

C.S. Lewis on Pacifism

In 1940, C.S. Lewis gave a talk to a pacifist group at Oxford: *Why I Am Not a Pacifist*. Years later it was printed [pages 64 to 90] with 8 other sermons and addresses he delivered during World War II in a book called *The Weight of Glory*. In the **Introduction**, the editor says that C.S. Lewis *never made any attempt to publish it* in his life time, and that it was printed after his death from a copy he had given to one of his students. So it may not represent what Lewis himself regarded as an important part of his Christian witness. But he never repudiated it, and the last part of it does make an argument against Christian pacifism.

The first part of the talk is a somewhat academic analysis of how we arrive at ethical judgments via Reason and *Conscience* and *intuitions*-- *The question is whether to serve in the wars at the command of the civil society to which we belong is a wicked action, or an action morally indifferent, or an action morally obligatory*. Perhaps because he is addressing a pacifist group, which was not necessarily a Christian group, he relies upon arguments of a more general character which lead him to the conclusions that **pacifism** is not practical, *universal peace* is unlikely to arrive, and that, historically, almost all societies have believed in *righteous war*--

81 "The sentence of general human authority is equally clear. From the dawn of history . . . the world echoes with the praise of righteous war. . . . Homer and Virgil, Plato and Aristotle, Zarathustra and the *Bhagavad Gita*."

81 "I am almost tempted to reply to the Pacifist as Johnson replied to Goldsmith, *Nay Sir, if you will not take the universal opinion of mankind, I have no more to say to you*. . . . Hooker thought *the general and perpetual voice of men is as the sentence of God Himself*."

And that is the argument with which Lewis concludes his talk: if he was a pacifist he would have *the voice of almost all humanity against me*. [*WG* page 90]

Which is a strange argument for a Christian moralist to make. Is *the universal opinion of mankind* the foundation of Christian morals ? Jesus taught nothing that they didn't already believe ? Did they believe in *love your enemies* and *do good to those who hate you* ? And Jesus introduces this teaching by the phrase: *You have heard it said . . . but I say . . .* which shows that he did not assume he was just re-affirming the **OPINION** they already had. (Matthew chapter 5)

The *Bhagavad Gita* is the Hindu holy book in which the god Krishna, disguised as a chariot driver, talks Prince Arjuna out of his scruples about engaging in a fratricidal battle against his kin folk. That might be enough to convince pious Hindus of the righteousness of war. But it is strange that Lewis should cite it as a moral authority contra pacifism, especially as he does not invoke the Old Testament sanctions of war, which is the usual approach of *bible* believers who want to justify war.

Which I argue with in *The New Covenant versus the Old Covenant*; *The Spiritual Warfare of Jesus Christ*; *What Does Jesus teach About The Law ? Render, Not Sur-render Unto Caesar*; *He Beat Them with a Whip ! Two Swords is Enough . . . Enough for What ? Who Would Jesus Bomb ? Turning the Other Cheek* and *Heresy of the Christian State* on the **www.Radical Christian Press.org** web site.

Similarly, invoking pagan and pre Christian writers like Homer and Virgil to justify war hardly suits the position of C.S. Lewis, one of the most prominent English Christian writers of the 20th century.

But, finally, in the last part of his talk, he does tackle the question of Christian Pacifism--

82 "But human authority may be discounted on a quite different ground. It may be held, at least by a **Christian Pacifist**, that the human race is fallen and corrupt, so that even the consent of great and wise human teachers and great nations widely separated in time and place affords no clue whatsoever to the good. If this contention is being made, we must then turn to our next head, that of Divine Authority."

His first major argument here is that the Anglican, Presbyterian and Catholic Churches all sanction war. Lewis, who belonged to the Church of England, cites "my immediate authority as an Anglican, the 39 articles . . . *it is lawful for Christian men at the command of the magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars.* He notes that the Presbyterians were not pacifists, that Thomas Aquinas justified war and that the popes, including the current pope, (Pope Pius XII) justified war.

The **MILITARY CHRISTIANITY**, which is the basic theology of these state churches, dates from the **cross in the sky** story--*IN THIS SIGN YOU WILL CONQUER*--which supposedly caused the Emperor Constantine to put the cross on the shields of his soldiers in 312 A.D. See *Church of the Empire* Chapter IV *Constantine's Miracle*.

God on Both Sides

It is true that the popes *justified* war, but it raises an obvious question which Lewis ignores: were both sides **righteous** in World War II ? The Pope in Italy was effectively on the opposite side of the war from the British. Pope Pius XI blessed Mussolini's army as they set out for Ethiopia. [He apparently knew the war was *unjust* = **unrighteous**--but could not say so. See *Tracking Satan 666*] Because Germany was Italy's ally, the Popes had to refrain from saying anything which might have caused German Catholics to lose enthusiasm for the German war effort, including the invasion of Catholic Poland that triggered the British Declaration of War on Germany.

In *German Catholics and Hitler's Wars*, published in 1962, Gordon Zahn documents the whole-hearted **PATRIOTIC** support for Hitler's wars from the German Catholic Church: "the German Catholic who looked to his religious superiors for spiritual guidance and direction regarding service in Hitler's wars received virtually the same answers he would have received from the Nazi ruler himself." [Zahn 17] See *Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors* page 13 and the letter added to the end which discusses the role of Pope Pius XII in World War II

In fact, Pope Pius XI was the first to recognize Hitler's government, and he signed a *Concordat* with him. The Pope was alarmed at the persecution of the Catholic Church by the Communists and recognized that Hitler and Mussolini were the major opponents of Communism in Europe. Which made sense at the time. If war is the effective antidote to evil, then Hitler was the antidote to Stalin. And vice versa, as the Allies decided. Those were the choices. In fact, Mussolini's *Fascists* arguably saved Italy from the Communists who came close to taking it over in the 1920s. And there was a similar battle in Germany between the Communists and the National Socialists. The civil war in Spain came down to a contest between the Communists and the Fascists.

All of the state churches justify war, but then we have the spectacle of both sides of a war supposedly being justified. Lewis neglects to notice the problem except in one place [77-78] where he imagines that--"two soldiers on opposite sides, each believing his own country to be in the right, each at the

moment when his selfishness is most in abeyance and his will to sacrifice in the ascendant, should kill [each] other in plain battle seems to me by no means one of the most terrible things in this very terrible world. Of course, one of them (at least) must be mistaken."

In World War I, when all of the major combatants were nominally *Christian* nations, you have the spectacle of nationalism trumping Christian faith or rather combining with it into an ideology of patriotic *Christianity* which somehow justifies war with other *Christian* nations. The German army had a German version of the same prayer book which was distributed to the English soldiers, *Mit Jesus in der Field*, which actually used the same picture, except that the soldier's uniform was changed. Crucifixes blessed by the Pope were distributed to the Catholics in both armies.

And they didn't even divide along the historic lines of Christian division. Mainly Protestant Germany went to war against mainly Protestant England. Catholic Italy was at war with Catholic Austria. Obviously they had long forgotten the admonition of Jesus that *all men will know you are my disciples if you love one another as I have loved you.* John 13.34-35

When America entered the first World War in April 1917, the Catholic Bishops of the United States immediately pledged Catholic support for the war and established the National Catholic War Council. It was the forerunner of the USCCB--the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Ben Salmon of Denver is probably the best known of a small number of Catholics who were sent to prison for refusing military service in World War I. Thousands of Americans were jailed just for speaking or writing against this war for *freedom*. [*Opponents of War 1917-1918* by Peterson and Fite] The same thing happened in England.

In World War II, these *two soldiers on opposite sides* were fighting for Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia. No doubt they had been brainwashed to believe in their side of the war, but the main thing these conscripts believed was that they would be shot if they refused to go forward into battle. Even if the cause had been **just**, they belonged to armies which routinely committed every kind of crime--killing civilians, looting stores and homes, raping women, starving prisoners to death. The Russians raped a million women in their march across Europe. Of 3.9 million Russian soldiers captured by the Germans in June 1941, 2.8 million had died by February 1942.

The assumption that the bishops of Germany preached was that these conscript soldiers, fighting for a demonic state, will go to heaven as Christian martyrs. [see *Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors* page 14.] And that of course is just what you have to do when your theology requires you to believe in the righteousness of the wars of your state. But, if serving in Hitler's army is a ticket to heaven, what do you have to do to get into hell ?

State Church Theology

The Churches which Lewis invokes as his authority were all State Churches in their original history and in the theology they were stuck with thereafter, even when they were dis-established. They were all directly or indirectly descended from the Imperial Church of the Roman Empire which Constantine and the *trahitor* bishops established in the 4th century and which did ban the Christian pacifism of the early church that persisted among the so-called *heretic* churches persecuted by the Empire and its official Church. See *The Church of the Empire*.

Lewis may not have known much of this history, but he was surely aware of groups like the Quakers, many thousands of whom had been imprisoned in England because they were pacifists, because they opposed slavery, and because they refused to attend the services of the Anglican State Church to which Lewis belonged. He is being less than candid in neglecting to even mention the existence of these

Christian Pacifist churches. In World War I there were a dozen of them in England and America--Quakers, Plymouth Brethren, Amish, Mennonites, Hutterites etc. and they were persecuted and prosecuted in both England and America. [See *The Martyrs of Alcatraz* in *The Plough* Summer 2014] In England, 6000 draft refusers were put in prison in World War I and about the same number in World War II, and most of them were Christian pacifists. That was in addition to some 16,000 given *Conscientious Objector* status in the first World War and 61,000 in WW II.

The Quakers began their opposition to slavery while Anglicans and the Anglican Church itself continued to own sugar plantations worked by slave labor in the West Indies. See page 67 of the book by Adam Hochschild *Bury the Chains* 2005, a good history of the Abolition movement and how the Quakers and their allies finally brought an end to legal slavery in the British Empire. They launched the Abolition Movement in America while George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and Patrick Henry et al perpetuated slavery. [See *The Great Land Hunt*] And they were put in jail for refusing to serve in the Revolutionary War of 1776. See *The Roots of Abortion* page 11 and 45 See also Hochschild's 2011 book about World War I: *To End All Wars*. You can justify slavery as easily as war, using the kind of argument Lewis employs: historically, the *common opinion of mankind*--Aristotle et al--accepted slavery as **righteous**.

patristic authority

On page 83 Lewis cites Augustine as his *patristic authority* for war and quotes the old argument based upon what John the Baptist did not say to the soldiers. Augustine was the principal author of the theology which has been used ever since to justify the Imperial Church and the wars of empire--as I discuss at length in *The Church of the Empire* and *Heresy of the Christian State*. The doctrine that Augustine states in *Contra Faustus* is that a *just man* should have no scruple about waging war at the command of an unjust king. That doctrine justified the Catholics and Lutherans of Germany in invading Poland and France at the command of Adolph Hitler. [See *Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors* page 23]

Augustine was an establishment intellectual whose pen was at the service of imperial policy, including especially the persecution of the *donatists* of North Africa--the Christians who refused to join the new imperial church. Lewis also invokes the support of *great and wise human teachers* like Aristotle, another establishment intellectual who gets some of the blame for the wars waged by his pupil Alexander the Great. Whose *greatness* is measured by the number of countries he invaded and the number of people he slaughtered.

the reply of the pirate to Alexander the Great:

*Because I do it with a little ship, I am called a robber.
You, because you do it with a great fleet,
are called an emperor.*

It was supposedly a grand thing that Alexander the Great marched all the way to India while imposing Greek culture every where he went. Despite their practices of slavery and buggery, their worship of randy gods and goddesses, and their constant wars, the Greeks were **so** enlightened. And so good at killing with their *phalanx* formation. They still believe this in various places. cf. *When eras die, their legacy is left to strange police, professors in New England guard the glory that was Greece*. [Clarence Day] You could hardly be at Oxford for any length of time without absorbing the prevailing ideology of a faith in *Western Civilization* as epitomized by Greece and Rome.

What was Alexander doing ? Defending Greece from the Persians ? Well, the best defense is a good offense. That is why Alexander had to lead his army all the way to India in a series of *righteous wars*. Or maybe they weren't so *righteous* but who cares about that now ?

One of Lewis's older contemporaries was the German Lutheran theologian Adolf Harnack, a close adviser to Kaiser Wilhelm, who drew up a statement of support for the German invasion of Belgium in 1914. He and the other 92 signers express their faith in Germany and deny the atrocities in Belgium alleged against the Germans-- *To the Civilized World . . . It is not true that our troops have brutally destroyed Louvain*. In August 1914 the Germans burned the historic library of Louvain with its unique collection of medieval manuscripts. The compromised situation of these men raises the obvious question as to how close you can be to imperial power without giving up any claim to integrity in passing judgment on the wars of the empire. And the same question has to be raised in respect to C.S. Lewis and other British professors and bishops with ties to the establishment of the British Empire.

the early church fathers

Lewis ignores the pre Nicene church fathers **Origen** and **Tertullian** who spoke for the early Christian Church at a time when thousands of Christians went to their deaths for refusing to serve in the Roman army. And this pacifist witness continued long after the apostate bishops made the deal with Constantine which established *The Church of the Empire*, as described in my book of that title. See also *The Underground Church in the Dark Ages*.

Origen wrote: *We do not brandish the sword against any people, nor do we learn to make war, because we have become children of peace through Jesus, whom we follow as our leader.* (*Contra Celsum* 5:33)

In his book, *On Idolatry*, Chapter 19, written about 210 AD, Tertullian explains why Christians cannot join the army: *There is no compatibility between the oath to serve God and the oath to serve man, between the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One life cannot be owed to two masters, God and Caesar. Of course--if you like to make a jest of the subject--Moses carried a rod and Aaron wore a buckler, John had a leather belt, Joshua led an army and Peter made war. Yes. but tell me how he will make war, indeed how he will serve in peacetime, without a sword--which the Lord took away ? Even if soldiers came to John and were given instructions to keep, even if the centurion believed, the Lord afterwards unbelted every soldier when he disarmed Peter.* The argument about John the Baptist and the soldiers which Tertullian buried in the 3rd century was dug up and recycled by Augustine in the 4th century. And Lewis dutifully copies it.

The *Canons of Hippolytus* are another early source which shows that pacifism was the norm in the early church. Lewis ignores all of these early church writings in his argument and he ignores the martyrs also. Even more than what was written, the blood of many martyrs testifies to the refusal to join the army that was the foundational belief and moral discipline of the early Christian church. *Martyr* means *witness*--they gave heroic Christian *witness* to the pacifism of the early church.

A series of 20th century books by Adolf Harnack, C.J. Cadoux and Jean-Michel Hornus review the pacifism of the early Christian church. C.J. Cadoux wrote *The Early Christian Attitude to War*. Jean-Michel Hornus wrote *It is Not Lawful for Me to Fight*. And see David Gracie's introduction to his translation of Adolf Harnack's *Militia Christi*. Harnack was a remarkable scholar, but his arguments are distorted by the patriotic identification with imperial Germany that he displayed in 1914. Which was essentially the same attitude that English theologians and Churchmen displayed towards the British Empire at that time. As G.K. Chesterton said, faith in the British Empire was the real religion of most of

the men of his time. And it became fused with their *Christian* faith into that amalgam of Patriotic and Military Christianity which produced an epidemic of madness and murder in 1914.

A British private, W.H.A. Groom lost his faith in the war and wrote that: *I thought of the patriotic national churches all praying for victory. How could God choose ? We Christian killers killing Christians* [page 313 Nigel Steel and Peter Hart *Passchendaele The Sacrificial Ground* 2000]

Pacifism remained an essential part of the basic morality of the church which refused to conform to the Imperial Church launched by the Emperor Constantine in the 4th century. As I have documented in *The Church of the Empire*. See especially page 85 *The Buried Issue of Christian Pacifism*. The history of Christian pacifism is often obscure and hard to trace but it can be found in the shadows of the official history--the half true but revealing accounts of the persecution of the *heretics* down through the centuries.

What Jesus Said And Did And refused to do

On page 82-83 Lewis says: "when we turn to Christianity, we find Pacifism based almost exclusively on certain of the sayings of Our Lord Himself." Which is not true. And then Lewis only discusses one of the sayings of Jesus: *Resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also*.

I agree with Lewis that this saying has to do with abating our personal pride when we are insulted, rather than with pacifism in time of war. [See *Turning the Other Cheek*.] But pride is a primary cause of personal and national quarrels. And this is only one of a dozen texts found in the gospels and the epistles which illustrate why Jesus was called *the Prince of Peace*. And it isn't just what He said that illustrates Christian pacifism, it is what He did and what He refused to do that illustrates it. And what his first followers did and refused to do.

Lewis ignores *Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you*. He misses John 18.36: my followers don't fight because my kingdom is not of this world. He overlooks what Jesus says when he vetoes the air strike on a Samaritan village: *you know not what spirit you are of* Luke 9:52-56. He neglects to notice what Jesus said to Peter when he told him to put away his sword: *all those who take the sword shall perish with it*. [See *Two Swords is Enough . . . Enough for What ?* and *He Beat Them with a Whip !* and *Who Would Jesus Bomb ?*]

Like other imperial Christians, Lewis does not recognize the anti state character of the *Kingdom of God* that Jesus launched. Jesus Christ had two chances to be the king and he turned down both of them. Luke 4.5-8 and John 6.15. He went on to define *the kingdom of God* in dozens of verses which show why it was fundamentally incompatible with restoring the Kingdom of Israel and why it has to remain permanently adversarial towards **the kingdoms of this world**, which require perennial wars. [See *Render, Not Sur-render Unto Caesar*]

Bismarck said: *war is the health of the state*. Mao Tse Sung said: *all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun*. The Roman Emperor was told: *if you refuse the sword, you must refuse the crown*. The *state* which Jesus founded has an entirely different kind of *health* and relies upon an entirely different kind of *power*. It is through the cross that we arrive at the crown.

