that Mennonite educational institutions be exempt from introducing military training and that the young men of our church who are enrolled in other schools be excused from all military drills.

Vineland Ont., May 7, 1917.

J. E. Hartzler,  
Goshen Ind.

Dear Brother:- Greeting. Your letter with enclosure regarding conference resolution received and noted.

The general sentiment of the "write-up" is good and should express broadly the position of the Mennonite Church on the military question. There are some suggestions that might be made. Of course you will correct the tenses and gramatic l arrangement where necessary. See Sec. 1

In section 2, there are a number of expressions that seem to me to be of a combative nature or very argumentative. "We believe that there is no such thing as, Etc." The sentence folowing is correct. If other phrases of a belief based upon the scripture could be added, - such doctrines as were held by the church in past ages and still maintained as principles of ur faith it would add strength to the statements, especially since they would folow logically the boight of Section 1.

Section 3, purports to be an opinion of our Church concerning war. Instd of stating the characteristics as they are stated, it seems to me that it would add strength to the point, to refer to the scripture showing tht war and the fruits of the flesh are in agreement, and that the fruits of the Spirit are the manifestations of the Christian life. This would avoid our stating our opinions of those who engage in war and believe they are doing right. This should be sespecially avoided, since in Sec. 5 We say, that "We believe that as Christians, we should not criticize our rulers". A;so , in Sec 3. we say that "We agree with Napoleon, Sherma and Hooker." The fact is, that we are not at all obliged to them for our faith nor for their opinions. We are making declarations here tht show our agreement with the Word of God. The authorities mentioned having no connection wh our faith or Church, neither with our practices. for, while they belived the wrongness of warfare, they still contined to wage it and hold positions tht made them subject to the call of the naton to continue such "hellish" bus-ness when onsidered necessary. We agree with Christ and the Apostles, and a their opinions, as expressed in the Word should be cited.

Section 4, I questioned the connection in the phrase, "Because of the above principles," and what follows.

Section 5, already referred to, closes with a quotation from <sup>a</sup>Isiah, Mich should say "learn" war any more.

Section 6, Would it not add strength to the statemet to cite instances of ~~persons~~ past persecutions against persons of non-resistant faith, and also in modern times, showing the firm belief in those principles. which are held more sacred than life because they are the Word of God.

Sec. 7, Is this whole statement of our faith to be an appeal to the government.?

I trust this may be of some help to you in these perilous times.

Yours,

S. J. Coffman