



*dancer-lindsey
debate*



J. F. Dancer, Jr. was born in McNairy County Tennessee on November 20, 1930. He began preaching in Pekin, Illinois in June of 1953.

In addition to the time spent in Pekin, Illinois, he has done local work in Hammond, Indiana and is presently with the West End Church in Louisville, Kentucky.



Dail Ellis Lindsey was born in 1939. His home town is Waco, Texas, but he is presently preaching at the Guadalupe Street congregation in Laredo, Texas.

Brother Lindsey is identified with Churches of Christ which defend the Herald of Truth Program and Orphan Homes, although he loves and respects other brethren who differ without being fanatical.

Although only 25, this is his fourth published debate; the remaining three defended Bible Classes (opponent, Ronny Wade), Individual Communion Cups (opponent, Ronny Wade), and Women Not Wearing Artificial Headdresses and Cutting Their Hair (opponent, E. H. Miller). He also has disputed with Baptists and Pentecostals. He is the author of a number of tracts.

Published by J. F. Dancer, Jr.
4401 W. Broadway, Louisville,
Kentucky 40211
1965

PROPOSITION: The Bible teaches that a Christian sins if he intentionally takes the life of another man while serving in the armed forces.

PROPOSITION: The Bible teaches that a Christian sins if he intentionally takes the life of another man while serving in the armed forces.

J. F. Dancer, Jr. - affirms
Dail Ellis Lindsey - denies

DANCER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

- A1. Terms defined: (1) "the Bible teaches" - the Bible is the authority, (2) "a Christian sins" - violates God's teaching, (3) "if he intentionally" - deliberately, with forethought, not accidental, (4) "takes the life" - kills, (5) "of another man" - another human, regardless of age or sex, (6) "while serving in the armed forces" - acting by the command of his government. The discussion does not involve the right of the Christian to serve in the armed forces or the right of the civil government to wage war, but CAN THE CHRISTIAN DELIBERATELY KILL, WITHOUT SINNING, BY THE COMMAND OF HIS GOVERNMENT??
- A2. My affirmation consist of two parts. When I prove them, I have proven my proposition. They are: (1) deliberate killing is contrary to the nature of Christians, thereby sinful, (2) personal responsibility is not lost just because the Christian is "told" to act.

PROOF FOR PART ONE

- A3. God's kingdom is peaceful in nature (Isaiah 2:4; 11:6-9). This shows the nature of the kingdom to be opposed to war, violence and bloodshed. Christians are citizens of that kingdom (Col. 1:13) and are to be characterized by peaceful actions. Isaiah said they would not "learn war any more". This means when one is converted to Christ, he has no interest in taking the lives of others. War and killing are generally based upon hate and revenge which are no part of the Christian's nature.
- A4. Christians must follow the "golden rule" (Luke 6:31). To fail is sinful! Is it practicing the "golden rule" to bomb, burn and kill? Is that how Christians desire to be treated? No Christian desires to face God unprepared, yet, when he kills he forces those killed to face God (Heb. 9:27), many times unprepared. This violates the "golden rule" and is sinful!
- A5. Love is a characteristic of the Christian. Love for brethren in every nation (1 Pet. 2:17; Jno. 13:35); love for neighbors (Gal. 5:14) and even for enemies (Matt. 5:44) is enjoined by God. Christians cannot work "ill" (harm) toward anyone they love (Rom. 13:20; 1 Cor. 13:5). They are to "do good" unto their enemies (Rom. 12:19,20). Since Christians cannot harm (work "ill") their brethren, neighbors or enemies, **THEY CANNOT KILL ANYONE!**
- A6. These principles (par. 3, 4, 5) shows deliberate killing is contrary to the nature of Christians and therefore sinful. We now move to part 2.

PROOF FOR PART TWO

- A7. Can Christians violate these principles in obedience to their government without sin? When he kills, is the responsibility his, or does it belong to the government, who commanded it? Suppose he is told to hate, steal (part of war for survival), cease preaching or forsake the assembling with saints to show forth the Lord's death? Can he obey without sin? Is he responsible to God for his actions? Or must the government alone answer? Christians must always act as to bring glory to God (Matt. 5:16). Christ is to be magnified in their bodies by either life or death (Phil. 1:20,21). These show responsibility to **OBEY GOD ALWAYS!**
- A8. Christians must answer for every deed "done in his body" (2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:5,7). To say, "I acted in obedience to the government" when it violates the very principles of

Christianity is no reason to act. The apostles recognized this when the "powers that be" told them to cease preaching (Acts 5:28,29). If the authorities cannot tell Christians to "cease preaching", how can they tell them to "work ill to their enemies" (by killing them)? The Christian cannot obey either command. He has Christ living in him (Gal. 2:20) and cannot do anything, regardless of who commands, contrary to His teaching. Christians never lose their responsibility for their own acts!