In his statement of the question Lewis says *the civil society to which we belong*. Who is *we* ? Do we Christians **belong** morally and spiritually to the same *society* as every one else ? And what does he mean by *civil* society ? Obviously he means The British Empire. A military society which established a world empire by the success of its armies and navies. Tertullian in his Apology, chapter 38 says *Nothing*

could be more foreign to the Christian than the State. And he says that *One life cannot be owed to two masters, God and Caesar.* If there is a serious question as to whether a Christian can identify with even a small state, like the Kingdom of Israel, that question is magnified when it involves one of the great empires of *this world*, like the Roman Empire or its grandson, the British Empire. Jesus was crucified under a sign which mocked the idea that he was *King of the Jews*. But Jesus had already rejected the job and defined the *kingdom of God* in terms that drew a line between his *kingdom* and the Kingdom of Israel. As I argue on pages 5 to 8 of *Turning the Other Cheek: The Kingdom of God versus the Kingdom of Israel.*

conformity

Lewis neglects to notice what Jesus taught and what his first followers believed in respect to **refusing to conform** to *this world*. Galatians 6.14 *the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world.* That is how the early Christian church defined the *society* to which it **belonged**. The church was independent of and persecuted by the Jerusalem establishment until it lost the power to persecute when the war of 66 to 70 A.D. ended in the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple and the exile of the survivors.

The early church persisted in its refusal to conform to the Roman Empire, in its wars especially, long after apostate *traditor* bishops made the deal with Constantine which established *The Church of the Empire* in the 4th century--as I describe in my book of that title. See Appendix A *Friendship with the World is Enmity with God* (James 4.4) It was often an outlawed sect meeting secretly in graveyards and the underground catacombs where many of the early martyrs were buried. Those first Christians formed a real community which was maintained by spiritual warfare against the worldly society which surrounded it.

It has persisted as an underground and *heretic* church--a pacifist and non conforming church--through many centuries. Standing up to persecution by *the world*, it worked out what it means to be *in the world* but not *of the world*.

It is a theology which was validated by the blood of many martyrs. The Christian *society* to which we **belong** as Christians does call upon us to go to war. But it is a war against *this world* and it is fought with spiritual weapons, as Paul describes in 2 Corinthians 10.3-4 and Ephesians 6.10-18. We fight in the same way that Jesus fought, relying upon the power of his Spirit, as John 20.21-22 makes clear. See *The Spiritual Warfare of Jesus Christ.*

Most so-called *Christians* long ago conformed to the world--to the empires of this world--and cannot even imagine themselves seriously opposing *the kingdoms of this world*. They wait patiently for Jesus to return and claim the throne and meanwhile they pursue their investments in this world, march off in lock step when the emperor demands it, and sacrifice their first born sons in the wars of the empire.

Satan Rules the Empire

In the closing chapters of the Gospel of John, Jesus tells them that Satan is *the Prince of this world* and that they must expect to be persecuted by *the world*. The same doctrine: **Satan is the Ruler of All the Kingdoms of This World**--that is to say, the ruler of the empire--is found in Luke 4.5-8, Matthew 4.9 and Revelation 13.1-8 and 17.9. Tyconius, a 4th century Christian writer explained it further: *evil men are the throne of Satan.* As witness the Roman Empire and every other great empire.

That is the basic belief which Eusebius and Augustine negated by their mandate for Christians to join the Imperial Church. **The Whole Empire is Now Christian !** And that is what Lewis believes. He believes in the British Empire and the Church of England. His case for war derives from a faith in the

people, that is, *humanism*, and a faith in *imperialism*. From a refusal to acknowledge a kind of Christianity which is adversarial to the empire and which does not include the entire population indiscriminately. [See *The Church of the Empire* Chapter XIII *Everybody's Church: wheat & tares.*]

contra the people

Lewis belonged to the State Church of the British Empire, which is a direct descendent of that Imperial Church which became a bureaucracy of the Roman Empire and which necessarily abandoned pacifism. Like other worldly Christians, Lewis does not recognize that what *the people* are forced to adopt by the power of the State cannot be authentic Christianity. The *moral majority* is a myth. *The voice of almost all humanity* which Lewis invokes contra pacifism is his equivalent of the *moral majority*. The People Believe in the War ! How can The People be Wrong ? Contra Exodus 32.22 *you know the people that they are set on evil.*

Actually, *the people* are routinely bamboozled and coerced into going along with wars. And most of them are so ignorant of geography and history that they are easily fooled by the propaganda disseminated by the government through the controlled and censored media. But the underlying reality is that they want to be fooled. They want to stick with the crowd and they have no interest in defying the emperor, however wicked he is--especially if he is wicked. As Hitler proved once again.

They have crowd courage but not the solo courage which the Spirit gives. Like a bunch of lemmings, they will march over the cliff in lockstep rather than take a stand contra *the people*. They are either simpletons who worship Caesar--the Czar, the Kaiser, the King, the President--or, after enough of them have been slaughtered for nothing and they finally lose faith in the government, they are suckers for silly conspiracy theories. They blamed *The Jews* for Germany's defeat in World War I. What they don't have is the basic Christian faith which mandates that the *kingdom of God* must be established by spiritual battle **against** the kingdoms of this world, not by carnal warfare on their behalf.

Love One Another = don't kill one another

In the Gospel of John 13.34-35, Jesus tells them *by this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another, as I have loved you.* This is the primary sign of the real Christian church. How does it square with Christians going to war against other Christians ?

Whatever might be said in favor of Rome versus Carthage or Greece versus Persia, the conspicuous feature of World War I is that it was fought among *Christians*, who slaughtered one another by the millions. Russia had more churches than any nation in Europe. France and Italy and Austria were Catholic. Nearly everyone in Germany was a Catholic or a Lutheran. In 1914 the people of England and America were church going Christians as they have not been since.

It is no coincidence that *Christian* armies first appeared in the 4th century at the same time that the first *Christian* empire was established. War by Christians against other Christians began with the launching of the Imperial Church in the 4th century. It is the sure sign of the false church. And the wars by one *Christian* nation against another were the common feature of *Christendom* for centuries thereafter until they culminated in the great slaughter of 1914. Which produced that post Christian Europe that plunged into an even worse war 20 years later.

Lewis does not even notice that the nations which went to war in 1914 and again in 1939 were supposed to be *Christian* nations. For him it is Germans versus British. Despite his avowal of Christianity, his primary loyalty is to the British Empire. It is a spiritual and moral identity which precludes the possibility of a fundamental opposition between the Christian Church and the British Empire. So it

doesn't occur to him to raise the question as to why the *Christians* of Germany and the *Christians* of England were so ready to wage war against each other. Or why the *Christian* professors found it so easy to justify it.

So all the *Christians* of Europe and America joined in this gigantic orgy of killing, *the war to end all wars, the war to make the world safe for democracy*, which led directly to Communist Russia and Nazi Germany and World War II, in which 60 million were killed, two thirds of them civilians. That led to Communist China and millions more killed by starvation. Lewis argues [pages 72-73] against the contention *that wars always do more harm than good*. Which is the only sensible conclusion you can reach when you survey the terrible destruction of war, millions of men mechanically slaughtered, women raped, cities and villages and farms destroyed, children orphaned, pets and farm animals abandoned. Tuchman 227-228 describes a cat left behind and milk cows in pain from being left un milked after the Belgians had to flee the German invasion in 1914.

600,000 widows

There were 600,000 widows in France by the end of World War I and a million children left fatherless. By the end of the Civil War in America there were 80,000 widows in Alabama alone. How many children had to grow up without a father ? By the end of World War II, there were several million orphans among the Displaced Persons scattered all over Europe. You have to be a moral idiot = a patriot *Christian*--not to see *more harm than good* in what war does.

The disappearance of a whole generation of young men from England in World War I doomed a whole generation of women to go through life unmarried and childless. By the end of World War II, there were 12 million *Displaced Persons* in Europe, most of whom never found their way *home* again. See William Hitchcock *The Bitter Road to Freedom* 2008 Chapter 7 and Ben Shephard *The Long Road Home* 2011 See Nikolai Tolstoy, *Victims of Yalta*, which describes how hundreds of thousands of anti Stalin Russians who had escaped during the chaos of World War II were forced by America and Britain to return to the Soviet Union where, if they were not immediately shot, they were sent to the terrible Siberian labor camps which few survived. Roosevelt and Churchill had made a secret agreement with Stalin at Yalta to force them to return.

Romans 13 versus Revelation 13

On page 87 Lewis cites Romans 13.4 and 1 Peter 2.14 as mandating Christian participation in war--although they don't. In *The Church of the Empire* Chapter XI *Augustine and the Manufacture of Scripture*, page 112, I present the evidence that Romans 13.1-7 was fabricated by Augustine late in the 4th century to justify the Imperial Church and the deal it made with the Roman Empire. And I argue that 1 Peter 2.14 was not written by Peter and that the attitude it expresses runs counter to what Peter declared in Acts 5.29 that *We must obey God rather than men*. Did Peter really expect Christians to obey Emperor Nero, King Herod and Governor Pontius Pilate, rather than follow his example in respect to the Jewish authorities ? How much respect did Jesus show to King Herod ? **He wouldn't even speak to him !** [Luke 23.9] He referred to him as *that fox*. [Luke 13.32]

The authentic Christian belief is that Satan is the ruler of the kingdoms of this world. That is found in Luke 4 where Jesus rejects Satan's offer. And those who try to explain that away ** must also explain why Jesus describes Satan as *the Prince of this World* in the Gospel of John and why he so emphatically warns his followers about conforming to the *World*. In 2 Corinthians 4.4 Paul calls Satan *the god of this world*. In Revelation 13.2-4 the authority of *the beast* comes from the dragon. Who is none other than

Satan himself as 12.9 shows. That is, the authority of the Roman Empire comes from Satan. The Roman Empire was the epitome of the state, the greatest empire the world had ever seen. Satan was the real ruler of the Roman Empire, and the ruler of the empires which grew out of it. Revelation 19.11-21 describes a great battle between Jesus and his followers and *the kings of the earth* who are controlled by *the beast*.

[** see **Satan Lied to Jesus** addition to page 117 in Chapter XI of *The Church of the Empire*]

That is why Augustine and Luther et al tried to get rid of the Book of *Revelation*. It was excluded from the canon of the Eastern Orthodox Church for several centuries. In the essay on *Revelation* he wrote for the 1890 Encyclopedia Britannica, the German theologian Adolf Harnack has to acknowledge that the doctrine it contains--Satan rules the Roman Empire--is the opposite of the doctrine found in Romans 13.1-7. The international fellowship of Christian scholars which existed in the late 19th century was one of the casualties of World War I. Since German Christians and English Christians were slaughtering one another wholesale, it is not surprising that German Christian theologians and English Christian theologians stopped talking to one another as if they all belonged to the same Christian tradition. They had sense enough to see that much. The endless stream of lies put out by war time governments did not leave much space for the international exchange of Christian truth. German contributors to the Cambridge Medieval History were dropped. They had been major contributors to the Encyclopedia Britannica before 1914. Adolph Harnack contributed to the 9th edition published in 1890.

If there was any reason to doubt that Satan rules the kingdoms of this world, the sheer volume of mass murder in the wars of the empires would resolve that doubt. In the climactic act of World War II, a Catholic pilot dropped an atomic bomb on a Catholic primary school full of kids which was at *ground zero* in Hiroshima. Dropping bombs on cities--women and kids and old folks--had long since become the standard practice of the American and British air forces. And, morally, it wasn't anything new. Only the method was new. (See *Child Sacrifice to the Goddess of Liberty*.) It was a typical action of that war, not an exceptional action. The bombing of Tokyo or Dresden or Hamburg was the same. It isn't just that this deed was done. Because those who did it had the sanction of the government and wore the proper uniforms, it was regarded as an **act of heroism**, not an **act of terrorism**. Lewis would have to classify it as *righteous*--the necessary action of a *righteous war*.

Saint Paul's Real Belief

Saint Paul's epistles have a number of verses which are clearly adversarial to the Empire, such as 1 Corinthians 6.1-7 where he shames them for taking one another to court before the *unbelievers*. The least person in the church is a better judge than the pagan magistrate he says. That is what Paul really thought about the authority of the pagan magistrate. 1 Corinthians 2.6-8 indicts the *rulers of this age* for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Contra the absurd claim found in the *revised* Romans 13.3 that *rulers are not a terror to good works*. That is just what they are, as they proved over and over again in their dealings with the Christians. 1 Corinthians 15.25 states plainly that the rulers are the *enemies* of Jesus Christ, not his *ministers*, as the apostates of the 4th century had to assert, after they sold out the Church to the emperor and were added to the imperial pay roll.

Paul emphasizes that we must fight a spiritual battle using spiritual weapons: 2 Corinthians 10.3-4 *we do not war after the flesh* Ephesians 6.10-18 *For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.*

Faith in Nero ?

Who else can Paul mean by *principalities* and *powers* and *the rulers of the darkness of this world* except the rulers of the Roman Empire like Nero, who murderously persecuted the Christians ? Augustine converted Paul posthumously to a faith in the Roman Emperor by writing Romans 13.1-7. In his 1890 article on the book of *Revelation*, [eb9 XX 499c] Adolf Harnack shows how the number 666 in Revelation 13.18 adds up from the Hebrew letters for *Emperor Nero*. [see *Tracking Satan 666*] And, as he implies, this doctrine is the opposite of the one found in Romans 13.

If Paul had written Romans 13.1-7, he would have had to address not just the question of whether you obey the Emperor Nero but whether you worship him. The worship of the emperor as a god was central to the faith in the Roman Empire. Images of the emperor as a god were carried by the Roman legions as army standards. [See the discussion in *Render, Not Sur-render Unto Caesar* of the episode found in Josephus.]

Paul wrote *Romans* about 58 A.D., 4 years after Nero became the Emperor and only a few years before the rebellion against the Roman Empire broke out in Israel in 66 A.D. Would Jesus or Paul have told Christians to serve in the legions sent by Nero to crush that rebellion ? There are several good reasons for not believing that. The real history shows that they did not fight on either side of that war. [See *Essenes and Christians*] That is how they defined themselves as *Christians*. That definition persisted for centuries thereafter in the underground and *heretic* church, and it persists to the present day.

Romans 13.1-7 says *the powers that be are ordained of God* and *he is the minister of God to thee for good*. Nero became emperor in 54 A.D. after his mother poisoned the emperor Claudius. A few years later, Nero had her murdered--one of his many murders. After Rome was devastated by a great fire, Nero blamed the Christians and executed many of them. He framed and executed wealthy men in order to confiscate their estates and he built an enormous golden palace for himself. He also defined **captive audience**: *no one was allowed to leave the theatre during his recitals* says Suetonius.

He was the emperor when the Jews rebelled against Roman rule in 66 A.D. and he sent an army to suppress the rebellion. He castrated a boy and *married* him in a public ceremony. He was deposed and forced to commit suicide in 68 A.D. The popular legend that he was not really dead and would return became part of the *AntiChrist* symbolism found in the book of *Revelation*. *AntiChrist* has returned many times since then, under many names, with the support of anti Christians.

In *The Twelve Caesars* Suetonius describes Nero and the other Emperors who illustrate what Lord Acton meant when he said that *Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely*. There is no way that Saint Paul could have taught the Christians to put their faith in this fellow. *He is the minister of God to thee for good* was absurd on the face of it. Try repeating that to yourself while sitting through one of Nero's recitals.

Criminal Caesars

The notorious Nero wasn't much different from or much worse than the emperors who came before him or those who came after him. The same vicious criminality that appears in Nero, appears in all the emperors. It evidently goes with the job. That character re-appears in all the emperors, including Constantine, who, like Nero, murdered his own family, and who, like Nero, murdered the Christians--the real Christians who refused to join his State Church. There was no such thing as a good emperor, it is a contradiction in terms. How can a good man discharge his responsibilities to an evil empire ? A "good" emperor was one who only had a few murders to his dis-credit, not counting his routine massacres of political opponents, for political prudence or just for entertainment. An eb9 article mentions a Roman amphitheater at *TREVES* where *Constantine caused several thousand Franks and Bructeri to be butchered for the public amusement*. XXIII 553

Tiberius, Nero's predecessor, who was the Emperor when Jesus taught, built a pleasure palace and gardens for himself on the Isle of Capri where he devoted the final years of his reign to the pursuit of perverse pleasure, as Tacitus and Suetonius relate. When two pagan altar boys complained of his assault upon them, he ordered their legs to be broken. And yet these emperors were made into gods on the coins and their statues were put into the temples for the worship of the multitude. The belief in the empire and the worship of the emperor were essential to the strength and cohesion of the state. What else was it but demon worship ? [See *Render, Not Sur-render Unto Caesar* See *Church of the Empire Chapter VI The Urgent Necessity of a State Religion*]

In addition to his Romans 13 argument, Augustine constructed an argument that the Second Psalm prophesies a *King's Covenant* which was fulfilled when Constantine established the Church as a bureaucracy of the Roman Empire. But the chronology of the *King's Covenant* doctrine does not square with the Romans 13 theology which says that the pagan Roman Emperors got the job from God the Father even before any of them became Christians. [See *Church of the Empire Chapter XII The Church of the New Age*]

On page 88 Lewis says: *Christian authority, then, fails me in my search for Pacifism.* But he didn't search very thoroughly. He made a pretence of *searching* to arrive at the *Christian* patriot position to which he was already committed--the position which has defined worldly so-called *Christians* from the time of Constantine and Augustine. Whose real faith is focused upon the great empire to which they belong.

DEFENDING YOUR EMPIRE

my empire right or wrong !

A major problem with C.S. Lewis's talk is the simplistic assumption he makes as to what the war is about: fight or be conquered by the Germans. Which is a naive echo of war time propaganda. He does not even begin to discuss the world wide battle of the British Empire in both World War I and World War II. The real question Lewis has to try and answer is: *Am I morally obliged to get myself killed some where on the far side of the world in one of the perennial wars of the British Empire ?*

At the level of the common conscript the propaganda issue is whether or not you are going to allow those Germans to rape your mother / sister / girl friend. Your alternative was to fight your way to Germany so you could rape their women folk. Fellows who flunked geography are taught to believe that they are defending their homes and families when they are fighting a war on some other continent 1000 miles from home, where you defend your family by attacking someone else's family.

In World War I there was a prolonged battle between *German East Africa--Tanganyika--and British East Africa--Kenya*. The German army was mainly composed of African soldiers. The British army was mainly composed of Indian soldiers. Germany and Great Britain both conscripted hundreds of thousands of Africans into forced labor battalions and many of them died. [Hochschild *To End All Wars* page 349] African soldiers from British Nigeria were sent to the Cameroons to fight the Germans. Submission to *germanism* by Englishmen was not the issue. An expedition from New Zealand drove the Germans out of New Guinea and Samoa.

The British military in **British Somaliland** were also fighting against the *Mad Mullah* and the *dervishes* during World War I. He and his followers were finally defeated by the Royal Air Force in 1920. There was also a French Somaliland and an Italian Somaliland which became a base for Mussolini's invasion

of Ethiopia. An endless civil war and a terrible famine are the features of modern Somalia--their post Colonial inheritance. And naturally it has become the home base for pirates and Moslem terrorists.

The Belgian Congo

The atrocities committed by the Germans in their 1914 invasion of Belgium became a staple of war time propaganda. But the Belgians themselves, before and after the war, continued their enslavement of the Congo, which killed a million Congolese. What other European colonial powers did in Africa was as bad. British rule in Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa was less atrocious, but that is saying very little. Meanwhile, what America did in its colonial occupation of the Philippines was just as atrocious. In 1961, the American CIA put Colonel Mobutu in charge of the Congo. And he did his best to duplicate the crimes of King Leopold. [See *King Leopold's Ghost* by Adam Hochschild 302-304] In the civil wars which have engulfed the Congo in the 21st century, millions have been killed, millions of women have been raped, while the rest of the world looks away.

Measured by their actual results, the *righteous wars* of the 20th century achieved the opposite of *righteousness*. The wholesale corruption and the terrible poverty of post British Nigeria is rivaled by that of the post American Philippines. Which is aptly symbolized by the 20,000 pairs of shoes that Imelda Marcos left behind when she and Ferdinand got out of there with their billions. Empires typically establish themselves by the bribery of the native rulers they empower. And this corrupt ruling class perpetuates itself thereafter while the wretched poverty of the rest of the society continues. Complete corruption now prevails in Afghanistan and Iraq as the Americans try to leave. There is a similar corruption in Pakistan, America's treacherous *ally*, which is also encouraged by American bribery.

the war for oil

A British army of mostly Indian troops invaded what is now **Iraq** November 7th 1914 to secure the Anglo-Persian oil installations. Churchill had converted the Royal Navy from coal to oil and they now depended upon Middle Eastern oil. They had a series of battles with a German officered Turkish army which led to a 148 day siege of a British force at Kut, in Mesopotamia, from December 3, 1915, to April 29 the following year. They finally had to surrender, 10,000 of them, the largest surrender of imperial troops since Yorktown. A relief force struggling up the flooded Tigris River valley to their rescue suffered 23,000 casualties. The British eventually captured Baghdad in March 1917.

In the 1920s, the RAF was bombing in Iraq. The British occupation of Iraq--a pseudo nation created by the British--eventually led to the American involvement with Iraq and to the endless wars with the militant Moslems. The President is giving a speech today about what America will do to oppose the new *Islamic State* which has occupied a large part of Iraq, using the American equipment it captured from the Iraqi army. The corrupt Shia based government established by American intervention led to the alienation of the Sunnis who then gave their support to *ISIS*.

The American Iraq War formally ended in December 2013 with 100,000 Iraqis killed in *war-related violence*. 4484 Americans killed and 33,000 wounded. Cost \$ 800 billion. An article in the 9-29-14 *New Yorker* page 51 describes one American created Iraqi division which had dwindled to 500 men while the officers maintained the fiction of still having its official strength of 10,000 and pocketed the pay roll. The same thing happened in South Vietnam during the Vietnam War.

On to Armageddon

An army from British occupied Egypt, made up of soldiers from India, Australia and New Zealand, drove the Turks out of Palestine and *liberated Jerusalem* on December 11th 1917. Five weeks earlier the British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour wrote Lord Rothschild that *His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people*. And so the foundation was laid for the war which continues 100 years later. In a recent round (August 2014) 71 Israelis and 2100 Palestinians have been killed. [See: *Zionism versus Judaism*]

In World War II, North Africa was a major theater of the war. Britain still occupied Egypt and France occupied Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria. Americans had to fight and die there to drive out the Germans and make North Africa safe for the colonial powers. Which led to more wars after World War II, including the terrible anti colonial war in Algeria, which the French finally lost.

When Woodrow Wilson attended the Treaty Conference in Paris at the end of World War I, Ho Chi Minh gave Wilson a letter requesting independence for Vietnam. Which was in accordance with Wilson's principle of national self determination. But the French hung on to their colonies in Indochina, and it took World War II and the Vietnam War to finally bring about an *independent* state dependent upon Communist Russia and China. Ho Chi Minh led a guerrilla war against the Japanese occupation during World War II. Then continued the war against the French who reclaimed Vietnam after World War II. Then continued it against the Americans and the corrupt puppet government they set up. Two million Vietnamese were killed during the American war in Vietnam to protect them from *Communism*. After the Americans burned the villages of Vietnam and raped the women, they decided that the Communists could have it after all and bugged out. If **nationalism** equals **righteousness**, Ho Chi Minh was the only one with any claim to it.

A righteous war for diamonds

The major cause of the 1899 War in **South Africa** was the discovery of diamonds and gold in the Boer Republics which were coveted by Englishmen. The Boer War ended with the systematic destruction of the farms of the Boers who were put in concentration camps. [See Martin Meredith, *Diamonds, Gold, and War The British, The Boers, and The Making of South Africa* page 453] General Kitchener had a major role in this policy of ethnic displacement. He became the hero of England in World War I and the organizer of its armies. Kitchener's soldiers destroyed 30,000 farms and dozens of villages and drove 160,000 Boer wives and children into 50 concentration camps where 28,000 of them died from malnutrition and disease. [See Piers Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* pages 226-227]

A war in pursuit of diamonds and gold in which farm houses are burned down and the women and kids put into concentration camps under atrocious conditions can hardly be put under the head of **righteous war**. Thousands of rank and file British soldiers were sent to die in this shameful enterprise a long way from England. Back home, patriotic Englishmen celebrated the victory of the British army. [Brendon 223 and 225]

The British in India

The invasion and conquest of India by the British East India Company is a long history of **very unrighteous** wars fought for loot. Like most of his countrymen, C.S. Lewis is oblivious of the real history of the British Empire and blinded by patriotism to the Relentless Unrighteousness of the wars of the Empire. After Germany invaded Poland on September 1st 1939, Lord Linlithgow, the British Viceroy of India, declared war on Germany on behalf of 300 million Indians without consulting any of them. Meanwhile, the British violently repressed Indian demands for **home rule**.

Winston Churchill reacted to the Irwin / Gandhi agreement of 1931: *Our continued existence as a great power is at stake. The loss of India would mark and consummate the downfall of the British Empire. That great organism would pass at a stroke out of life into history. From such a catastrophe there could be no recovery.* Churchill had a faith in a *great power* and a *great organism*. And he was at least half right in arguing that *the downfall of the British Empire* would come about when they abandoned their rule of India. Once empires start **down sizing** they are doomed--doomed as empires anyway. And how can you go on after your imperial glory is gone ? Set up the Roman Eagle in the out house ? (Or the German Eagle. Or the American Eagle.) Somehow the welfare of *Christian* England had come to depend upon their perpetuating their conquest of a large Hindu / Moslem country on the far side of the world.

When the British abruptly quit India in 1947, there was a slaughter of Moslems by Hindus and Hindus by Moslems which killed more than a million. A major cause of the slaughter was the demobilizing of soldiers from the British Indian army--2.5 million Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs who had been given military training and experience by the British. Now they used it against one another in an indiscriminate slaughter.

In World War II, the British fought to hang on to India and to recover Burma from the Japanese. Whatever those battles of the British Empire were about, they obviously have very little to do with the question as to whether the English would hate it if they were occupied by the Germans. Since they didn't mind it that much when a line of German speaking kings moved into England, there is some reason to doubt whether this was much of an issue. They did not show much anti German sensitivity when they sent an army of Hessians to put down the rebellion in America. In fact, Germany had no plan to invade England in 1914. England went to war in defense of the British Empire, not in defense of England. That was only the propaganda cover for the war. Did the Australians also fear a German invasion ? Is that why they had to join the invasion of Turkey ?

the wars of empire

These wars only make sense as wars of the British Empire. And so the question is not whether you are ready to *die for your country* but whether you are ready to **kill for your empire**. The American Empire has a similar history, beginning with the wars of extermination against the natives of North America by the Puritans and the settlers of Virginia. [See *cask of poisoned sherry* in *The Great Land Hunt*; See the *Governor Bradford* essay.] The American Invasion of the Philippines in 1899 was as atrocious as anything done by the British. It set the stage for the collision between the American Empire and the Empire of Japan in World War II. [see *Roots of Abortion* page 91]

During the Revolutionary War, Governor Patrick Henry of Virginia sent George Rogers Clark with a military force to attack the various Indian tribes hundreds of miles to the west--*the Shawanese, Mingoes, Munsies and the nearer Wiandots*--to secure the land claimed by Virginia under its Royal Charter--in which Henry had invested--*the end proposed should be their extermination, or their removal beyond the lakes or Illinois river. The same world will scarcely do for them and us.* [see *Roots of Abortion* page 61]

Every war is *righteous* in the eyes of a patriotic populace brainwashed by the media to believe in it. No war is *righteous* when you read the real history. But people get their *history* from the patriotic comic book and the patriot talk show host. The farther they are from the front line trenches of the infantry, the louder the volume of their patriotism. They **support the troops** from a safe distance with a \$ 2 bumper sticker.

Is a poem by Tennyson which commemorates the suicidal cavalry charge of the *Light Brigade* in 1854 in the Crimean War: *Cannon to right of them, Cannon to left of them, Cannon in front of them volleyed and thundered . . . Into the Valley of Death Rode the 600 . . . Theirs Not to Reason Why, Theirs but to do and die.*

So what were they doing charging entrenched Russian guns on horseback in the Crimea ? *Noble six hundred !* Tennyson calls them. Carrying out a doomed charge because of a mistaken order in a futile war 1000 miles from home was *noble*. It illustrates the fact that the individual has to abandon his judgment to the *Magistrate* as soon as he joins the army. The *Magistrate* in this instance means whatever near sighted general gave the order from miles away.

In 1842 some 17,000 British soldiers were killed in a failed attempt to conquer Afghanistan, leaving their bones scattered all the way to the Khyber Pass, as they retreated. [See *The Roots of Abortion* page 90 re: the *White Graveyard*. Most of them didn't even get a grave.] And, despite Alexander the Great's conquest of this region, they didn't find much trace of Greek culture. If you have a religious faith in the British Empire, these episodes make sense. Otherwise they don't. Especially they don't make sense of the pretence that you are defending your home and your family. You are a long way from home.

In 1839, the British Empire launched *The Opium War* to force China to allow British merchants to continue selling opium in China. It killed 20,000 Chinese soldiers. *Righteous War* in this instance meant the **right** to continue selling the opium which was having such a devastating effect on China. In Afghanistan today, as part of the deal they made with the war lords, the U.S. has allowed them to continue cultivating opium poppies. Before the American invasion, the Taliban government came close to ending the cultivation of opium poppies in Afghanistan. But now opium finances the Taliban insurgency. For 17 years the U.S. Air Force has controlled the skies of Afghanistan, flying over the poppy fields they refuse to see, while Afghanistan remains the major supplier of the world's heroin. The government the U.S. supported in Vietnam was involved in drug dealing with the connivance of the C.I.A. Imperial politics is always characterized by a complete lack of scruples. By a culture of criminal behavior which has to be tolerated at the highest levels of the State.

A Not Very *Righteous* War for sugar plantations worked by slaves

Bury the Chains by Adam Hochschild, pages 267 to 287. describes how the British sent 89,000 white officers and enlisted men to the West Indies between 1793 and 1801 to hold onto their sugar producing islands like Jamaica, Grenada, Barbados and Antigua by suppressing the slave rebellions. The British sent more soldiers to the West Indies than they had sent to suppress the rebellion in the North American colonies 20 years earlier. The Church of England's Codrington Plantation was on Barbados. 285

The British invaded *Haiti*, then called *St. Domingue*, from 1793 to 1798, to try and suppress the slave rebellion led by Toussaint L'Ouverture which had already driven out the French. A British army of 20,000 soldiers set out to annex this largest and richest of the Caribbean sugar producing islands. Some 60 per cent of them are buried there, victims of tropical diseases like yellow fever and malaria and rebel ambushes for which the terrain was ideal. The British Government also purchased 13,400 Africans from the slave ships and pressed them into the British Army after they discovered that white soldiers were especially vulnerable to the hot climate and the tropical diseases. The red woolen uniforms didn't help. The British finally had to admit defeat: *The soldiers of the world's greatest slave-trading nation had given way before an army of ex-slaves.* 279

Those are some of the unrighteous realities of the *righteous wars* of the British Empire.

The new government of the United States, headed by Virginia slave owners, President George Washington and Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson, had sent 1000 muskets and \$ 400,000 to help the French suppress the initial slave rebellion on *St. Domingue*. American slave owners were well aware of the danger they faced if these slave revolts spread to Virginia. 268

The Magistrate's Perspective

The Church of England article Lewis cites as his church authority for going to war *at the command of the magistrate* was derived from the theology of John Calvin. Who dedicated his *Institutes* to King Francis I of France. After he became King in 1515, Francis I led a French army across the Alps *by a pass deemed impracticable* to recover Milan, which he claimed as an inheritance from his great-grandmother. When you have to **Cross the Alps** to **defend** what supposedly belongs to you, it can hardly be said that you are *defending your country*. The rank and file soldiers killed or crippled in this expedition were sacrificed to the international ambitions of the *magistrate*. And that is typical of the wars of the empire. The claim that you are *defending your country* is propaganda designed to fool simpletons.

It is the standard official propaganda. When Germany invaded Belgium in 1914, they claimed it was in *defense* of Germany against an attack by France. And there was a half truth to this claim. The French had 70 divisions ready to go to war in August 1914--as many as the Germans--and regarded it as inevitable, although that was kept secret from the populace. Since the time of Napoleon, France had mandated universal conscription. Germany demanded that Belgium let the German army march on through to fight against the French. And only went to war against Belgium after the Belgians refused. It is arguable that another war between France and Germany was made almost inevitable because of the long history of such wars, going back to the time of Napoleon and beyond. But, even if a war is inevitable, it is not inevitable that those who claim to be *Christians* have to participate. The refusal to participate is just what distinguished those early Christians. And later Christians like the *Anabaptists* and the *Quakers*.

In defense of what ?

It is a natural instinct to defend your home and your family. Your hand instinctively flies up to stop a ball thrown at your head. The unsafest place on earth is between a mother bear and her cubs. You can hardly keep your dog from biting the mail as it comes through the mail slot and barking at the mail man--he knows when we are being invaded. But what does war have to do with defending your home and your family ? Not one thing. That is, nothing.

If every man would sit by his front door, holding his deer rifle, ready to defend his home against all intruders, there would never be a war. In order for a war to begin, somebody has to leave home and start it. When you reach the end of your block, still holding your deer rifle, common sense should tell you that you have gone beyond defending your home, although you may be defending your turf against the rival gang from the next street. By the time you reach the county line, *defending my home and my family* does not describe what you are doing, although *Laying Down My Life for my County . . . I regret that I have only one life to give for my County My County Right or Wrong . . . It is sweet and good to Die for Your County* etc. can now be invoked. (Josh Billings on *sweet and good* etc. "I don't know myself--I never tried it.")

The *Country* for which Horace expected the conscripts to gladly die while he stayed home and wrote poetry, was the Roman Empire which had sprawled over dozens of *countries*, making slaves of their inhabitants. American soldiers shipped overseas are regularly brainwashed to believe that they are

somehow defending their own homes and families when they are on the other side of the world, destroying someone else's home and killing his family. The children at Mylai were massacred without mercy by American soldiers who would tell you that they were there to protect their families back home. Now their kids have to compete with all those smart kids who came here as refugees from the American War in Vietnam. Their killing and dying accomplished that much. While their kids grow up without a father.

By the time you arrive at that front line, thousands of miles from your home, it must be obvious that you are **DEFENDING YOUR EMPIRE**. And that is what American wars are about, all bunkum aside. Which means **EXPANDING THE EMPIRE**, because an empire must grow or die. In fact, it grows and dies at the same time, growing at the margins while dying at the center, like a cancer tumor. It can never be at peace for long, nor allow **FREEDOM** except as the empty slogan invoked to cover every kind of coercion. If you join the army, the one thing you can be sure of is that, if and when your women folk are attacked, you won't be within 100 miles of the place. American soldiers ship out to *pacify* countries on the other side of the world while the war continues in the inner cities of America.

faith in the empire

In his 1936 *Autobiography*, page 145, G.K. Chesterton writes: *The truth is that for most men about this time Imperialism, or at least patriotism, was a substitute for religion. Men believed in the British Empire precisely because they had nothing else to believe in.* But men also meld their worldly *Christian* faith with their faith in the empire to produce that idolatry which is the basic characteristic of the Patriot Cult. They believe in *GodBlessAmerica* and gather around the flag pole to pray. This faith produces that mindless *support* for the military which leads to perennial wars.

America is the Greatest Country in the World ! . . . Deutschland Uber Alles ! and Rule Britannia ! are in a way exact translations of one other. The same essential faith appears in the orations of Eusebius in praise of the court of Constantine as representing the *Kingdom of God* on earth. And it is the faith of Augustine who went to a lot of trouble to produce the theology for it. [See *The Church of the Empire.*]

In a 1789 letter from Thomas Paine in London to Thomas Jefferson in Paris, he notes the *national puffery* of the British as displayed in an address by Sir William Appleby which begins: *Britain, the Queen of Isles--the pride of Nations--the Arbitress of Europe, perhaps, of the World.* (*Papers of Thomas Jefferson* v. 14 p. 568) The American Empire has long since succeeded to the position of *Arbitress of the World* which the British Empire once claimed. The *national puffery* of contemporary American speeches makes Appleby's claims appear modest. Nothing is surer than that *pride goeth before a fall* and that empires inevitably *decline and fall*, sooner or later. The more money they spend on the wars of Empire the sooner it happens.