- A9. I have shown deliberate killing is foreign to the nature of God's kingdom and not a part of a Christian's life. I also proved that Christians must answer for EVERY DEED they commit. True, they must "submit" to the government, but not to the extent of going contrary to the principles and nature of their heavenly citizenship (Phil. 3:20). Therefore, I have proved my proposition, CHRISTIANS CANNOT DELIBERATELY KILL WITHOUT SINNING!

LINDSEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE

- N1. The definition of terms is accepted. Questions: (1) If it is a sin to kill in the Service, then wouldn't it be a sin even to be in the Service and be an accessory to the killing? (2) Are governments condemned for waging defensive wars? (3) Are sinners under the same law as Christians?
- N2.,3. Isa.2:4; 11:6-9 is a prophecy of the spiritual peace between Jews and Gentiles, and has no reference to carnal warfare. Eph. 2:11-17 shows that this peace is that of both being made one body by Christ. (Cf. Isa. 2; 11; Ezek. 34; and Rom. 15.) There will be "wars and rumours of wars" (Matt. 24:6). Yes, Christians are citizens of God's kingdom (Col. 1:13); but Paul was also a citizen of the Roman kingdom (Acts 21:39), characterized by both peace and war.
- N4. If the "golden rule" (Lk. 6:31) forbids war, then it also forbids doing anything, e.g. rebuking, which the person doesn't like. Yes, the person killed is forced to face God (Heb. 9:27), just as was the case when Gideon, Saul, David, and others killed in war with God's approval. Were these men guilty of hate simply because they killed? Didn't they love? Although the "golden rule" was in force even in the day of these killings (Lev. 19:18), it wasn't violated in these cases or similar ones.
- N5.,6. Everyone agrees that it is essential for one to love in order to be a child of God, but Brother Dancer must prove that one cannot love yet kill in war. Although Rom.13:10 says that, "love worketh no ill to his neighbor", this principle, though in existence (Lev.19:18), did not forbid war in the Old Testament. Why then, should we suppose that it does in the New? "Ill" here is translated from the Greek noun kakos, which refers only to the type harm that is "base, wrong, wicked" (Thayer's lexicon, p. 320). Even one of the ten commandments said, "Thou shall not kill" (murder), but this did not forbid Gideon and others to kill in war. Rom. 13:10 forbids aggression, not defensive or protective measures.
- N7. Yes, a Christian is personally responsible for what he does anywhere. In my opinion, however, this has nothing to do with the proposition; for Brother Dancer must prove that a Christian sins in being responsible for the death of enemies in battle.
- N8. Rom.13:10 was studied in paragraph 5. If it were sinful for Christians to kill in war, then, naturally, they would be obligated to abstain from it, regardless of what the governmental authorities commanded. But since Brother Dancer has not proved that Christians sin by killing in war, his statement about obeying God rather than men is only begging the question.
- N9. No proof has been given to support the proposition. Both in the Old Testament and the New, man of God were forbidden to take the law into their own hands or work evil aga-

inst their friends or enemies; yet the Old Testament contains accounts of wars sanctioned by God, and the New Testament nowhere forbids them.

- N10. A group of soldiers once asked John the Baptist, forerunner of Christ, "what shall we do?" The Baptist replied: "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages" (Lk. 3:14). Notes: (1) "Do violence" is translated from the Greek verb diaseio, which here means "to extort from one by intimidation money or other property" (Thayer's lexicon, p. 141; all authorities agree). (2) Instead of condemning warfare or telling the soldiers not to kill enemies, the Baptist told them to be content with their wages. This implies that John, by inspiration, sanctioned their position. Surely, if being in Service and killing in war is sinful, John would have told them; for they asked, "what shall we do?" John did not tell them to give up their wages as soldiers, but to be content with them.
- N11. From Acts 16:27-36 we learn that the keeper of the Philippian prison carried a sword (was a soldier); that he was converted and baptized in the dead of the night; and that he was still the keeper of the prison the morning following his conversion (verse 36). Here was a Christian soldier, prepared to war, if necessary, to keep the prison. Yes, Christians may kill in war.

2nd AFF.

A10. My opponent agrees that it is essential for Christians to love and that they are personally responsible for their every action. He further says that a "spiritual peace" is supposed to characterize them in every nation (Jew and Gentile N2, 3) --- yet he says they can still bomb, burn and kill! Since Isaiah 2:4 prophesies of "spiritual peace" does it not imply that those men who enjoy this "peace" would also have a peaceful disposition toward each other? Can Christians kill Christians in different nations at any time? There is no evidence that Christians (either Jews or Gentiles) participated in the wars of Matt.24:6. Nor is there evidence that Paul ever went to war.