In 1897 Winston Churchill proclaimed his faith in the mission of the British Empire: *we shall continue to pursue that course marked out for us by an all-wise hand and carry out our mission of bearing peace, civilisation and good government to the uttermost ends of the earth.* [Brendon page 211] That **mission to the world** has now been claimed by the American Empire. As Ronald Reagan said, **WE HAVE A RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY**. When America invaded the Philippines in 1899, President William McKinley justified it because of America's mission to *civilize* them. [see *Roots* pages 91-93]

In World War I a British bishop preached: *Such a war is a heavy price to pay for our progress towards the realisation of the Christianity of Christ, but duty calls.* Meanwhile, A German nationalist proclaimed: *God must stand on Germany's side. We fight for truth, culture and civilization and human progress and true Christianity.*" [Joseph E. Persico *11th Month 11th Day 11th Hour Armistice Day*

1918 2004 page 189] Both sides went to war on behalf of *true Christianity* and *civilization*. And produced Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany.

The legions of the Roman Empire marched all the way to Britain to carry out their *civilizing* mission in the time of Julius Caesar. No doubt the English needed *civilizing*, but the question was whether Roman soldiers recruited from barbarian tribes could meet this challenge, whether the Roman sword produced **peace** and **civilization** as the Romans believed. Galgacus, a British chieftain quoted by Tacitus, described *the terrible Romans from whose oppression escape is vainly sought by obedience and submission. . . . to robbery, slaughter, plunder, they give the lying name of empire; they create a wilderness and call it peace.*

Civilizing the Congo

Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* begins by evoking that time in a novel that depicts the horrors of 19th century colonialism that he witnessed first hand in the Belgian Congo. He shows how the pretence of a *civilizing* mission was used as camouflage for criminal atrocities in pursuit of loot. Adam Hochschild's *King Leopold's Ghost* vividly documents what Conrad encountered.

The mission which Jesus entrusted to his disciples in Matthew 28.19 and John 20.21-22 to take the gospel to all nations was usurped by the *Christian* Roman Empire after Jesus supposedly became Constantine's partner. [See *Church of the Empire* Chapter IV *Constantine's Miracle*.] The British Empire and the American Empire inherited the mission of the Roman Empire to send armies and navies to the *ends of the earth* to spread this gospel of war on behalf of *peace*.

The British Empire had begun to wane when World War I began. And World War II accelerated the process. *Rule Britannia* had imposed its rule on a large part of the world. *The Sun Never Sets on the British Empire*. But the sun was beginning to set on the British Empire. *Rule Britannia* proclaims that Englishmen will *never, never be slaves*. Which begs the question about Englishmen going along with enslaving others. *Bury the Chains* shows how completely complicit with slavery most Englishmen were. Even if they didn't make money from it--a lot of them did--they did nothing to put an end to it. The Last Judgment described in Matthew 25.31-46 falls heavily upon those who **OMITTED to do something**.

America Saves the World

On September 11th 2002, President Bush gave a speech at Ellis Island with the Statue of Liberty in the background: *the greatness of America . . . America the Hope of Mankind . . . A light shines in the darkness and the darkness does not comprehend it*. He believed in his mission to eradicate evil. How ? By sending the American army to Afghanistan and Iraq. *Stand Beside Her and Guide Her Through the Night with a Light from Above* replaces the idea of the Holy Spirit who guides the individual Christian. Did Jesus breathe into the face of the Statue of Liberty and say: *receive the Holy Spirit* ? [John 20] But most so-called *Christians* have never received Him either. That is why they depend upon the Power of the Empire to Save Them--the power of a giant statue of Isis the Sun Goddess, and the *new world order* she symbolizes--the treacherous power of a false faith. [See *The Secret Faith of the Founding Fathers*]

On April 2nd 1917 Woodrow Wilson asked Congress for a Declaration of War *for the ultimate peace of the world and the liberation of its people . . . the world must be made safe for democracy*. America's intervention instead produced two of the most virulent forms of totalitarianism the world has ever seen. Out of the rotting heart of **CHRISTENDOM** grew the terrible thorn bushes of Communism and Fascism, from twin seeds opened by the fires of the Great War and watered by the streams of blood which flowed

from it. World War II was the direct result of World War I. Nazism and Bolshevism grew out of the very heart of what called itself *Christendom* in the aftermath of that war.

Wilson's mission to **make the world safe for democracy** led to 10,000 Americans being arrested under the Patriot Act for opposing the war. People were given long prison sentences just for handing out leaflets or speaking out.

In his Speech in Pueblo Colorado September 25th 1919 Wilson said: *Again and again, my fellow citizens, mothers who lost their sons in France have come to me and, taking my hand, have not only shed tears upon it, but they have added: God Bless You, Mister President. Why, my fellow citizens, should they weep upon my hand and pray God to bless me? I ordered their sons overseas. I consented to them being put in the most dangerous parts of the battle line, where death was certain. But they rightly believe that their sons saved the liberty of the world. They believe that this sacrifice was made in order that other sons should not be called upon to die. I wish some of the men who are now opposing the settlement could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see this thing through to the end and make good their redemption of the world.*

By endorsing the League of Nations, he means. Even though these fellows *sacrificed* their lives for peace, freedom etc.--after killing as many other young men as they could--nothing will come of it unless a big international bureaucracy is set up. The blood of sacrifice needs the hot air of endless speeches to accomplish its aim. No one will know what they died for until someone makes a speech about it.

Like all patriot orators, Wilson neglects to mention that these soldiers **KILLED FOR THE CAUSE** instead of just dying for it. In fact, it was their killing, not their dying, which produced the victory which supposedly **SAVED THE LIBERTY OF THE WORLD**. An army which just dies without accomplishing the killing it is sent out to do is of no use. But we prefer to ignore that aspect of it. Listening to patriotic speeches, which present fallen soldiers as if they were Christian martyrs, you would never guess that military recruits are relentlessly drilled to shout **KILL !** and to mean it and to do it. ***Dying for your country*** is the big patriotic lie behind which **KILLING FOR YOUR EMPIRE** is concealed. If the Patriot could face the truth, he would give the most honor to the soldier who killed the most and lived to brag about it, not the fellows who died in the war. What are the names of those who did the most killing in the war? They are the ones who accomplished whatever it was that was supposedly accomplished.

redeeming the world

Their redemption of the world--America still operates on that same premise. It is up to America to save the world. How? By our military power of course. The fellows from the wrong side of the tracks, once they are trained to use automatic rifles, can be sent anywhere in the world to **save** everyone who needs **saving**. The Americans rounded up the Vietnamese and put them in concentration camps in the name of **Freedom**. They kick down the front doors in *Operation Iraqi Freedom*.

They *sacrificed* so that *other sons should not be called upon to die*. In fact their *sacrifice* led directly to a war in which 10 times as many would be killed. And that war has led to more wars. War does not lead to peace. One war always leads to the next war. A.J. Muste said: *There is no way to peace. Peace is the way*. It is the truth. But once you have sacrificed your son to Moloch, you have to believe in what you did. Women have to believe in their abortions. Wilson believed himself to be a Christian. And yet somehow believed that sending young men to stick bayonets in other young men meant *their redemption of the world*. You can't **REDEEM THE WORLD** unless you are prepared to stick a bayonet in somebody--unless you are willing to wave your little flag and **SUPPORT THE TROOPS** while somebody from the wrong side of the tracks is hired or drafted to do it. Wilson the idealist perpetuated racial

segregation in his administration. Negroes were excluded from federal jobs in the South. Like earlier patriotic preachers of *LIBERTY* he defined it so as to exclude the black population.

They draft men from the slums, teach them to use the bayonet, send them to some far off place where they don't even speak the language, and they will save the world by killing and dying. These men tend to be the worst educated and least motivated people in society. Many of them are recruited from those who would otherwise be in jail. But even when they have good qualities as individuals, their military training is rigorously designed to erase individuality in order to make them into the expendable and replaceable parts of a military machine. They get the same haircut, wear the same uniform, march in rows, and die in bunches. Any gaps are filled by replacements who are as identical as possible. So it is the military machine directed by the Commander in Chief in which we put our trust. In *GodBlessAmerica* we trust. What is his real name ? The relentless lying of the government in time of war and the relentless obscenities of soldiers' talk provide a couple of clues.

The spiritual pretensions attached to these wars are a form of Satan Worship. Which is at the very center of the Imperial cult. As described in Revelation 13.4 *they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast.* The *beast* is the Roman Empire and the *dragon* is Satan. The Empire worship which was the foundation of the Roman Empire is also the foundation of those empires which inherited its power and its pretensions--it's self-anointed mission to the world.

THROWING AWAY THE LIVES OF SOLDIERS

In *The Guns of August* (1962), page 174, Barbara Tuchman writes that "The prodigal spending of lives by all the belligerents that was to mount and mount in senseless excess to hundreds of thousands at the Somme, to over a million at Verdun began on that second day of the war [August 5th 1914] at Liege." Where the Germans sent wave after wave of soldiers in a futile assault against the Belgian forts rather than wait for their giant siege guns to arrive. "**The dead piled up in ridges a yard high.**" The giant siege guns arrived a week later on August 12th and destroyed the forts. [191] But rather than wait for them to arrive, the German generals threw away the lives of these teen age conscripts and volunteers just to prove something--to prove they could do it.

And this *prodigal spending* of the lives of common soldiers is typical of war. *Butcher Grant* sent wave after wave of Union soldiers against entrenched Confederate positions. And was hailed as a hero afterwards and elected President. In Vietnam, they sent one doomed company after another up one *Hamburger Hill* after another, while pretending that the hill was an important strategic objective. Then they just abandoned the hill afterwards.

And soldiers obey these senseless and suicidal orders. That is what standard military training does to them. The drill sergeant in *All Quiet On the Western Front* sees the new recruits in their dress uniforms on their way to town for a night out. So he orders them to crawl through a big mud puddle. And they do. When they get to the front line, their officers will order them to do things which are even nastier and more humiliating--suicidal orders which will get them killed for nothing. A major mutiny finally broke out in the French army after a million of them had been slaughtered. Earlier, a *lycee* class of 27, conscripted in August 1914, were all dead by Christmas except for one who had escaped the call up because he was sick. [Tuchman page 439] By the end of the Vietnam War, demoralized American soldiers often murdered their officers. The army admitted to 1600 cases of *fragging*--rolling a grenade into the lieutenant's tent while he slept. So they took the grenades away.

On the last morning of the war, which ended at 11 am on November 11 1918, some American commanders continued to send soldiers to their doom. That reflected the attitude of General John Pershing who was opposed to the armistice. General Summerall sent men over the Meuse that morning at a cost of 1130 casualties including 127 dead. Captain Harry Truman kept his artillery battery firing right up to the end, "displaying the sternness later evident in his decision to use the atom bomb in World War II." He also opposed the armistice as premature [Persico pictures following page 237]

Verdun

Verdun is the name given to the major French / German battlefield of World War I. 700,000 soldiers were killed in 4 years of trench warfare. and 120,000 *unknown* French and German soldiers are buried there. The Cathedral of Rheims, where French kings were crowned, was destroyed by artillery shells. The ancient stained glass windows were shattered. The village of Fleury **changed hands 16 times** in 4 months, **13 times in one month** "with men dying for ground that would not matter a half hour later." [Persico 83]

Between February and September 1916, the French artillery fired 10,300,000 rounds with the field artillery, 1,200,000 rounds of medium calibre and 600,000 rounds of large calibre." [Supplementary Volume III of the 13th edition of Encyclopedia Britannica 1926 page 944] The German artillery fired a similar number of shells. This enormous use of artillery, plus machine guns, caused most of the casualties.

The battle continued in a desultory way until the very end of the war. We are used to thinking of *battles* as being decided in a day or two. But the battles of World War I in France were stalemates that dragged on for months or years, with both sides compelled to get out of their trenches and charge the murderous machine guns of the other side, accomplishing nothing except more casualties.

Slaughter on the Somme

Despite 7 days of preliminary shelling in which a million and a half artillery shells were fired, German machine guns and barbed wire were still in place when the British charged on July 1st 1916 to begin the **Battle of the Somme**. The barbed wire stopped any attempt at a cavalry charge and snagged the kilts of the Scotch regiments, making them easy targets. The Allied forces had 20,000 killed or fatally wounded the first day. The 1st Newfoundland Regiment had 684 of 752 killed, wounded or missing by the end of the day without inflicting a single casualty on the entrenched Germans they were charging. [Hochschild *Wars* 207] It wasn't long before the German soldiers were forced into the same suicidal charges against fortified British machine guns.

The battle of the Somme engaged 500,000 British troops and it continued for 4 and a half months before it settled into an entrenched stalemate. By mid November 1916 there had been 614,000 Allied casualties, British and French. During those 140 days, the front line moved less than 10 miles at a cost of over a million killed--counting British, French and German. 420,000 were British. Of those killed in the battle, 76,000 bodies were never found. The two sides fired 30 million shells in 4.5 months. In 2005 French explosives experts removed 50 tons of shells from the Somme battle field. [Hochschild *Wars* 214]

C.S. Lewis himself was hit by an errant British artillery shell which ended his war service. He arrived in France on his 19th birthday, November 29th 1917, and was severely wounded April 15 1918. He was lucky to survive. Two of his comrades were killed by the same shell. A substantial number of those

killed or crippled were the victims of *Friendly Fire* when the artillery was not properly coordinated with the advancing soldiers. [Steel 151]

The bodies of many soldiers were never recovered. They didn't even get put into a mass grave. They sank into the mud holes of Passchendaele or their remains were fragmented and scattered by the relentless artillery barrages. 100 years later, they are still digging up skulls and bones and unexploded shells from those battle fields. A *France 24* report estimates that there are **700,000** remains of World War I soldiers **missing** in France. There were 78,000 American soldiers killed in World War I whose bodies were never found.

turning young men to dung

The farmer's plow still turns up skulls 100 years later. A monument at Thiepval lists the names of 73,412 British Empire men, *the Missing of the Somme*. A poem by Edward Thomas described it: *As when I was young-- / And when the lost one was here-- / And when the war began / To turn young men to dung*. He was killed April 9th 1917 by a shell blast. The Hochschild book page 364 says there were **400,000** British Empire soldiers in the several theatres of the war *whose resting place is unknown*. **Resting Place** means the weed patch he fertilizes or the shell hole where some of his bone fragments might be found.

In 2014, 100 years later, they were still digging up mortar shells and bones in farm fields near Ypres Belgium. "In a German cemetery in the nearby village of Langemark, a patch of grass holds the bones of 25,000 men, many of them unidentified . . . *the Diggers*, following the bulldozers at a new industrial site, recently found the bones of 200 soldiers, only one of which could be identified. " [New York Times August 5th 2014 A8]

That of course is why they came up with this **Tomb of the Unknown Soldier** gimmick. There is one in Paris and another in Arlington National Cemetery near Washington D.C. And a **Tomb of the Unknown Warrior** in Westminster Abbey. It gives widows and childless mothers the illusion that *Johnny* might be in there. The odds are against it. And sometimes it might be better if the remains did not come back. A lieutenant friend of mine accompanied the casket of a soldier killed in Vietnam whose body had been lying out in the jungle for several weeks before it was found. Against my friend's advice, the father insisted on opening the casket. He was so shocked by what he found in there that he physically attacked my friend. Some 2500 American soldiers and some 300,000 Vietnamese soldiers are still *missing* after the War in Vietnam. There are still 8000 American *MIAs* from the Korean War. Some 79,000 American military were *missing* at the end of World War II.

mechanical slaughter

Lewis depicts war as a personal combat between two self-motivated individuals. But most of the casualties came from artillery and machine guns, plus the poison gas which was used by both sides. It was a relentless mechanical slaughter to which individual courage had little relevance. 70 per cent of the casualties came from **700 million artillery shells** fired in World War I. The machine guns mowed down entire companies forced to charge in the wake of the shelling. The Maxim gun invented in 1898 fired 500 rounds a minute. The Vickers machine gun used in World War I fired 700 rounds per minute. Hochschild page XI describes an entire British company of 160 men mowed down by one German machine gun that they persisted in charging.

Poison gas shells carrying chlorine, phosgene or mustard gas killed thousands. Corporal Adolph Hitler was temporarily blinded by a British gas attack. Diseases peculiar to battle field conditions, like *trench foot*, took a heavy toll. A slight wound from a shell splinter could lead to gangrene or septicaemia. In

1918, influenza crossed the Atlantic with the American soldiers in crowded troop ships which were perfect incubators for an epidemic which killed thousands of them before they ever fired a shot at the Germans.

Germany was the first to use chemical weapons on a mass scale. On April 22nd 1915 at Ypres Belgium they killed 6000 British and French troops. But the British and French also began using it. The 1925 Geneva Protocol banned the use of chemical and biological weapons. In 1935-36 Mussolini used mustard gas in Ethiopia. In 1940-41 Japan used chemical and biological weapons in China. In 1965-67 Nassar of Egypt used chemical weapons in Yemen. America used Agent Orange in Vietnam. In the Iran-Iraq war 1980-88 Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against the Iranians and against the Kurds. "Given American and Western unease with Iran's revolution, there was little public outrage as Muslims used poison on other Muslims; but there was a reaction when Hussein killed 3200-5000 Kurds around Halabja. Thousands more were injured and later died. The Chemical Weapons Convention of 1993 has been in force since 1997. It was ratified by 189 states except for Syria, North Korea, South Sudan, Angola and Egypt. New York Times A1 and A8 Saturday September 7th 2013 The Syrian government has been charged with several chemical weapon attacks against rebel held cities.

filthiest language ever heard

Noble self sacrifice in single combat was not the way that most soldiers died. *Six Weeks* by John Lewis-Stempel 2011 page 276 quotes the letter of an officer who had to curse his men *with some of the filthiest language ever heard* and threaten them with his revolver to force them to charge. When a dozen of them finally did *they were all killed almost at once*. On page 216 Stempel quotes from a letter that 2nd Lieutenant Ernest Routley wrote to his brother from the battlefield of the Somme: *as you are waiting your turn to go over the top, you see your pals get cut down by machine gun fire, and then see if you think it's a glorious thing to die. It would be glorious if you could have a fair fight, but it's absolute murder here*. An officer felt a little sheepish after he fired a howitzer at two German soldiers carrying a latrine bucket. Steel 199

When British Field Marshal Douglas Haig was told that there were 40,000 casualties by the second day of the battle--which was in fact a *gross underestimate*--he said that the casualties were not excessive. [Persico 237 and Hochschild 207] Haig would not visit the casualty stations because it made him physically sick.

Lieutenant Colonel E.T.F. Sandys, whose battalion had 500 casualties, shot himself a few months later after writing to a fellow officer that *I have never had a moment's peace since July 1st*. Hochschild 207 One of the poems by Lieutenant Siegfried Sassoon refers to *The General who did for Harry and Jack with his plan of attack*. [*Six Weeks* 168]

By November the British had suffered half a million casualties on the Somme, including 125,000 dead. The French had 200,000 casualties. "The Allies had gained roughly seven square miles of ground." The German General Erich von Falkenhayn responded with counter attacks that were just as suicidal. [Hochschild 214] By November the battle field of the Somme was a waste land devoid of houses or trees and strewn with rotting corpses and every kind of military debris-- *many dead bodies, decomposed almost to little heaps of dust and rags, helmets, German and British, rifles, entrenching tools, shells, grenades, machine gun belts, water bottles, and every conceivable fragment of weapons and shreds of clothing littered the whole ground between the blasted trees*. [Hochschild 229] *rats feasted on the bodies left in no man's land . . . leaving only skeletons draped in scraps of khaki* [Hochschild 166] The still living soldiers were plagued by rats, flies, mosquitos and lice. [Stempel 125-126]

Whatever glory there was in earlier wars, whether real or imaginary, it disappeared from this war right from the start. When the war began French soldiers still wore the traditional uniform of a blue coat with red trousers. But after the appalling casualties of the first battles, they were forced to adopt the mud colored uniforms the other armies were already wearing. In less than a month the French army suffered 300,000 casualties. There was no mention of this in the British press. Hochschild 103

The Great War had all the glory of a meat packing plant operating on three shifts, while men were brought in like truck loads of cattle to be driven into the slaughter works. The war began in August 1914 and by 1915 1 million had been killed.

No More Cavalry charges

The cavalry charge was also one of the first casualties of World War I. At the climax of the Boer War, the British carried out a wonderful cavalry charge. Wonderful because the Boers did not have machine guns and barbed wire. Which soon made the cavalry charge obsolete. At the start of the war, the British generals French and Haig still had great faith in the cavalry. They disregarded the opinion of a British military observer of the Russian / Japanese war of 1905 who said that the only effective thing the cavalry could do in the face of entrenched machine guns was to cook for the infantry. As the war proved. Hochschild 41

There was some use in dismounted cavalry armed with rifles and / or *mounted infantry* as they were called. But Haig insisted on keeping the lance and the sword used by the cavalry and persisted in forming cavalry divisions, which required horses and grooms and hay, and which took up much of the space required to ship the British Expeditionary Force to France. England eventually had five cavalry divisions in World War I. The Germans and the French both had 10. The Germans sent 8 cavalry divisions with 40,000 horses into their initial invasion of Belgium. But their *Uhlans* were easy targets for the repeating rifles of the Belgian defenders. At the Battle of the Somme a picturesque squadron of Indian Cavalry briefly appeared and then permanently disappeared. Hochschild 208

Digging trenches and hanging out in them for weeks or months became the characteristic way that the war was fought in the major theater of the war in France.

Horses and mules were still used for transport in World War I. A modern sentimental movie depicts both sides cooperating to rescue a horse caught in the barbed wire. The reality was different. In a single day in June 1916, 7000 horses were killed. Persico 83-86

Drowning in mud at Passchendaele

The battle of Passchendaele, also known as the third battle of Ypres in Belgium, began July 31st 1917 and brought new horrors. The area has a high water table and the ancient drainage system of canals and ditches and little rivers was destroyed by the millions of artillery shells fired by both sides. Then relentless heavy rains turned the entire battle field into a giant bog in which horses and mules floundered and soldiers *sank shrieking* while their comrades watched helplessly. Soldiers trying to help were sucked in themselves. Their comrades were forced to march on and leave them to their fate. [Steel 266] One soldier stuck in the mire, who had to be abandoned by his comrades, was still there when they came back two days later, but only his head was above the mud and he was *raving mad*. Hochschild 288

The tanks, newly invented by the British, also sank into this terrible mud. Only 1 of 48 made it through the mud and the German artillery the first time they were deployed. In a later tank attack--the last one they tried--all nine had to be abandoned after they got stuck in the mud or were hit by artillery. When the tank corps team returned the next day they found the derelict tanks full of dead, dying and wounded

who could find no better shelter. *The road was a complete shambles and strewn with debris, broken vehicles, dead and dying horses and men.* [Steel 120 and 272]

The British laid *duck boards* across the mire and persisted in trying to take more of this sticky morass, which was soon filled with rotting corpses, German and British [Hochschild 286] The artillery turned the battlefield into a carpet of continuous shell holes filled with water. Wounded soldiers or those who slipped off the *duck boards* disappeared into these shell holes. Explosions from artillery shells threw up the bodies of soldiers buried in the mud by previous shells. When the British captured a *Jerry pill box* with dead German soldiers at the entrance and in the pool of water underneath *the stink was abominable.* [Steel 198]

The stench of death hung over the whole battlefield from all the corpses in various stages of putrefaction. A board by the side of the road which said: *This was Langemarck*, was the only indication of the village which had once been there. [Steel 166-167]

The large number of casualties overwhelmed the stretcher bearers who were supposed to carry the wounded to the rear dressing stations. Wounded soldiers were left unattended for days. Steel 277 And the attempt to collect the bodies of slain soldiers from the battle field was largely abandoned, even when they were not blown to pieces or buried in shell holes. At best, some of them were collected into mass graves.

Soldier Servants

One cause of the shortage of manpower was the large number of soldiers assigned as servants to attend to the personal needs of the officers. A soldier was court-martialled when he wrote a letter complaining about the waste of manpower represented by these thousands of soldier / servants who cleaned the boots of the officer or fetched his shaving water. He estimated that half a million men were serving as *batmen, grooms, servants, waiters* or in *commissioned and non-commissioned "cushy" jobs* performing tasks which were *not necessary to the winning of the war.* Even though the letter had been stopped by the military censors and never published by the newspaper, Corporal Rochester was demoted and severely punished just for writing it. [Hochschild 233-236]

Away from the front lines the best hospitals were for officers only, as were many hotels and bars and restaurants. The British class system persisted throughout the war. When a mass grave with 98 soldiers was dug up, the 4 officers were given coffins and taken to a cemetery in a nearby French town. The 94 common soldiers were re-buried in the mass grave. Hochschild 127 The franchise was still severely limited. Some 72 % of English men had no vote.

In his diary, one front line officer complained bitterly about the Generals and the staff officers who ordered futile attacks while they stayed away from the battle field. *We never saw a staff officer in the forward area.* [Second Lieutenant Robert Johnston 16th Battalion Royal Scots Steel 284]

What was left of the town of Passchendaele finally fell on November 6 1917. But the soldiers who took it were pinned down there by German machine gun and artillery. The following day the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia and the war on the Eastern Front came to an end. With the result that Germany could now bring train loads of these soldiers to the Western Front. When they attacked in March of 1918, the British were forced to abandon Passchendaele and withdraw to Ypres. The entire five miles of the Ypres salient that the British had gained in August, September and October 1917 at a cost of 250,000 killed and wounded was given up in a matter of days. It was only the belated arrival of the Americans that saved Britain and France from defeat, or at least saved them from negotiating an

armistice without a victory, because they were counting on the impact of American troops. [Hochschild 303]

Altogether the several battles of Ypres had cost half a million British casualties. Although the fighting continued all winter, the last British offensive ended on November 10th. The Canadian Corps left after having suffered 15,000 casualties in a "patently meaningless sacrifice." The Canadian Prime Minister was so enraged that he grabbed Lloyd George and shook him at a meeting in London afterwards. Hochschild 287 The so-called *Third Battle of Ypres* [= *Passchendaele*] had *consumed the finest fighting units of the British Empire*. Steel 300

The strategic aim of these Ypres campaigns, which was never achieved, was to break through to the Belgian coast and attack the German submarine bases there.

There is a memorial at the Menin Gate near Ypres put up in 1928 with the names of 58,896 British soldiers whose bodies were lost in the mud and never recovered from this one small section of the Ypres salient. Another 34,957 names of those "lost without trace" are engraved at a memorial at the Tyne Cot cemetery, which also has 11,908 individual graves. Some 8400 of these are marked as *A Soldier of the Great War, Known Unto God*. Contra the story books in which the warrior achieves fame, these soldiers achieved complete anonymity.

Envy the Dead

The survivors sometimes had reason to envy the dead. In the movies, the gallant officer is wounded in the chest and wakes up in a hospital with a beautiful nurse in attendance. The non movie reality is that soldiers lost arms and legs, were blinded by gas and had their faces shot away. *Six Weeks* page 275 describes an officer who woke up a eunuch after his genitals were blown away. He wrote a farewell letter to his fiance and then shot himself. That kind of an injury, common enough in war, gets no mention on Memorial Day.

21 million soldiers were wounded in World War I, of which an estimated 7 million were permanently maimed. That doesn't count those who suffered from the psychological trauma then called *shell shock*, which is now called *post traumatic stress disorder--PTSD*. Stempel has a whole last chapter on the after effects of the war upon soldiers. They often suffered from "dreadful nightmares that rendered sleep a torment, changed patterns of behaviour and broke up previously happy families." Many of them continually re-lived the war in their nightmares. It drove some of them to suicide. The British government was paying a disability pension to 120,000 *psychiatric cases* 20 years later. [Stempel 318] Other veterans spent years in a kind of emotional limbo which was the result of what they had endured when *Almost every kind of feeling dried up inside us*. [Steel 312-318]

There is a bitter 19th century song about a crippled soldier returning from the war--

Johnny I hardly knew ya

With your drums and guns, and guns and drums, hoo roo hoo roo . . . the enemy nearly slew ya . . . My darlin' dear you look so queer, Johnny I hardly knew ya

Where are the legs with which you run, When first you went to carry a gun ? Indeed your dancing days are done . . .

Where are the eyes that looked so mild, When my poor heart you first beguiled, Why did you run from me and the child ? . . .

You haven't an arm and you haven't a leg, you're a spineless, boneless, chickenless egg, You'll have to be put in a bowl to beg, . .

I'm happy for to see you home, but My darlin' dear you look so queer, Johnny I hardly knew ya

Paddy's Lamentation, an Irish song about the American Civil War in which so many Irish conscripts, fleeing the famine in Ireland, were killed and crippled says: *I was by hunger pressed and by poverty distressed . . . When we got to Yankee land, they shoved a gun into our hand, saying, Paddy you must go and fight for Lincoln . . . There is nothing here but war, where the murderin' canons roar . . .* They told him: *if you get shot or lose your leg every mother's son of you will get a pension, but myself I lost me leg, they gave me a wooden peg.*

Even soldiers who survived the war in relatively good health often found it very difficult to adjust to civilian life afterwards. The boredom and pettiness of civilian jobs were a great let down after the high drama of war in which they had been taught to believe that they were *preserving civilization* and *saving the world* etc. The problem was compounded by the lack of employment for veterans of World War I. Commoners who became *Temporary Gentlemen* when they became officers were demoted after the war. Stempel 310-311 England's class system was undermined by the war but it still survived.

Gallipoli

Some 200,000 soldiers from England, Australia and New Zealand were killed at Gallipoli in World War I in a futile effort to invade Turkey by fighting up the cliffs at Anzac in the Dardanelles. Many more were wounded, some of them crippled for life. They finally gave it up. The *War Diaries* of Kenneth Best, who was a chaplain at Gallipoli, describes how the lives of the soldiers and the field officers were thrown away while the staff officers stayed in the bunkers.

When they abandoned the campaign in 1916, leaving their dead comrades behind, one soldier said: *I hope they won't hear us marching off.* [Best 247] Best's Christian faith became a casualty of his war experiences. The faith in Military Christianity and the God ordained British Empire steadily eroded among those who had to endure the horrors of the front lines.

On pages 139-140 of his *Diary* for Friday June 4th, Best describes the 3rd battle of Krithia in which the Collingwood Battalion lost 625 of 850 in less than 10 minutes. Two days later, Best confides to his diary his pity for the exhausted survivors, his anger at the shortage of stretcher bearers and his scorn for the staff officers, who stay in the deep dug-outs, well away from the front line where common soldiers and junior officers are being slaughtered for no purpose.

Best's diary describes the beach where they were stuck: 147 Sunday June 12th *No shelter from sun--trenches like cesspits, full of flies and waste matter with dead bodies half-buried below them. Unburied putrefying corpses all around, while survivors are half dead with fatigue and unable to resist disease. Lot of dysentery and cases of fever.* 148 *one lad sat on a Turk's corpse and deemed it a soft cushion* at a prayer service in a trench. The breeze off the ocean brought the stench of the bloated dead horses floating in the surf just off the beach.

The destruction of so many lives by a stupid and suicidal military strategy, to which the generals back in England remained stubbornly committed, produced a few grim jokes which Best recorded. Back in England the Major welcomes the returning regiment--as much of it as survived--*Your fame has gone out into all the world and now let me have the honour of shaking hands with both of you.* [Best 156]

After the war, Hamilton and Kitchener reminisce about the different divisions and then recall *By George yes, there was a 42nd Division: they must be there still.* [Best 176] The 42nd was nearly annihilated at Gallipoli.

Supplementary volume III 1101 c of the 13th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica describes how Australians were massacred at Anzac when sent over the top of their trenches. I 816 cd describes two divisions of Australian and New Zealand troops *Landing at Anzac.* They take the beach April 25th 1915 and are stuck there. 817 c to 818 b describes the invasion at **Suvla Bay** August 8th 1915 which led to *very heavy losses. The 54th Div. had already been swallowed up at Suvla. The conditions of stalemate which had prevailed before the arrival of the five new divisions from England set in afresh and continued to the end.* They finally abandoned the effort as hopeless in January 1916 after throwing away the lives of 200,000 soldiers to prove something that was obvious to the participants long before.

As elsewhere, *friendly fire* caused many of the casualties. Best 107 describes a group of soldiers rushing to take a trench after a shell from a distant British war ship had devastated the Turks occupying it. Then a second shell from the same British war ship devastated them.

Russia: *this insane regime*

The Russian peasants worshipped the Czar, just as the Romans worshipped Caesar as God's representative on earth--the pagan doctrine that Augustine stuck into Romans 13. It isn't just a doctrine, it is the common **idolatry of power** to which *the people* are addicted, and their patriot pastors are enablers of this addiction. Tolstoy's *War and Peace* describes the idolatry of the Czar. The worshipful attitude of the Germans towards *Der Fuhrer* was basically the same.

By the first World War the Czarist government was Europe's largest and most corrupt bureaucracy. It was described as *this insane regime, this tangle of cowardice, blindness, craftiness, and stupidity.* (Tuchman 59) While the Czar and the Czarina and Rasputin regaled themselves in the palace, Russia's inept generals sent their peasant soldiers into futile attacks on entrenched German positions where they piled up in front of the German guns. Hindenburg later wrote: *we had to remove the mounds of enemy corpses from before our trenches in order to get a clear field of fire against fresh assaulting waves.* They lost count of how many were killed, some 5 to 8 million. [Alan Moorehead *The Russian Revolution* page 4]

How surprising is it that this war turned a so-called *Christian* nation into a **Communist** nation ? Satan was already in residence in the Kremlin before the Bolsheviks moved in. That is what happens to you when you worship the Czar and **obey the magistrate.** For some reason, it takes a radical Christian faith to see clearly that Satan is in charge of the empire, even though it is a common sense conclusion that you could arrive at just by making an accurate count of the bodies and the lies.

The radical Christian books and stories that Leo Tolstoy wrote late in life, like *The Kingdom of God is Within You,* appear against a background of Imperial Czarist Russia and the *Christian* militarism that Tolstoy himself once exemplified as an army officer. That was the book which inspired the *nonviolent* crusades of Gandhi in South Africa and India. But it came too late for Russia. The inevitable rebellion against the Czar was captured by the Communists.

sacrifice of the masses

In the battle of Lake Narocz near Vilna in Lithuania in March 1916, 100,000 Russian soldiers were killed and *accomplished nothing* as the Encyclopedia Britannica essayist admits [Encyclopedia Britannica 13 Supplementary Volume II 1018a **Narocz.**] Another article says: *the Russians hurled untrained masses on the German front at Lake Narocz, near the Vilna, once more gallantly sacrificing themselves to help their allies--*by distracting the Germans from their offensive in France. [III 1086bc **World War.**]

What a wonderfully obtuse description of the slaughter--*gallantly sacrificing themselves*--as if these *untrained masses* had made a *mass resolution* to get themselves killed for some strategic reason no one had explained to them. III 1094b says *Russia had sacrificed herself to save her allies; preparing the way for their ultimate victory as surely as for her downfall.* These masses of peasant soldiers *sacrificed themselves* and piled up their dead bodies in heaps to clear the way for Lenin and Stalin and the Bolsheviks to come to power in Russia. Question: Was this God's doing or Satan's ? If it was God's Plan, no wonder so many people lost their faith in God.