HIS QUESTIONS

A11. (1) Not in this proposition --- let's settle this one before we get into "accessory" action. (2) No. (3) All men are subject to obedience to the gospel, but some of God's laws pertain only to Christians - Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:18ff); giving (1 Cor. 16:1, 2); suit at civil court (1 Cor. 6:1-8); new life and disposition (2 Cor. 5:17).

A12. QUESTIONS: (1) Must Christians obey Luke 6:31? (2) Since you believe Rom.13:10 forbids aggression (N5,6), can Christians kill in a war of aggression without sin? (3) Do Christians desire their enemies to overrun their country, burning, bombing and killing?

A13. Brother Lindsey evidently misunderstands the "golden rule" (Luke 6:31). It says, "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them". Christians desire rebukes when they are needed because they want to go to heaven. But do Christians desire to face God unprepared? NO! Therefore, they have no right to force others (those they kill) to do so. Lev. 19:18 is not the same as the "golden rule". The context shows it has reference to Israelites and possibly those living nearby, but not their enemies, while that of Luke 6:31 includes all men, enemies included.

A14. The fact that Gideon, Saul, etc. killed with God's approval (N4) has no bearing upon our actions. GOD TOLD THEM WHOM TO KILL! HE LED THEM INTO BATTLE! He no longer specifies those deserving death nor does He lead any nation into war as He did then. War was allowed then because that kingdom was material and was enlarged and protected by carnal wars. To have a parallel today the Christian would have to fight (physically) to enlarge and protect the "kingdom of God", which he cannot do (2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:12). Joshua and others fought (with God's approval) wars of aggression. Does God approve of such today? No, so down goes the arguments from the Old Testament.

A15. Then he says "the New Testament nowhere forbids them" (meaning men of God at war, N9). Do we live by what the New Testament says or by what it does not say?? Christians live by faith (2 Cor. 5: 7) which comes from hearing the Word (Rom.10:17). For an action to be right it must be "authorized" by scripture. It is not allowed just because it is not "forbidden". The "silence of the scriptures" never authorized anything.

A16. Since brother Lindsey brought up the Greek (N5, 6), notice the meaning of "love". It comes from "agapa" and "agapao" which Thayer (Lexicon, pp. 3, 4, 653) defines as to "wish well", "good will", "to be kindly disposed to one". How can Christians feel this way toward their enemies and because of this feeling not do anything to them that is "base, wrong, wicked" (Rom.13:10) and THEN KILL, not only men, but WOMEN AND CHILDREN? One cannot be "kindly disposed" toward his enemies and at the same time kill them.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS ANSWERED

A17. John the Baptist lived and died under the law of Moses and what he told the soldiers (N10) do do has no bearing upon living as a Christian. John's work was to prepare the

people for Jesus, not tell them how Christians should behave. To have an argument from the jailer of Acts 16 (N11) brother Lindsey must prove that HE DID USE HIS SWORD (with God's approval) AFTER becoming a Christian. He cannot prove such, therefore he has no argument. My proposition still stands!

2nd NEG.

- N10. I have proved that the peace of Isa. 2:4 refers to the SPIRITUAL peace between Jews and Gentiles. The Jews once were God's chosen people, but "peace" was made when the Gentiles were brought in. JESUS was this "peace" (Eph.2:14), with no reference to carnal war. Since there will be "wars and rumors of wars" (Matt. 24:6), Isa. 2:4 cannot be a prophecy of world peace. As to Christians killing Christians, when two nations go to war, one of them is wrong; and the Christian should not serve or obey a government in the wrong (Acts 5:29). If this is followed, Christians will not kill Christians.
- N11. HIS REPLY TO MY QUESTIONS. (1) Although Dancer first introduced non-combatant Service, he now complains that my question is not on the proposition, as if his "Christians kill Christians" were in it. May one participate in war if he doesn't kill? (2) He says that governments are not forbidden to wage defensive wars, but that Christians are, as if Christians were never in the government. Tell us how it is right for one but wrong for the other. The very reason a sinner is a sinner is that he will not obey Christ's law. (3) A sinner is condemned for not having a "new life and disposition", and for not being in position to live for Christ. Since sin is the transgression of the law, the SINNER is under the law of Christ. Note: Sinners are not condemned by God's law for waging defensive wars (Dancer admits), but Christians are under the same law as sinners; therefore, Christians are not condemned by God's law for waging defensive wars.
- N12. HIS QUESTIONS ANSWERED. (1) Yes. (2) Not if they know it is aggression. (3) If it is to shorten war, save lives, and bring peace and truth, Christians should desire that their country be overrun.
- N13. Yes, "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them" (Lk.6:31). This SAME golden rule was in the "law and prophets" (Matt.7:12). Lev.19:18 states the same general principle, and vs. 34 shows that it was applied even to strangers; yet this did not condemn wars of the Old Testament. God always has commanded men to love, and forbidden them to hate. Note: Christians desire to be stopped by force if and when they backslide and commit acts of aggression, but Christians are to do unto others as they, themselves, wish to be treated (Lk. 6:31); therefore, Christians should stop by force all who commit acts of aggression.
- N14. God does not tell us directly whom to kill or what to do; but He did tell us to be subject to the powers that be (Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:14,15), who do know our enemies. The soldiers the Baptist approved (Lk.3:14) had not God as a direct commander. Joshua fought no wars of aggression, nor did any child of God.
- N15. I said that the Old Testament allowed wars, and that the New Testament doesn't forbid them. Surely, Dancer will agree that when the New Testament doesn't forbid a thing IN SOME WAY (e.g., the law of exclusion), that thing is permissible.
- N16. Brother Dancer, agapao (love) is used in Lev.19:18 in the Septuagint Greek Translation, but this didn't forbid war. No Scripture says it is "base, wrong, wicked" (Rom. 13:10) for Christians to kill in war. You mention "women and children", but Saul was condemned for not killing them (1 Sam. 15). Weren't the Old Testament soldiers of God "well disposed"? Tell us.

N17. John the Baptist, though subject to the Law of Moses, came preparing the way for Jesus. He taught baptism, and a score of other things not in Moses' law. In fact, I call on Dancer to show a single exclusively Old Testament thing he taught. John came teaching the *NW*. He upheld soldiers and their position in Service (Lk. 3:14), as I proved. Lk. 6:31 was given before the cross, yet Dancer wears it out.

Now, Dancer says I must prove that the Christian Jailer DID use his sword. Isn't it enough that he was a jailer after conversion (Acts 16:36), and that his job was to kill if necessary? He was a soldier with a sword, as I proved; and he - A CHRISTIAN - was ready to kill if necessary.

3rd AFF.

- A18. No, it is not enough to sustain your argument (your #11, 1st Neg) to show that the jailer in Acts 16 was still a jailer after baptism. You used him to prove that a Christian CAN KILL with GOD'S APPROVAL - well, show that the jailer DID KILL (and God approved) after becoming a Christian or leave him alone!
- A19. I am accused of "wearing out" Luke 6:31. Well, let's see. My opponent agrees Christians have no desire to die in sin. He says Christians MUST obey Luke 6:31. At the same time he tries to justify Christians forcing others to die in sin. No, rather Luke 6:31 is wearing him out.
- A20. Brother Lindsey says the Christian should not obey the government when it is wrong (his N10, 2nd neg), yet he says the government is the one who identifies our enemies (N14). How can we know when the government is wrong if it is the one who says who should be killed? He says it is sinful to fight "aggressively" (if the Christian knows it is an aggressive fight). Suppose the Christian was deceived by his government and thinks he is fighting defensively? Does God excuse him because of his ignorance? Eve was deceived (1 Tim.2:14) but she answered for her act. Paul says ignorance is no excuse (Acts 17:30). Sin is sin, even if the person is deceived.
- A21. God uses the government to punish evildoers (Rom.13:1-7), but nowhere in the New Testament does he tell the Christian to take part in that punishment. Rom. 13:1 shows that God made a distinction between the government and the Christian. Let's keep that distinction today. The conclusion in #11 (2nd neg) is false because the minor premises is invalid. Christians and sinners DO NOT live under the same portions of law. Christians are children of God and must live accordingly, while sinners do not have to live up to those standards. The sinner will be condemned because HE FACED GOD IN SIN (2 Thess.1:8,9). People are expected to live as "Christians" (with new life and disposition) ONLY after they have been "born again" (Rom.6:4).
- A22. Lev.19:18 DID FORBID WAR against "the children of thy people" and "thy neighbor". The only reason the Israelites could (if they did) war against those in this verse would be for God to temporarily set this aside by TELLING THEM TO GO TO WAR. Without that further revelation from God, they could not fight! God never approved of His children killing unless He pointed out those to die. To have a parallel today God would have to tell us to go to war and DOES NOT!
- A23. Joshua DID fight aggressively! See the battle of Jericho (Joshua 6). This was done with God's approval. God TOLD Saul to kill the women and children. These Old Testament examples do Lindsey no good for God no longer leads men to war. Instead, He says "love", "do good" and "pray for your enemies". With no instructions to kill, the "law of exclusion" excludes the Christian killing anyone.
- A24. Back to the "golden rule". Lindsey says "Christians desire to be stopped by force when they backslide and commit acts of aggression" (N13). Do they desire to be killed while committing those acts of aggression as backsliders? NO! Therefore they have no right to kill someone else in the act of aggression. He further says, "Christians should stop by force all who commit acts of aggression". Jesus said if one smites you on one cheek (aggressive act) "turn the other" -- not kill him. And if one compells you to go one mile (aggressive act) "go two" -- not kill him (Matt. 5:39-41). Brother Lindsey, let both of us follow Jesus!
- A25. Christians must love their enemies and do good toward them (Matt. 5:44; Rom. 12:20). Those they love, they are kindly disposed toward and do nothing to them that is wicked. It is impossible for one to love another, do good to him, wish him well, want him to die "in the Lord" and kill him while he is living in sin!