Alan Moorehead's *The Russian Revolution*, pages 3 to 7, describes the situation which led to the collapse of the Russian war effort and the revolution of March 1917 which was captured by the Bolsheviks in October 1917. Millions of men, mostly peasants, had been sent into stupid battles without proper training or equipment. After 2.5 years of a war in which barbed wire was a major factor, Russian soldiers at the front still had no wire cutters. Some infantry units had no rifles--were given axes instead--and had no winter boots in December. The retreating Russian army destroyed everything and drove the less than loyal population from their homes, creating 6 million refugees, which included half a million Jews, 3/4ths of a million Poles, an equal number of Lithuanians, Latvians and ethnic Germans. [Hochschild *Wars* 156-157]

By the end of 1916, millions of these Russian peasant soldiers had been killed and hundreds of thousands of them had deserted. The establishment of Communist Russia was a major result of World War I. The preservation of Stalin's USSR and the spread of Communism to China and some 15 other countries was the major achievement of World War II. How *righteous* were these wars ? *By their fruits ye shall know them.* How much of a calculation do you need to make to arrive at the conclusion that **wars do more harm than good** ? A conclusion to which patriot Christians like C.S. Lewis remain blinded.

the greatness of our country

Just before the final big **German Offensive** of March 21st to April 4th 1918, General Ludendorff told Kaiser Wilhelm that *the very last man is employed in the decisive conflict, and is animated not only by love for his emperor and his native land, but by confidence in the strength of the military leadership and the greatness of our country.* [eb 13 Supplementary Volume II 193b] However *great* his country, the German soldier, if he had any sense, would have asked himself what he was doing in a muddy trench halfway across France--someone else's *country*--shooting at Frenchmen. What does *greatness* mean in this context ? Like the *greatness* of Alexander the Great, it needs some scrutiny. A similar scrutiny must be applied to the proposition that *America is the Greatest Country in the World !*

In *Mein Kampf*, Adolph Hitler invokes the patriotic legend of young German soldiers advancing to their doom in World War I while singing: *Deutschland, Deutschland uber alles, uber alles in der Welt !* These young brainwashed idiots had spaced out the fact that, by way of defending *Deutschland*, they were tearing up farms and rural villages in Belgium and France. They were the typical product of military training, then and now. Their fantasies about military glory are reinforced by a complete ignorance of history and geography which is insured by control of the press and censorship of their correspondence with people at home.

One of these young idiots was Corporal Adolph Hitler who was temporarily blinded by a British mustard gas attack. He was still recovering while Germany surrendered and he blamed the reds and the Jews for *stabbing the army in the back*. [John Tolland *Adolf Hitler* xiv] The fervent German patriotism of his later orations galvanized his countrymen to do it all over again. Although, as Tolland remarks, if his father Alois had not changed his last name to *Hitler*, *It is difficult to imagine seventy million Germans shouting in all seriousness "Heil Schicklgruber !"* [Tolland page 5]

Obviously there is a religious belief in this national faith. A worship that is focused upon the Nation writ large and far beyond the natural boundaries of *my country*. It is a worship that centers upon the person of the *Kaiser*--the *emperor* as Ludendorff rightly styles him. [*Caesar* became *Kaiser* and *Czar*] What else is it but a moral madness that adds up to demon worship, as witness the human sacrifice it demands ?

This madness did not end with Germany's defeat in World War I. Adolph Hitler revived it. He was a brave soldier in World War I and he devoutly believed in the *greatness* of Germany, even while he mixed it up with the faith in a *new world order*. Crazy as it was, the German people bought it. The passionate patriotism he preached evoked a deep response in the German people. Which was promoted by the German clergy. See *Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors*.

Nine million soldiers were killed in World War I and 7 million civilians. And this great *sacrifice* of conscripts led directly to a Communist government in Russia and Fascist governments in Italy, Spain and Germany. It led directly to World War II, in which 12 million Russian soldiers were killed, and in which 60 million people were killed over all, two thirds of them civilians. But the tragedy of war is not really measured by the estimate of how many millions were killed. *To the world he was a soldier, To me he was all the world*. Persico 380

volunteers versus conscripts

One of Lewis's basic assumptions is that soldiers are volunteers willing to die in defense of their *country*. The reality is that most of them are conscripts forced into situations where their lives are thrown away. The wholesale waste of human life by slavery, by poverty, by abortion and by conscription in war time is a basic characteristic of human society. And World War I provides a conspicuous illustration.

In World War I, England relied upon volunteers at first. And a million young Englishmen did volunteer in 1914. Many of them were eager for what they regarded as a great adventure and only afraid that the war would be over before they made it to France. Women went around handing out white feathers to young men who were not yet in uniform. But they ran out of volunteers after the reality of the war became better known. After that, the government had to rely upon conscription. And women were conscripted to work in war factories, which had serious hazards.

Wars will end when women stop admiring soldiers in uniform. They also like waiters in bow ties and footmen in livery--all those who are ready to serve them.

Soldiers are never really *volunteers* in the same way as those who volunteer for other things, who can quit when they want. Once you have taken that fatal step forward you belong to the army like any conscript. From then on, any refusal of orders, however stupid, can cause you to be court martialled and sent to prison or even shot on the spot.

The average man has very little at stake in a war except whether he survives the war and whether he gets a bonus or a pension. The stakes mainly concern the people at the top of the society who can afford to have international interests. That was obviously the case with the millions of soldiers who got nothing

from the first world war or the second world war except a grave in a foreign field. A lot of them did not get that much. The big patriots of society manage to stay well away from the front lines of the infantry where life is *nasty, brutish and short*. The further from the front line, the hotter the fire of patriotism.

While front line soldiers soon lose track of the noble ideals for which they are supposed to be fighting. As one soldier wrote: *every man Jack is fed up almost past bearing and not a single one has an ounce of what we call patriotism left in him. No one cares a rap whether Germany has Alsace, Belgium or France too for that matter. All that every man desires now is to get done with it and go home. . . .* [Steel 304]

Despite continuing propaganda and censorship of news and letters, the daily experience of the soldiers leads to a steady erosion of the fuzzy notions which allowed them to Have Faith in the War. What they have left is loyalty to their buddies and a hatred of the enemy which is enhanced by the desire to avenge fallen comrades. Visceral tribal and racial hatreds find outlets in war. Little trace of the noble idealism of patriotic speeches survives at the level of the infantry.

Killing of prisoners

The cold blooded killing of enemy soldiers who had surrendered or who were trying to surrender was a common practice in World War I--as it was in other wars, contra the official pretence.

Every honest book about war brings out the fact that soldiers commonly shoot enemy soldiers when they are trying to surrender or already captives. In the Pacific in World War II frustrated intelligence officers had to offer a week's furlough to try and get a live prisoner to interrogate, because the habit of killing prisoners had become so engrained.

Books about World War I testify to the same basic fact. Best 132 refers to the Australians not taking prisoners--as if the practice was peculiar to the Australians. The *Passchendaele* book by Nigel Steel and Peter Hart provides ample evidence that the English did the same--119 *there were many men who shot down any of the enemy, regardless of circumstances, wounded or prisoners it made no difference*. Hochschild 196 describes them killing Germans who are trying to surrender. Stempel 210 he and his men bayoneted Germans trying to surrender.

Paul Fussell's book about World War II, *Doing Battle The Making of a Skeptic* 1996 page 124, describes *The Great Turkey Shoot* when a group of Germans surrounded in a hollow and trying to surrender were gunned down without mercy by the American soldiers who were "Laughing and howling." He observes that *one of the most brutal things in the world is your average nineteen-year-old American boy*. But you hardly need to specify *American*. Teenaged boys are the prime target of military recruiters the world over. They readily join gangs which become army platoons. In the pages leading up to this one Fussell describes how he himself had become hardened to where nothing bothered him.

A billboard at a U.S. Naval Base in the Pacific said *Kill Japs Kill Japs Kill More Japs*. Making it in effect official policy. And it accurately reflects the common feeling of American sailors and soldiers.

A Vietnam veteran interviewed in the Ken Burns film, explained that captured *Viet Cong* weren't really prisoners unless and until they managed to make it to a rear area where the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners might be at least nominally observed.

The same standard applied to the battles of World War I in which many German soldiers taken prisoner on the battle field did not become **Prisoners of War** unless and until they made it to the rear. In one

episode, two captured Germans saved themselves by volunteering to carry a wounded British officer to the rear.

War Stinks

A basic fact about war to which printed words cannot do justice is that **war stinks**.

A war correspondent in Belgium in 1914 noted the smell of half a million unbathed men. Tuchman 259 The battle fields of the Somme were littered with the rotting corpses of horses and mules and soldiers. The relentless artillery threw up corpses already buried and the smell mixed with the smell of the gas shells. [Steel 168] The trenches were used as toilets by soldiers who risked death if they left the trench to relieve themselves.

In his memoir of World War II, Eugene Sledge describes the conditions in the battle of Okinawa when he had to occupy a fox hole along with a half buried dead Japanese soldier. The smell of excrement and vomit mingled with the smell of dead bodies and you might very well join them, thanks to a sniper, if you even stuck your head up to get a breath of air. [Sledge *With the Old Breed at Peleliu and Okinawa*.]

Friendly Fire

Getting killed or crippled by *friendly fire* is a major hazard of war. In the recent war in Iraq a quarter of the casualties were due to *friendly fire* or accidents. An NFL star who volunteered for the war in Afghanistan was killed by *friendly fire* and the government concealed that fact until the funeral had come and gone. Obviously, getting killed by your own side tarnishes whatever purpose there is supposed to be to your *sacrifice* and leaves the eulogist with an awkward fact to explain or ignore as best he can. So and so died for his country at the hands of his country.

In *Wartime* Paul Fussell describes several episodes of mass casualties when Allied planes mistakenly dropped bombs on Allied forces or ground gunners shot down their own air force. And the press was prevented from reporting any of it. And it wasn't just carelessness. The British killed 1200 French sailors by intentionally bombing the French fleet in the Mediterranean to keep it from falling into the hands of the Germans, after France had surrendered. To prepare the way for the Normandy invasion, American and British planes systematically bombed railway lines, killing some 12,000 Belgian and French civilians whose death sentence was passed upon them because they lived near the railroad tracks. Such things are commonly done in war. They display the same **military mind set** that General Washington and Colonel Webb displayed when they shelled the city of Boston in March of 1776. [See *The Roots of Abortion* pages 73-74 re-printed as *Child Sacrifice to the Goddess of Liberty* and see the quote below.]

A 2008 book by William Hitchcock, *The Bitter Road to Freedom*, describes how British and American war planes systematically destroyed the towns of Normandy, killing thousands of French citizens, destroying churches, hospitals, schools and civic buildings for no good reason in the immediate follow up to the Normandy invasion in 1944. Whatever the harm the German occupation had caused, the Germans had moved on, but the Allies destroyed these towns anyway. The pictures of these French towns, bombed by the Allies, look just like the towns of Germany which were also bombed until nothing was left but rubble. And the soldiers looted French homes as if they were dealing with the enemy.

At the end of his talk, [page 89] Lewis makes a comparison between *the life of a soldier on active service*, who is liable to *pain and death* and the Pacifist at Oxford--*Pacifism threatens you with almost nothing. . . . It offers you time to lay the foundations of a career. You do not even have to fear, as Pacifists may have had to fear in the last war, that public opinion will punish you when the peace comes.*

This is a specious comparison. It may have been the case that a professor at Oxford in 1940 could discreetly hold a pacifist opinion without damage to his career. But a patriot professor like Lewis himself was even safer. In fact, his career was substantially promoted by his war time broadcasts for the BBC, and his talks to the RAF, which were eventually collected as *Mere Christianity*, one of his most popular books. While pacifists were excluded from speaking on any subject on the BBC. [Marsden 26] During World War I, Bertrand Russell lost his position at Cambridge for writing a leaflet for the No Conscription Fellowship. Later he was given six months in jail for another article in their journal. Hochschild 190 and 323.

Teachers who registered as *conscientious objectors* lost their jobs and were blacklisted afterwards. *Opponents of War*, chapter 10, describes the patriotic coercion aimed at professors in America in World War I which forced many of them to abandon their careers.

Some 6000 pacifist draft refusers went to prison in England in World War II, about the same number as in World War I. Some were very badly treated. [See Peace Pledge Union documents on line] The same thing happened in America.

Lewis is using an unbalanced comparison between someone who merely has a pacifist opinion and a soldier, usually a conscript, who winds up in the hell of the front line trenches. Nine out of 10 men in the military manage to avoid those front line trenches one way or another. The front line junior officers got creamed along with the soldiers but staff officers stayed well away from the mud and blood of the trenches. *Forward ! they cried from the rear, and the front line died.* A World War I Lieutenant describes a confrontation with a general who wanted to inspect their rifles after a terrible battle. But he gives him some credit: *He was the only general I ever saw in the line.* [*Six Weeks* by John Lewis-Stempel page 166]

The more truthful comparison is that between the patriot who *supports* the war from a safe distance and the pacifist draft refuser who faces prison or worse. Even if they sign up for some branch of the military to avoid the draft, most patriots stay well away from the mud and blood of the front line infantry. They volunteer for the National Guard or the Reserve etc.

draft refusers beheaded

In World War II Germany, draft refusers were executed by beheading. That is what happened to thousands of Christians in the early church who refused to serve in the Roman army. It still happens in many places. Franz Jaggerstatter was executed by beheading in 1943 for his refusal to serve in Hitler's army. He believed that he was called to be a martyr for the Kingdom of God, instead of a killer in the service of the new German empire. And the same thing happened to other Christian pacifists. [*In Solitary Witness* by Gordon Zahn tells the story of Franz Jaggerstatter]

In America and Britain several thousand men went to prison in World War I and World War II for refusing military service. Some of them were very harshly treated. Two Hutterites were killed by severe mistreatment at the hands of the American military. See *The Martyrs of Alcatraz* Plough Summer 2014. Four young Hutterites were forced into the army in 1918. Then sent to Alcatraz when they

refused to put on the army uniform. Then, at Fort Leavenworth, they were so severely mistreated that Joseph and Michael Hofer died of the mistreatment.

Lewis is implying that at least some of those who claim to be *pacifists* are motivated by the desire to avoid the trenches. No doubt that is true, but there are a dozen easier ways to avoid front line service. That is what most *patriots* do. Of all those who join the military, less than 20 percent wind up in front line combat. By volunteering for some other duty or some other branch of the service they avoid it. In the 1960s a lot of men avoided military service entirely by student deferments or pursuing occupations that were exempt. *Draft Dodging* is resorted to by *patriots* more than it is by *pacifists*. A substantial number of *pacifists* in all of our wars refused on principle to accept a Conscientious Objector deferment and went to prison instead as **draft refusers**.

A lot of people assume they know all about *pacifism* having never bothered to learn anything about it. The so called **absolute nonviolence** position is rare and almost impossible to defend-- *What, you are going to stand there and do nothing while someone attacks your daughter ? !* The relative pacifist position is much easier to defend: *Why do we have to send an army to the far side of the world to defend our families here in America ?*

Supposedly Hussein had *weapons of mass destruction* and the capacity to deliver them to America and the will to do it = the madness to attempt it. That is what justified the American invasion of Iraq which led to the destruction of Iraq, the launching of the Islamic State etc. America invaded Vietnam under the influence of similar specious arguments, which neglected to tell the history of Vietnam's colonial occupation by the French etc.

The individual trying to judge the **righteousness** of a war for himself finds that 1) those who have the information cannot be trusted to tell the truth 2) you have to stand up to the threat of prison to make a decision 3) there is an enormous pressure of conformity from a brainwashed populace whose patriotism is in proportion to its ignorance.

Patriotism is usually just an opinion. A \$ 2 bumper sticker. Real pacifism is not just an opinion. It requires the courage to resist the extreme coercion of social conformity and the threat of prison. It requires an individual courage which most individuals do not have, unless they have received that Spirit of Courage which animated the early Christians to refuse military service.

When pacifism is just an opinion, it is not worth much. But the same can be said for patriotism. When pacifism means persisting despite the threat of prison or even having your head cut off, as it has for many thousands of Christian pacifists in years gone by, it has the power to transform society.

guard of lies

After World War II, Winston Churchill wrote that *in wartime, truth is so precious that she should always be attended by a bodyguard of lies*. Which is a sophisticated way of admitting that the British government lied all through the war. A steady stream of false information is an essential part of war. Governments rely upon sustained and systematic falsehood, not just to fool the enemy, but to deceive the home population and the soldiers fighting the war. A government in time of war is a propaganda machine which can be relied upon to do its best to deceive everyone. Hochschild 289 describes the propaganda effort carried out by Director of Information John Buchan.

Kenneth Best writes: "As I suspected, Major Clarke tells me 55,000 Turkish casualties is a fictitious estimate. The figure is calculated on no sure data, but intended to keep up morale of our troops who are

having a trying time, losing men steadily and gaining nothing--except a few yards of Turkish soil." page 132 of *A Chaplain at Gallipoli*.

The Slapton Sands disaster, aka *Operation Tiger*, a training exercise gone awry just before D-Day in World War II, led to 700 American soldiers being secretly buried in a mass grave on an English farm while everyone involved was sworn to secrecy on pain of court martial. See *War Time* by Paul Fussell. It is part of the plot of a *Foyle's War* episode.

It is well said that *truth is the first casualty in war*. And the newspaper is the first conscript. In World War I and World War II the press in England and America was told what it could print and what it could not print. The media over did it, reporting minor successes as big victories. They then had to be told to present a more realistic picture so that people would understand why sacrifice was still necessary. See the article on war time censorship in the Encyclopedia Britannica supplementary volumes put out in 1925. By late 1917, there were 4000 censors at work in England, censoring both the press and the mail. Hochschild 295

The Patriot Act

The censorship in America was similar. Under the Patriot Act passed in 1917 some 10,000 Americans were sent to prison just for anti war leaflets or speeches. Ammon Hennacy was given 5 years in prison for passing out anti war leaflets. The *Fire in a Crowded Theater* decision by Justice Oliver Wendall Holmes upheld the felony conviction and prison sentence of a man who was preparing the mailing of an anti conscription leaflet when the Federal police came into his office and arrested him.

President Wilson did not explicitly get the right to censor the press under the Espionage Act, but Title XII of the Act did the same thing in effect by allowing him to prohibit sending *through the mails* any materials *advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law of the United States*. *Treason* was interpreted to mean any opposition to the war.