3rd NEG.

- N18. I proved in my First Negative that the Christian jailer of Philippi was prepared to kill AFTER conversion (Acts 16:23-36). The proposition does not obligate me to prove that a Christian DID KILL, but that he MAY KILL in war. There are many things we have the right to do, for which there is no express example in the New Testament. If the jailer was approved by God for being prepared to kill, he could not have been condemned for proper killing.
- N19. Dancer's only "reply" to the fact that John the Baptist approved soldiers (Lk. 3:14) was that John said this before the cross. I proved that although the "Golden Rule" of Lk. 6:31 was said before the cross, Dancer wears it out. He made no reply in his last article, nor did he even mention my reply on Isa. 2:4. God forced many to die in sin, as did His prophets. No reply!
- N20. Christians should be able to know the enemies of truth (Heb. 5:14). I did not say Christians cannot fight "aggressively," as Dancer says I said; I said they can't knowingly commit aggression. If a Christian is committing aggression but doesn't know it, he is no more guilty than the Christian who accidentally kills someone. Although the soldiers the Baptist approved, and the Christian jailer, were subject to being deceived, and although they had not God as a direct commander, they still remained in the Service, and were prepared to kill - all with God's approval. Tell us, Dancer, could a Christian be a non-combatant in Service if the government deceived him? The sin of Eve, which Dancer refers to, was not an accident; for God had told her not to eat forbidden fruit (under ANY circumstances). Acts 17:30 does not refer to accident; and I challenge you, Dancer, to say that it does.
- N21. Dancer says God did not tell the Christian to take part in the punishment of evil-doers; but although God did not even tell the sinner to punish evil doers, Dancer says the sinner should so punish. He says that God made a distinction between the government and the Christian. The same Scripture which allows a Christian to be a non-combatant allows him to be a combatant so far as being in the government is concerned. How about Civil Service? As to sinners, how could the sinner violate the law to be born again if he is not under, or subject to, this law? Sin is transgression of the law (1 Jno. 3:4). Sinners are under COMMAND (Acts 17:30), and they sin for not living as Christians. Name one thing, Dancer, which is wrong for a Christian to do but which is not wrong for a sinner to do. Sinners, therefore, are under the same law as Christians. Note: Sinners are not condemned by God's law for waging defensive wars (Dancer admits), but Christians are under the same law as sinners; therefore, Christians are not condemned by God's law for waging defensive wars.
- N22. If God set aside the love of Lev. 19:18 so that His servants could fight, as Dancer says, this would mean His servants HATED enemies; and were approved in it! God never set love aside (1 Jno. 2:7-11). See paragraphs N20 and N23 on direct command from God.
- N23. Dancer accuses Joshua of aggression! Joshua was only fighting to gain a portion of land to which he had a right, but which the inhabitants of Canaan would not part with without war. Did God command this killing (Joshua 6)? Not aggression!
- N24. In my last article, I said: "Christians desire to be stopped by force if and when they backslide and commit acts of aggression, but Christians are to do unto others as they, themselves, wish to be treated (Lk. 6:31); therefore, Christians should stop by force all who commit acts of aggression." All Dancer can say is: "Do they desire to be killed while committing those acts of aggression as backsliders?" No; but neither do they desire to be REBUKED or PREACHED TO! Matt. 5:39-41 speaks only of a slap on the cheek - a mere insult, and not aggression. Christians are not to fight such, but may protect themselves from attempts on life, etc. (Acts 16).

N25. The principles of Matt. 5:39-41 and Rom. 12 are in the Old Law, but did not forbid war of a just nature.

- A26. Brother Lindsey says that Matt. 5 and Rom. 12 did not forbid wars of "just nature". This implies they did forbid "unjust wars". What is an "unjust war"? Who determines whether "just" or "unjust"?
- A27. He denies Matt. 5:39-41 mentioning aggression. Aggression is: "a first or unprovoked attack, an act of hostility; also the practice of attack or encroachment" (Webster). Certainly Matt. 5:39-41 concerns aggression. Jesus said don't resist it! Brother Lindsey obviously still misses the point of Luke 6:31. In plain words it says, "treat others as you would like to be treated". I don't want to be killed in sin, therefore I cannot kill others in sin. I want to be rebuked when I err, therefore I rebuke others in error. The wishes of the one in sin are not considered. Christians act in the way they want others to act.
- A28. "Did God command this killing (Joshua 6)?" (N23). Certainly, but that does not mean it wasn't aggression. See definition above. God has, in times past, commanded aggressive wars, HE NO LONGER DOES. You said exactly what I said you did in reference to "aggressive action". See my A20, your N12, N20. Eve was deceived (1 Tim. 2:14), her sin was no "accident". Acts 17:30 refers to sins of ignorance, hence includes deception. Neither were excused by God. Brother Lindsey admits aggressive killing is sinful, but says if the government deceives the one doing it, it is not sin! Use his reasoning with Eve: eating "forbidden fruit" was sin. Eve was deceived, so it was not sin. Not so! Deception does not excuse!
- A29. 1 Jno. 2:7-11 concerns feelings toward brethren. It has no connection with whether God ever set aside "love". I never said God set aside Lev. 19:18,34. I said (my A22) if Israel ever did war against those of Lev. 19:18,34 (with God's approval) they would have to have more instructions from God, those they had would not allow it!
- A30. God said the government was to punish evildoers (Rom. 13:3-6). The distinction between Christian and government is seen in verses 4, 6. Non-combatant service is again brought up. Not in this proposition. We are discussing KILLING! He asks, "What about Civil Service?" Well, what about it? Please set us straight on knowing whom to kill, first, the government is to tell us (N14), now, we should recognize them ourselves (N20). Which is it? Heb. 5:14 applies to those of "full age" and refers to recognizing "good and evil" and has no reference to "enemies".
- A31. Again brother Lindsey insists that sinners and Christians are under identical portions of law. I am asked one thing that is wrong for Christians but is not wrong for sinners. Here's two: (1) going to law against brethren (1 Cor. 6:1-8), (2) baptism for remission of sins (Acts 8:12-24). All men are under God's law. Some portions apply only to each group. Therefore conclusion in N21 false.
- A32. Isaiah 2:4 refers to the "peaceful nature" characterizing those in God's kingdom all over the world. This is further seen in James 3:17. Every Christian is to have a peaceful disposition. Call it "spiritual peace" if you like, but it's still peace, which is directly opposed to killing!
- A33. Back to the Philippian Jailer. Brother Lindsey has not (and cannot) proved that he was even prepared to kill after becoming a Christian. True, he was still a "keeper of the prison" but that doesn't prove he was ready to kill. One can't even prove that he kept his sword after conversion, much less that he was ready to use it. On another occasion Jesus approved possession of a sword but not its use (Luke 22:36; Matt. 26:52). The jailer proves nothing for Lindsey.
- A34. MAJOR PREMISE: Christians are to treat others as they would be treated.

MINOR PREMISE; Christians have no desire to be killed in sin.

Brother Lindsey admits both.

CONCLUSION: Christians cannot kill those participating in aggressive war (Lindsey admits is sin) because it forces them to die in sin. Killing is therefore contrary to a Christian's nature. My proposition stands!

4th NEG.

- N26. You cannot answer arguments by ignoring them, Brother Dancer. Yes, as I have shown, God condemns those who wage unjust wars. An unjust war is a war of aggression, which anyone should know is wrong.
- N27. Matt. 5:39-41 does not speak of aggression; for this passage speaks of violence between individuals, which is called assault. An invasion of a NATION'S territories is aggression, but an intrusion upon a neighboring estate is only trespass. (See Funk and Wagnall's Dictionary.) A Christian should not resist the petty slap of Matt. 5; he should leave it to the authorities (Rom. 13). An attack on life, however, may be resisted (Acts 16). I wish to be killed in sin if that is what it takes to stop me from killing others, don't you, Dancer? Tell us. And since we are to treat others the way we wish to be treated, we should kill them if necessary, even if they don't like it (just as they don't like rebukes). The Golden Rule of Matt. 7:12 was said to SINNERS and disciples. God's soldiers who lived under the "law and prophets" were subject to the Golden Rule (Matt. 7:12), and this is the way they obeyed it - killed when necessary. Dancer refuses to reply. He thinks his silence will cover up his failures.
- N28. Give us the passage in which God commanded the killing of Joshua 6. Joshua invaded his OWN property, not the enemy's; hence, no aggression. "Aggression" seldom means "aggressively" or "aggressive", Brother Dancer. A question on deception: Would a man be condemned in helping robbers escape if he did not know they were escaping robbers? I have referred to accident, not deception, other than to ask you a question (which you ignored). You were silent on my reply on Acts 17:11 and Eve. Why? The possibility of being deceived (not in proposition) did not keep the jailer out of Service.
- N29. Love was commanded from the beginning (1 Jno. 2:7-11), and included love of enemies (Prov. 25:21). The same law of Moses which contained the love of Lev. 19:18 also contained the approval of just war for servants of God (Deut. 19; 20, 21). Long before Moses' Law was given, Abraham and his 318 soldiers defeated enemies and rescued Lot and stolen goods (Gen. 14:8-20). God approved. Moses killed an Egyptian to protect a Hebrew (Ex. 2:11, 12).
- N30. In Rom. 13:3-6, there is no distinction between the Christian and the government; if there were, then a Christian could not be a part of ANY agency of government, as for example, the Post Office Department. I can see why Dancer refuses to discuss non-combatant Service. Yet he discusses aggression, government, deception, and a dozen other things not implied in the proposition. BOTH the government and Christians determine enemies. Aren't "enemies" of truth "evil"? Even babes in Christ, and most who are not even in Christ, know enemies of truth - by nature (Rom. 2:14).
- N31. Although Dancer says a sinner is not wrong for remaining unbaptized, baptism is a COMMAND to the SINNER (Acts 10:48). If one can transgress by refusing baptism, he is under Christ's law; "for where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. 4:15). The sinner is condemned for not being a Christian; and, thus, for not submitting to the law, as in court cases (1 Cor. 6:1-8). Thus, my syllogism stands.
- N32. My reply on Isa. 2:4 remains ignored, and I see no reason to repeat the reply. A just war is to secure and maintain PEACE, as it was in the Old Testament.