A Pentecostal minister, Reverend Clarence Waldron of Windsor Vermont. published a pamphlet: *The Word of the Cross* which said that *Christ has no kingdom here. His servants must not fight*. [cf. John 18.36] *A Christian can take no part in the war*. He was arrested, charged with violating the Espionage Act, sentenced to 18 years, and sent to the federal penitentiary in Atlanta. A year later, after the war was over, he was pardoned, along with others who had been given these ridiculous sentences just for writing or speaking or preaching against the war. But of course the message had been sent. [*Opponents of War* 117-118]

flag above the church

Theodore Roosevelt said *the clergyman who does not put the flag above the church had better close his church and keep it closed*. [115] He thereby defined **patriot Christianity**. Today, they still gather around the flag pole to pray. The flag defines what they believe in. At Newton Massachusetts, the Reverend Abraham J. Muste resigned under pressure because he opposed the war. He later led the War Resisters' League. Some preachers were jailed for anti war sermons. A group of pacifist ministers in California was prevented from holding a conference. The popular patriot preacher Billy Sunday called for them to be lynched. When they finally held a meeting, the police came and arrested three of them. They were accused of *discussing, arguing and preaching certain thoughts and theories in opposition to the orderly conduct of the affairs of the United States of America, and which said thoughts and theories were calculated to cause any American citizen then and there present to assault and batter the persons so uttering the same*. ** There were meetings in private homes under police surveillance before the

last meeting was broken up by the South Pasadena Home Guards. Storey, a Quaker, was taken in a car, then turned loose to a mob which beat him." *Opponents of War* 115-116

** That is the legal theory of *heckler's veto*: you have committed a crime if patriots are provoked to attack you while the police look the other way. But then they arrest you.

Thousands of Americans were arrested and imprisoned for similar *crimes*. One woman got 5 years for a letter published in the newspaper. *The Land of the Free* reacts like every other militarized nation in war time. That is the reality behind the facade. Chapter X of the Peterson and Fite book describes how teachers were silenced or fired if they continued to oppose the war. And the same thing happened in England in both World Wars, contra Lewis's assertion that you could be a pacifist without harming your career.

Denver Post Thursday May 4th 2006 **Montana pardons 80 convicted WWI hysteria.** "citizens who spoke out against the government during World War I" 80 people convicted of sedition mostly working-class people of German descent who were convicted under what was then one of the harshest sedition laws in the nation. August Lambrecht was imprisoned for seven months for prediction the United States would *get a licking* in France. Left the state after his release for fear of being imprisoned again. 78 men and one woman were convicted of sedition. They were imprisoned for an average of 19 months, often based on casual comments made in saloons. Journalism professor Clem Work of the University of Montana wrote a book *Darkest Before Dawn: Sedition and Free Speech in the American West*. A man in Indiana was locked up for a month for *uttering disparaging remarks about President Wilson*.

In the early period of WW II, the media was forbidden to show dead bodies of American soldiers. The government and the media routinely concealed major facts about our Russian allies like a million rapes by the red army while they marched across Europe, including Russian women they had just *liberated* from Germany's slave labor camps. Long after the war was over the British and American governments were still concealing the secret deal that Churchill and Roosevelt made with Stalin at Yalta to forcibly return all the anti Communist Russians who had escaped to the west during the war. Those who were not shot were sent to the horrible Siberian labor camps. See Nikolai Tolstoy, *Victims of Yalta*.

why censorship is needed

Support for the Vietnam war steadily eroded because Johnson never formally declared war and never imposed censorship upon the news media, as was done in earlier wars. When the American people were exposed to the realities of the war they couldn't take it. I remember a patriotic lady trying to explain away the Mylai massacre after *Life Magazine* published the pictures in 1969. Even a 3 year old might take a message to her guerrilla father, she argued.

The information about the Vietnam War put out by the American Government was 9 parts fiction to 1 part fact. They didn't just deceive the gullible patriotic populace, they deceived themselves. After throwing away 50 thousand American lives, they found a dishonorable way out by abandoning those they had promised to protect.

America's last war, the invasion of Iraq, was based upon the government's claim that Iraq had *weapons of mass destruction* which could somehow reach the U.S. Which turned out to be not true.

Conscience versus the King

A conscientious civilian may very well pass through his whole life without ever having to consider whether to use deadly force to protect himself or his family. And when your kid or your dog is threatened by some other kid or dog, you are very likely to react instinctively without having any time to consider the ethics of your situation. But what does that have to do with war ?

The elaborate presentation of *conscience* that C.S. Lewis makes in the first part of his talk--*Conscience in the (a) sense . . . in the (b) sense* [70] is irrelevant to war, where the first thing you do is to surrender your conscience to the Commander in Chief--to his representative the platoon sergeant or the second lieutenant. When he tells you to lob a grenade or drop a bomb, you do it. You don't argue with him. He has the legal right to shoot you on the spot if you refuse to obey orders.

The first duty of a soldier is to obey the command of his superior officer. That is what military training drills into him until it becomes second nature. The chain of command is his *conscience*. Augustine's doctrine is that we must obey the ruler regardless of whether he is just or unjust--without even raising the question. That question is between the ruler and God and not even the bishop is competent to consider it, much less someone down at our level.

In practice it means that you do what the Sergeant or the Lieutenant tells you to do without questioning the order. The sergeant has replaced your conscience. When you join the army, you belong body and soul to a military machine. You have the same haircut and the same uniform as the others, you march in lockstep with them and **charge** forward with them on command of the officer. Any further decision about what you will do belongs to the platoon, the company and the regiment. Orders come from the top down and no one wants your opinion as to whether they are right or wrong. A *conscience* is a luxury you cannot afford. You left it behind with your civilian clothes. There is not much use trying to form a conscience when you are marching in lock step with a bunch of other draftees and memorizing admonitions like: **the purpose of the bayonet is to kill.**

Any attempt to have an independent conscience thereafter will lead to Court Martial and prison. Or death. In World War I, in the British army, the death sentence after a court martial was ordered 3080 times and carried out on 346 occasions. Soldiers who retreated from a hopeless position without waiting for orders were liable as were those who fell asleep on sentry duty. **Field Punishment # 1** was meted out on 60,210 occasions in WWI. You were chained to a post out on the battle field. Forced to do hard labor. And sentenced to forfeit of pay. The British army still used flogging to punish soldiers until 1881 and it was used in military prisons until 1907. *Six Weeks* 165-166. The Russian army still allowed physical punishments in the late 20th century. Historically, the situation of a soldier was not much different from that of a slave. A draft refuser locked up in prison is a free man by comparison.

Besides formal death sentences following a court martial proceeding, soldiers were shot on the spot by officers if they did not follow orders. General George Washington told the soldiers that if they ran from the battle, *they must expect Instant Death by way of example to others.* [Webb diary, see below] Steel 310 quotes a soldier's letter: *there is no alternative to the firing squad but to go forward . . .* Best 90 Tuesday February 9 [1915]: "The Staff Officers say many of our men on the Western Front had to be shot on retreat from Mons, to prevent retreat from becoming a panicky flight."

facts from the *Ministry of Information*

Lewis concedes that *of every 100 facts upon which to reason, 99 depend on authority.* And he says *We accept them on authority* and *Hence the value of authority in checking, or even superseding, our own activity.* Pages 66-69. He raises no warning flag about the dangers of accepting as *facts* what the government says is true. His other **authority** is that Church which has thrown in its lot with that of the Empire. How can either of these *authorities* be trusted to tell us the truth ? How can the Apostate

Church which has conformed to **this world** pretend to any independent moral judgment upon those actions of that State upon which it depends ? The deal it has made with the empire guarantees its lack of integrity. It has lost that Spirit which gives us the Courage to Bear Witness to the Truth.

Lewis himself declined an invitation to write columns for the *Ministry of Information* in World War II because he did not want to *write lies*. [according to a Wikipedia article] But he persisted in his silly argument which assumes that the average person has the chance to make a conscientious decision about whether or not to join the army. The assumption that we have access to *the facts* and that we are free to *reason* about them is silly. Franz Jaggerstatter had his head chopped off when he refused to serve in Hitler's army. The Jehovah's Witnesses and other Christian pacifists were put to death by both Stalin and Hitler when they refused military service. In England in World War I, 34 draft refusers were taken to France and sentenced to death before it was commuted to 10 years in prison. Hochschild 202 In America two of the Hutterites forced into the army were killed by the mistreatment they suffered at Fort Leavenworth in Kansas.

How can you make a conscientious decision with a gun at your head after being brainwashed to believe what the government wants you to believe ? While women are handing you white feathers. If you consult your pastor, the odds are about 999 to 1 that he is a patriot conformist who will parrot whatever the government is saying. See *Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors*.

It is silly to pretend that a soldier can have a conscience. Unless he can resist pressures that few men can resist, Economic pressure pushes men into the army and it is backed by conscription. The pressure to conform is generated by government propaganda transmitted by subservient news media. It is backed by the threat of disgrace and punishment. You may be imprisoned or even executed. You are surrounded by the worship of the flag and the military.

A continuous flow of propaganda designed to brainwash everyone is typical of so-called *democratic* states in war time and it is the permanent foundation of dictatorial and totalitarian states. In modern times, football games are the scene of regular patriotic ceremonies which promote the flag worship of the *America* cult = mindless support for the military and the wars of the empire. The military pays the NFL to do it. The taxpayers and the fans have to foot the bill to have themselves regularly dosed with patriotic piety.

Young men who are serenely ignorant of history and geography in the first place are subjected to patriotic brainwashing reinforced by a set of *facts* selected by the war making government and published by the news media. If, despite that, you arrive at the conclusion that the war is wrong, you are subjected to the easy scorn of the patriotic conformists--most of the populace--and then faced with prison or even execution if you still refuse to sign up. When World War I began, patriotic mobs attacked anti war rallies while the police looked the other way.

There is an obvious fallacy in the argument Lewis makes that war must be righteous because people believe it to be righteous. Nothing is more common and more conspicuous than the tendency people have to justify the most atrocious wars with pretences promoted by government propaganda published in a jingoistic press. Our tendency as individuals to justify ourselves despite any evidence to the contrary is multiplied by 1000 when the nation goes to war. When a patriotic mob believes something, it is presumptive evidence that it is not true.

patriotic propaganda

How easy it is to deceive most of the population with patriotic propaganda. You hardly have to convince them of anything, they already believe it. It amounts to a religious faith. That of course is the

basic charter of the Imperial Church, which is everyone's church, which overlaps with the state. See *The Church of the Empire*, especially Chapter XIII *Everybody's Church: Wheat and Tares*.

You haven't much leeway to be a Christian by yourself when you have been taught from an early age to march along in step with the other *Christian soldiers*. *Six Weeks* describes how Public School boys were required to take Officers' Training which taught them Military Christianity and faith in the British Empire. None of them had read any real history of the British Empire. In place of that they were given the standard patriotic history, reinforced by the sermons they heard in chapel. It was essentially the same kind of patriotic brainwashing program used in the *Hitler Youth* in the years leading up to World War II. In America, the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s accustomed men to the army style discipline imposed upon most of them when they were drafted into the army a few years later.

Six Weeks 259-260 describes a sermon which tried to find the spiritual and moral meaning of the struggle for Passchendaele--which tries to make sense of these 19 year olds sinking into mud holes. After all, Jesus died at 33. A post war memorial at Winchester says they *laid down their lives for mankind* [316] Just like Jesus. But Jesus didn't drown in a mud hole at age 19. And what these young English idiots actually accomplished was to clear the way for Stalin in Russia and Hitler in Germany. From which *mankind* received very little benefit--to say the least.

Good Old Joe

Most of us imbibe patriotism with our mother's milk. There is a picture of me and my brother as children, growing up in World War II, into which my father was drafted despite having 4 kids. We are wearing some kid version of an army uniform and saluting. Aside from being indoctrinated from the cradle, all the information reaching us through the news media was routinely censored, as were the letters home by soldiers. None of us knew enough to object to the alliance with Joe Stalin. *I like old Joe*, President Truman said. We were oblivious of the fact that millions of civilians, women and kids and old men, were being killed and crippled by the allied bombing of German and Japanese cities.

In *War and Peace*, Tolstoy fails to even mention **rape** when he lists the other *crimes* committed by soldiers in the War of 1812: *Millions of men perpetrated against one another so great a mass of crime--fraud, swindling, robbery, forgery, issue of counterfeit money, plunder, incendiarism, and murder--that the annals of all the criminal courts of the world could not muster such a sum of wickedness in whole centuries, though the men who committed these deeds did not at that time look on them as crimes.* [*W & P* Part 9 page 561 Modern Library] No doubt the Czarist censor would have deleted it if Tolstoy had included it. Rape is the most common crime in war and the one most commonly concealed. There was less opportunity for rape in World War I just because the armies were stuck in the trenches with very little access to the civilian population. But rape was a common crime in World War II, committed by all of the armies, not just by the Russians. [See William Hitchcock *The Bitter Road to Freedom* page 194] And it was commonly concealed by all of the *Ministries of Information*.

bombing of cities

What made the slaughter of World War II even worse than the slaughter of World War I is the bombing of cities. By the time it ended, 60 million had been killed, two thirds of them civilians--women and kids and old men. The armies were not stuck in trenches the way they were in World War I, so they rampaged through towns and villages, raping and looting and killing.

brothels

One of the basic facts of war, whether ancient or modern, is that prostitutes are a military necessity. Lewis must have known that. So how can a Christian moralist so easily assume that *War is Righteous* when it so inevitably erodes sexual morality ?

In Washington D.C., when the Union Army was quartered there during the Civil War, there were 450 brothels. The name **HOOKER** comes from the name for the prostitutes who serviced the army while General Joe Hooker commanded it--*Hooker's Girls*.

In World War I an extensive system of military brothels was established in France. The brothels of Amiens produced an epidemic of venereal disease which became a major problem for the military. The English army in France reported some 153,351 cases. *Six Weeks* 254 And of course these soldiers carried venereal disease home with them if they survived the war.

The total and entirely predictable wholesale erosion of sexual morality in time of war is another obvious clue that there is something fundamentally wrong with conscripting young men and sending them far away from wives and girl friends for years at a time. If you are really *defending your home*, why is that necessary ?

Homosexual sex is also common among sexually starved soldiers although it is so routinely concealed that it is almost impossible to trace accurately and it is rarely prosecuted. *Six Weeks* 256 says there were 17 trials for *indecent* among British soldiers in World War I.

In Vietnam there were 300,000 or more women working as prostitutes by 1973. Thousands more were raped by American soldiers. The testimony of veterans shows that it was a common crime which was commonly concealed. See my article *Rape in War Time*.

Unleash the Orcs

The great fairy tale epic *The Lord of the Rings* by J.R.R. Tolkien reflects his experience in World War I from which he was invalidated home with *trench fever*. He was a close friend of C.S. Lewis, who also wrote theological fairy tales.

The *Orcs* who are the soldiers of the **Dark Lord** are modeled upon the common soldiers Tolkien encountered in World War I who are characterized by constant quarrelling and constant cursing. The relentless obscenity of the language of soldiers is a reliable indicator as to whether it is Jesus or Satan who inspires the war. An evil spirit marked by quarrels and obscenity is characteristic of all the armies. The Hutterites forced into the American army in 1917 were *appalled by the coarse language of their associates*. The military trainers encourage and manipulate the pugnacity of soldiers against other soldiers on the same side in order to develop that habitual pugnacity which is needed in battle.

Any realistic war novel records the obscene language that soldiers talk. Is this kind of language incidental to the noble and moral purpose they are carrying out ? Is it compatible with the claim that they are *Christian* soldiers ? In fact, it shows something very basic about the war. An enterprise marked by hatred, lies and obscenity cannot be made to fit under the head of *righteous* Christian warfare.

Tolkien's **ring bearer** is a Jesus figure who saves the world by his solo ordeal. Which reflects the bad theology of the Worldly Church--Jesus does it all, we don't have to do anything. The true Christian theology develops out of the gospel of John 20.21-22 where Jesus breathes the Holy Spirit into his apostles to enable them to continue His mission to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. Which cannot be established by armed men, as Jesus explains to Pilate in John 18.36.

In this fairy tale version of World War II, only evil *Orcs* and other evil ones are slaughtered to bring down the **Dark Lord**. In the real War, millions of innocent men, women and children were slaughtered and a second **Dark Lord** emerged triumphant. He died in bed in his old age, after presiding over the murder of many more innocent victims.

Ignorance is Your Patriotic Duty

Most Americans are still willfully ignorant of the realities of American wars. You can read a dozen American histories without learning the most basic facts about the American Revolution. After 250 years, 99 per cent of Americans are ignorant of them. Such as that:

I. It took two French armies and two French navies to carry Washington's French-financed *American* army across the finish line at Yorktown. See Lee Kennett *The French Forces in America 1780-1783* (1977)

II. The citizen's militias were useless--*summer soldiers*--and had to be replaced by a professional army. [see the letters of Washington et al]

III. I came across these items in the *Journal* of one of Washington's staff officers, **Colonel Samuel Webb**, about how they shelled the houses to drive out the British when they had Boston surrounded in March 1776: page 132 entry for Saturday March 2nd 1776 *from my window have a most pleasing and yet dismal View of the firey Ministers of Death flying thro the Air, poor inhabitants our friends we pity most sincerely, but particularly the Women & Children.* page 134 entry for Tuesday, March 5th 1776 *Last night at 7 oClock we began a heavy Cannonade on the Town of Boston, from our Forts on Cobble-Hill, Lechmore's Point, & Lamb's Dam on Roxbury side . . . Our Shell rak'd the houses terribly and the Crys of poor Women and Children frequently reach'd our Ears,--we would that they were out of the Devoted Capital, but tis not in our power.* Of course they couldn't call off the shelling just because kids were getting hit. [See my article *Child Sacrifice to the Goddess of Liberty*]

Among the early Christians, pacifism was an essential part of their Christian faith. They did not have the education to arrive at such a conclusion by any study of their own. But the Sermon on the Mount and the other teachings of Jesus Christ reinforce the common sense perception that war is wrong. It invariably entails mindless violence and indiscriminate destruction. It never serves the interests of those common men who are forced into the army and sacrificed for nothing--for illusions that do not stand up to any serious scrutiny. You have to take pacifism on faith because the average person has no access to the facts. Fifty years later you might learn what really went on.

What good does it do all those young men, killed at 19, who *rest* beneath one of those identical white crosses in a long, long row in a foreign field far from home-- unless their remains are buried in the mud or lost in the jungle. Even in death, they are not allowed to reclaim their individuality which the army erased in basic training.

versus freedom of the individual

America supposedly stands for the **freedom of the individual**. When you join the army you give up your freedom and your individuality. Someone like Franz Jaggerstatter exhibits that Spirit of Truth and Love and Courage which is the only real alternative to war. The only real alternative to the conformists with their crowd courage who clump on over the cliff in lockstep with the rest of the crowd on command of *Der Fuhrer*.