N33. Dancer finally admits the Christian man of Acts 16 was a jailer after conversion. Well, the jailer's position demanded his killing if necessary. This was his job. If he had failed to comply with his position, he would have been a hypocrite in holding his job; and a hypocrite is not a Christian. Jesus commanded the possession of swords by His disciples because of a dangerous mission (Lk. 22:36-38). If they could not use the swords for defense, what were they for, and why would they be hypocrites in giving the wrong impression? Peter wrongly used his sword to resist false arrest, which he knew was prophesied, and which resistance Jesus did not need then (Matt.26:52-54).

N34. Noticed under paragraph N27.

N35. Dancer continues to ignore my argument on John the Baptist and the soldiers he approved. Why?

5th AFF.

- A35. Let the readers judge whether I "ignored" any arguments. The disciples' mission was to preach the gospel. Danger was not the reason for the sword of Luke 22:36-38 because two swords were sufficient for twelve men. By your definition of a "just war" we should war "to secure and maintain peace as it was in the Old Testament" (N32). This was peace in God's kingdom, but WE CANNOT war for such today (2 Cor. 10:3-6). Matt. 26:52-54 proves the disciples' swords were for the purpose of teaching an object lesson on submissiveness to civil authority.
- A36. Brother Lindsey admits that some of God's laws apply ONLY to sinners (his N31). By admitting this, he admits that some apply ONLY to Christians. This is my contention (A11). They are under different portions of law. Sinners are commanded to be baptized (Acts 10:48). After baptism, they have "new life" and must love their enemies (Matt. 5:44) and do good unto them (Rom. 12:17-21).
- A37. Now we are told enemies are known "by nature" (N30). His proof passage (Rom. 2:14) has no connection whatsoever with recognition of enemies. To apply it this way is to twist it's meaning. Rom. 13:3-6 shows the responsibility of the government to punish evildoers. The Christian is not to fear this punitive power. Why? Because he is a part of that power? No, because he does good and not evil! Christians can serve in any capacity that does not cause them to violate the rules of "new life".
- A38. Abraham, Moses and John were not Christians. Many Old Testament characters killed. Sometimes God approved, but where is the passage where He approves Christians deliberately killing? 1 Jno. 2:7-11 refers to the "beginning" of their learning Jesus' teaching and not the "beginning" of time. Deut. 19:20, 21 does not mention war. God commanded Moses to drive the inhabitants from Canaan (Num. 33:50-56). This was passed to Joshua (Josh. 1:1-9). The answer to your question (N28) would depend upon WHAT the man did as he helped the robbers escape. Eve's example shows one must answer for deception when a plain command of God is broken.
- A39. You misuse Funk and Wagnall. They define AGGRESSION as Webster did (my A27). You took the SYNONYM usage. Assault and trespass are TYPES of aggression. ANY first and unprovoked violation of one's rights is aggression! Matt. 5:39-41 is aggression because one has a right to not be slapped. By your definition, America became the aggressor when she invaded Germany, Italy and Japan.
- A40. NO, I do not wish to be killed in sin (your N27)! ALL WHO DIE IN SIN GO TO HELL! I have no desire to go there, neither does any faithful Christian. He became a Christian to escape hell. He lives by faith (2 Cor. 5:7) in order to save his soul (Heb. 10:39). That's the difference between Christians and aliens. Don't you want to retract your statement about wishing "to be killed in sin"?
- A41. The jailer was in "service" before conversion. There is no proof his job required killing. The only person the scriptures show he ever was willing to kill was himself. You are assuming his job demanded killing and that he was willing to kill after becoming a Christian.
- A42. Brother Lindsey, you accepted my definition of terms (your N1) which made no distinction in "just" or "unjust" wars. I said, "acting by the command of his government" (my A1). You say, "God condemns those who wage unjust wars" (N26) and thus ADMIT MY PROPOSITION! Admit you admitted it or repudiate your statement!

5th NEG.

- N35. Dancer says the two swords of Lk. 22:36-38 were not for defense, because two were insufficient for twelve men. But woe to the bandits who attack twelve men who have two

swords! What were they for if not for defense? My reply on Matt.26:52-54 goes ignored. I said, concerning war, "A just war is to secure and maintain PEACE, as it was in the Old Testament" (N32). Dancer quotes this, but changes the meaning by omitting the comma. Why? "It" refers to "war" in my statement. Yes, 2 Cor.10:3-6 forbids Christians to build the church by carnal war, but this point is irrelevant.

- N36. Dancer thinks if he false accuses me of admitting that some of God's laws apply only to Christians, the readers might be gullible enough to believe him. But I have said all along, "Christians are under the same law as sinners" (e.g., N21). He ignored by arguments here, and cited only references already discussed.
- N37. To "do by nature the things contained in the law" (Rom. 2:14) would include knowing the enemies of truth who break the law. Thus, every honest person would recognize enemies of truth. But Dancer says I "twist its meaning". Because we are to pay taxes to the government (Rom. 13:7), does this mean that we cannot collect taxes, and thus be part of the government? Likewise, because we are to have no fear of the government (Rom.13:3), does this mean that we cannot be in the government - in Military Service, for example?
- N38. The prophets and Old Law were only UNTIL John the Baptist (Matt. 11:13); thus, John did not teach the Old Law. John taught the new, e.g. the kingdom, baptism, etc. He approved soldiers by inspiration (Lk. 3:14). See my pp. N10, N17, N19 --- all of which were ignored. Love was commanded from the beginning of the race (1 Jn. 2:7-11; 3:11, 12; Lev.19:18), but this did not forbid defensive war; for Deut.19,20,21 gives provisions for killing in just war. Note that I cited CHAPTERS 19, 20, 21 of Deut.; but that Dancer CHANGES this to CHAPTER 19 and VERSES 20,21, and tried to reply to that! Why? My question was dodged. In p.A29, he even denied that such provision as in Deut. 19, 20, 21 was given for war.
- N39. I am told I "misuse Funk and Wagnall." But assault was distinguished from aggression by this great dictionary, although the words are similar in meaning (synonyms). The proposition refers to the Military, and "Aggression refers....in a military sense to an unprovoked military attack....aggression has been defined as any use of armed force in international relations not justified by defensive necessity, international authority or consent of the state in whose territory force has been used" (Britannica, emphasis mine). No, the harmless slap on the cheek (Matt.5:39) is not aggression (but petty assault), and, therefore, should not be resisted. Germany, Italy, and Japan invaded our allies, to whom we were bound, Brother Dancer. The proposition says nothing of such slaps between individuals, but Dancer brings it up; yet he insists that we stick with the proposition.
- N40. Dancer says if he ever backslides he wants people just to let him kill people in sin all he wishes without being stopped by force or killed if necessary. What love! If I ever must be killed to stop me from aggression or deadly assault, so let it be; and I try to treat others the same way. "Don't you want to retract your statement"?
- N41. The jailer remained in service after conversion (Acts 16:36), as Dancer admitted (his p. A33). But he denies the jailer's job was to kill if necessary. What, then, was the jailer for? I suppose the sword he carried (Acts 16:27) was for looks! Name one jailer whose job was not to kill if necessary. This Christian was prepared to.
- N42. Neither did the proposition make a distinction between killing enemies or friends, Brother Dancer, nor between killing deliberately when sane or insane; yet we should be mature enough to take some things for granted. You know I am not defending a Christian to do as he pleases in any and all circumstances of war. I am in the negative of your proposition. Why this petty attempt on the proposition?
- N43. I leave the issue to the readers to decide for themselves.

FINAL REJOINER

- A43. My apology to brother Lindsey for changing Deut. 19, 20, 21 to Deut. 19:20,21, I mis-read his reference. However, neither justify war today!
- A44. Deliberate killing is contrary to the nature of Christianity because:
- 1) Nature of God's kingdom is peaceful.
 - 2) Christians must abide by the "golden rule".
 - 3) The "love" Christians must have for all (even enemies) requires they work "good" toward them rather than "harm".
- A45. I leave the final decision to the readers with the admonition of Paul, ".....Christ liveth in me....." (Gal. 2:20). Would Jesus kill to save human life? Everyone will answer for his deeds (in war and peace) at the judgment (2 Cor. 5:10; Acts 17:30,31).

THE END

PRICES

Single Copy.....	\$ 0.25
10 Copies.....	2.00
25 Copies.....	4.25
50 Copies.....	8.00
100 Copies.....	15.00

Postpaid When Payment Is Made With Order

ORDER FROM:

J. F. Dancer, Jr.
4401 W. Broadway
Louisville, Ky. 40211