We praise the courage of soldiers but 9 times out of 10 it is a pretense. The whole purpose of military discipline is to make up for the lack of individual courage by the enforced conformity which transforms individuals into a military machine. Individuality is the first thing the military system sets out to erase. Everyone has to have the same haircut and the same uniform. Everyone has to learn to march in lockstep and do exactly what everyone else does on command of a single voice. Your personal identity is replaced by the identification with a military unit in the same way that young men in slums come to identify with a gang. The gang rapes which are common in military campaigns illustrate one effect of this group identity. The virility of the individual soldier comes to depend upon the gang--the military unit to which he belongs.

THE FUTILITY OF VIOLENCE

Most of what Jesus said about violence stressed that it had no role in establishing his kingdom (cf. John 18.36) But when he said to Peter that *all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*, Matthew 26.52, he spoke to the practical uselessness of violence, its self-defeating character.

It was an accurate prediction of what would soon happen to those who joined the rebellion against the Roman Empire in 66 A.D., which ended in 70 A.D. with the death of a million Jews and the destruction of The Temple, as Jesus had prophesied in Matthew 24. This rebellion, which aimed at re-establishing the independent kingdom of Israel, instead brought about the destruction of Israel and the dispersion of the Jews.

What Jesus said also speaks to the downfall of the Roman Empire itself, which grew larger and larger through its endless wars until it collapsed from its own weight. It perished by the swords of the conquered barbarians it had conscripted into its armies and trained to use the Roman sword.

When the Jerusalem mob chose the rebel Barabbas over Jesus, they expressed that faith in the sword which is the common idolatry of mankind.

Modern Israel has a big national monument to **Simeon bar-Kochba** who got a lot of people killed in his failed rebellion against the Roman Empire in 132-135 A.D. in the time of Hadrian. Rabbi Akiba hailed him as *The Messiah*. Israel does not have a big national monument for Jesus, Israel's most famous son, who refused to lead a rebellion against the Roman Empire. [See *Zionism versus Judaism*]

People worship the *GodBlessAmerica* flag and what it represents--victory in war with the help of God. *Is-ra-El* means *The Lord Does Battle*. Israel was established by the victories of its early wars for the *Promised Land* against those already living there.

When you have no other perspective, rebellion, even if it is doomed, appears to be admirable compared to submission--*liberty or death* ! And nationalistic hatred moves us beyond any sensible calculation of what is possible. I don't mind dying if I can take some of you S.O.B.s with me. *Die hard, my men, die hard ! Viva Muerte !*

Is armed resistance the only way or the best way to oppose an oppressive government ? It is arguably the worst way. But other ways of fighting back require a dedication and self discipline and individual courage which is characteristic of the few. *The masses* will do little or nothing unless they are

compelled to do it by external discipline, military style discipline. What they do spontaneously is throw rocks at the cops before they run. Then they loot the liquor stores.

faith in war

World War I, the war which was supposed to *make the world safe for democracy*, produced Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. However little *democracy* there was in imperial Germany or Czarist Russia, it got 10 times worse in the aftermath of World War I. The *war to end all wars* led to a war 20 years later which killed three times as many. Woodrow Wilson believed that the *sacrifice* of American soldiers in France should have **Saved the World**. So why did it achieve the opposite result ?

World War II was supposedly the Great Struggle Against Evil, as represented by Adolph Hitler and the Nazis. So how did Joe Stalin and the Communists become the major partner of the Allies in that struggle ? Were they reliable *comrades* in the **Battle against Evil** ? More or less, at least according to the usual *realpolitik* calculation. And in fact they bore the brunt of the battle. Two thirds of the German soldiers who were killed in World War II were killed on the eastern front in battle against the red army. Twelve million Russian soldiers died in the battle against Germany. *Censored* is the number of women raped by the red army in its march across Europe. Just one of those regrettable side effects of the **Battle against Evil**.

Especially when they don't have to fight it themselves, People live for war. Those who actually fight in the war soon become disillusioned with it. But those at a safe distance find *vicarious adventure* in a war. It gives a purpose and a meaning to their lives which is otherwise missing. It is a great crusade against evil and they brush aside any allegations of evil against those on their side of the war. Joe Stalin is moved to the far corner of the great tapestry upon which is painted the Defeat of Evil Hitler by America and Great Britain.

The victory of the Soviet Union was the major achievement of World War II. It made Stalin the master of eastern Europe. And he installed Mao Tse Tsung as the ruler of China. The pair of them killed more people than Hitler did.

A lot of medical operations do more harm than good. But a skilled surgeon will at least try to cut out most of the cancer without killing the patient. The allied operations of World War II in effect blasted the patient to get rid of the cancer. To cut out the cancer of Nazism, the women and kids of German cities were relentlessly bombed by American and British war planes. That is how efficient war is in targeting evil. It uses a meat axe to chop out the cancer.

It is typical of what is done in war. The *Goumiers* of North Africa, who were part of the French Army, looted, raped and murdered in a campaign of terror through the mountain villages of Italy even after Mussolini had been ousted. They were even worse than the other allied armies, which tolerated them, but not that much worse. The Good Knight is a myth. The reality is that they empty the prisons to fill up the regiments. An army on the march is a crime wave let loose, as Tolstoy says.

counter productive

American wars of the late 20th century can be accurately described as **counter productive**. They killed a million Vietnamese to **Stop Communism** and failed to stop it. This was what the world's most powerful military accomplished by deploying its arsenal. America dropped more bombs in Vietnam than were dropped by all sides in World War II. This overwhelming military force overwhelmed itself in effect.

In order to defeat the Taliban of Afghanistan, America forged an alliance with the war lords who were the worst thugs in Afghanistan. And they had to bribe them, thereby creating another completely corrupt ruling class which will perpetuate the poverty and misery of Afghanistan. And it is obviously not capable of defeating the Taliban without permanent American support and subsidies.

It is arguable that Belgium should not have attempted to oppose the German invasion. One of the conditions for a so-called *just war* is a reasonable chance of success. Which Belgium did not have when it tried to oppose 34 German divisions with its 7 divisions. In the period leading up to World War II, the people of Czechoslovakia, who made no attempt to oppose the juggernaut of Germany, suffered much less than the people of Poland who made a vain resistance.

It is the predictable fate of small nations to be dominated by large nations, for a while at least. Your country is always occupied by somebody. Large nations cannot be successfully invaded, as those who invaded Russia or China found out the hard way. Small nations cannot effectively resist invasion, unless, like Vietnam, they have the backing of large nations, upon whom they become dependent, after losing a million of their own people. The success of the American Revolution was mainly due to the armies and navies and moneys of the French Empire which supported it. [Lee Kennett *The French Forces in America 1780-1783* (1977)]

A violent rebellion which is predictably defeated undermines any attempt to launch a campaign of nonviolent resistance. As soon as the mob occupies the public square and the boys start throwing rocks at the cops, they have given the government all the excuse it needs for a violent crack down which will have popular support. As happened in Egypt and Syria the last few years. What have the rebels of Syria achieved except to perpetuate the dictator at the cost of many lives lost and many cities destroyed ? They had good cause to oppose him, but, once you start shooting, the only real question becomes who has the most weapons and / or the most backing of other nations. The quantity of arms and ammunition judges the *justice* of the cause. It is only in the comic books that the good guys always win.

The current miserable situation of the Arab world has resulted from their futile attempts at armed rebellion against governments supported by foreign powers like Russia and Iran and the U.S. Those who despise nonviolent warfare, and encourage the kids to throw rocks at the cops, predictably end up worse off than they were when the rebellion started. When you challenge the military power of the state you are **PLAYING INTO THEIR STRONG SUIT** and they are only too happy to respond in kind.

If you have to do your own fighting, you soon get enough of it. But people have a childish faith in war, especially if they don't have to fight it. They get off on vicarious violence. They identify with the victories of the nation. They wave the flag and *support the troops*. Patriotism fosters a religious identification with the flag and the military.

Peace undermines empires

The Communism of the Soviet Union was never got rid of by a war. Our Anti Communist Champion, Adolph Hitler, failed to do it. But the *Communist* totalitarianism of Russia and China has been steadily eroded by the lack of war in the years since. A war causes the population to rally around the dictator. It produces that national *unity* which is supposedly a good thing. Good for the empire, bad for its victims. War justifies dictators and creates totalitarian states. *War is the health of the State*, as Bismarck said. The corollary is that imperial states begin to wither in the absence of war. The great empire is a great vampire which grows weaker when it can't get enough blood.

Liberation has proven to be an illusion. Are Africans better off now that they have rulers of the same color ? They suffer at least as much violence as before and 10 times the corruption and there is no

international pressure to do anything about it because their situation no longer fits into the prevailing ideologies of Europe and America. In the 21st century wars in the Congo, 5 million have been killed and 5 million women have been raped.

Liberation has often been used as a euphemism for destruction. The *liberation* of women requires that they be separated from the unwanted babies which go into the trash at Planned Parenthood. The end result is that the number of American women arriving at age 40 with no children has doubled in the past 40 years. **Careers for Women** has *liberated* modern women from their chance to ever become mothers. In exchange they get a *career*--a 9 to 5 job some where in the bureaucracy. See *Pricey House and No Kids*.

When Ruanda was created by the re-distribution of African colonies after the first World War, two hostile tribes were put into the same nation. Where they have been at war off and on ever since. The genocide of the Tutsis by the Hutus in the spring of 1994 was the result of this. One of the poisonous fruits of *The Great War*.

The War to End Slavery

There is always the pretence that the war is fought for some **Great Moral Purpose**. Was the American Civil War the only way to finally abolish slavery? In a way it was, after all other options had been neglected.

But Britain had outlawed slavery in 1838 and France soon after. Czarist Russia, which made no claim to be **The Land of the Free**, liberated the serfs in 1861 without a war. Czar Alexander I came to admire the Quakers and he read the anti slavery book given to him by Thomas Clarkson. [Hochschild *Bury the Chains* 318] His grandson Alexander II finally carried out the emancipation of the serfs.

It was the Quakers who launched the Abolition movement which was finally successful in Britain as recounted in *Bury the Chains*. In America, the Quakers began freeing their slaves in the years before the Revolutionary war--the war for Liberty **plus Slavery**--which began in 1776. The American victory perpetuated slavery, which might otherwise have been outlawed in America when it was outlawed in the rest of the British Empire.

Dolly Madison

Because of their Quaker faith, John and Mary Payne freed the slaves from their *Scotchtown* Virginia plantation In 1782--a plantation which had previously belonged to Patrick Henry. Without the slave labor, they could not continue to make a go of the plantation. They moved to Philadelphia, where their family fortunes never recovered from the substantial loss of their property in the slaves they had *manumitted* instead of selling. Their daughter Dolly, forced to grow up in poverty, later married James Madison, leaving the Quaker religion of her parents. On her way to becoming the White House *hostess with the mostess*, she left the plain Quaker dress behind for the silks and satins and brocades which were the fashion among the ladies connected to the gentlemen of the new federal government. [see *Dolly Madison* by Katharine Anthony] She became the owner of Madison's slave plantation after his death. See page 17 of *The Great Land Hunt*

In January of 1773, Patrick Henry wrote a reply to Robert Pleasants, a Quaker and Virginia neighbor who had freed his slaves, hired them back as paid laborers, and set up schools to educate them. The reported cost was 3000 pounds--half a million in modern dollars. Pleasants had sent him an anti slavery book written by the French born Philadelphia Quaker Anthony Benezet. Henry expresses admiration for what the Quakers had done by way of freeing their slaves, but Henry lived and died an owner of

Virginia plantations worked by slaves, which he left to his many children, perpetuating a lifestyle of luxury built upon slavery. See page 9 of *The Great Land Hunt*. And the same was true of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison et al. They illustrate how *the love of money is the root of all evil*. And how the refusal to work for the nonviolent solution leads to violence as the only remedy. The slave owners of Virginia were largely responsible for the rebellion against *The Union* which caused the Civil War.

Wars are fought for money and power while idealistic proclamations are used as camouflage. General Sherman once bluntly stated a basic reason for the Civil War: *All the niggers in the South aren't worth the blood of one Union soldier. This is about control of the Mississippi River*. And not allowing the South to become independent of the *Union*. The establishment of the Great American Empire hung in the balance.

The bitterness of the defeated South was a major reason that a condition of semi slavery persisted for the Negroes of the South for 100 years after they had achieved nominal legal freedom at the end of the Civil War, which devastated and impoverished the South. They remained in poverty and bondage, perpetuated by Jim Crow laws and terrorism. There were an estimated 2500 lynchings in the last 16 years of the 19th century. Negroes were systematically disenfranchised and forced to go back to working on the plantations in a condition of semi slavery. The South was still segregated 100 years after the 13th amendment was passed. In the 1960s, Negroes still worked for \$ 3 a day when they could get it, and still were not citizens who could vote.

At the battle of Fredericksburg, in December 1862, some 9000 Union soldiers, most of them Irishmen, died in a series of 14 futile charges against Confederate soldiers behind a stone wall. The Confederate soldiers who killed them were also Irishmen, also recent immigrants fleeing the famine in Ireland. They had to kill and die in a war which had little to do with any grievance of theirs. The Confederate soldiers owned no slaves and the Union soldiers had little enthusiasm for dying on behalf of the Negro, as the Irish showed in the New York City anti draft riots in July 1963. Meanwhile, Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan and the Roosevelts bought their way out of the draft. Even if these soldiers were willing to die to end slavery, getting themselves killed charging soldiers entrenched behind a stone wall did nothing to achieve that goal.

It wasn't just the Union generals that issued these orders for men to commit suicide. At the battle of Gettysburg, the Confederate Commander in Chief Robert E. Lee ordered Pickett's division to charge an impregnable Union position on *Little Round Top*. Which resulted in 6500 killed or captured. *That old man had my division slaughtered*, Pickett later said. They didn't just die for nothing. This futile and suicidal charge, which killed so many young men, marks the beginning of the end for the Confederacy. Whatever claim might have been made for *State's Rights* and *Independence*, the death of these fellows contributed to its defeat.

General Burnside getting all those Irishmen killed for nothing at Fredericksburg just looks stupid. But the brilliant Robert E. Lee did the same. And General Grant finally won the Civil War by these suicidal charges which overwhelmed the Confederates. He seems to have correctly calculated that they would run out of bullets before he ran out of expendable Irishmen. We see the same suicidal mass charges in World War I 50 years later. And something basically similar in the Vietnam War 50 years after that. The French at Dienbienphu were defeated by *human wave* attacks--a mass of teen age conscripts forced into suicidal charges. The Chinese did the same in the Korean War.

The 14 futile charges against enemy soldiers behind a stone wall at Fredericksburg supposedly shows **courage**. Like the *moron* who jumped off the Empire State Building *to prove he had guts*. War regularly turns men into morons.

When Lincoln issued the *Emancipation Proclamation* in 1862 he also proclaimed that people who resisted the draft or discouraged enlistments could be arrested and subjected to martial law. The right of *habeas corpus* was suspended. Some 13,000 were arrested and often held in military prisons without trial. [page 699-700 *The Growth of the American Republic* Morison and Commager 1942] Abandoning the pretence of the basic rules of *liberty* is typical of government in time of war.

Haiti tradition of violence

Even when a war supposedly achieves a good end, it does it in such a way that the evils it produces long out last the good. The violent character of the slave rebellion in Haiti was perhaps inevitable, considering its violent history. But the perpetuation of a violent society more than 200 years later also seems to be inevitable. Is there really no way for them to escape from this endless recycling of violence ? And the same question has to be asked about many other countries where the violence and the corruption and the misery persist half a century or more after the last slave owner or colonial ruler has been expelled. Long after the physical enslavement has vanished, they are still chained to that ancient wheel of violence.

Washington Recovers His Slaves

When Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, George Washington and the other Virginia planters immediately reclaimed their slaves who had escaped to the British during the war. Whatever *liberty* the Virginia aristocracy achieved as a result of this war, for their slaves it meant a return to a life time of slavery. The Virginia Declaration of Rights of June 12th 1776 had been modified to avoid saying that the slaves of Virginia were included in *all men are created equally free & independent*. Instead it said that they were outside the *state of society* to which this principle applies. [See *Roots of Abortion* page 35.]

The soldiers of the Continental Army who managed to avoid death and dismemberment during the war still found that their pay in *continentals* was worth a few cents on the dollar by the end of the war. Which illustrates the basic fact that those who die in the war and those who benefit from it belong to different classes. That is why the lower class has to be forced and / or manipulated and deceived into going along with the war. They join the army out of economic necessity and out of an ignorance which governments promote by their war time propaganda and censorship of the press.

When Lewis refers to *the civil society to which we belong*, he glosses over the fact that those at the top, who make the decisions about war and peace, belong to it in an entirely different way from those at the bottom who have to fight the war. Millions of them end up as fertilizer in foreign fields while those who declare the war survive and prosper. It may be a high stakes gamble for those at the top, but they gamble with the lives of common men who are the poker chips in this game.

It is true that the common people sometimes suffer terrible things because of foreign conquest. It is also true that they often suffer worse things after the native rulers are re-established. What has happened to Africans since they have been **liberated** from their European Colonial rulers is often worse than what they suffered before. And now there is no international lobby to bring pressure on those rulers. Since it is Africans doing it to Africans the rest of us are out of the loop. Western investors find opportunity in the ways that Adam Smith once described--*the rate of profit . . . is naturally low in rich, and high in poor countries, and it is always highest in the countries which are going fastest to ruin*. [WN 248-250] A recent article describes how international investors are flocking to Nigeria, one of the most corrupt and violent countries in Africa where most residents lack clean water, electricity, food and adequate shelter.

The owner of a plantation like Washington or Jefferson spent the tobacco revenue his slaves earned toiling in the Virginia sun. In the same way, the stake the slaves had in the Revolutionary War had nothing in common with that of their owners.

The general earns another star ordering a charge in which thousands of common men get killed to gain a few yards of ground and swap one muddy trench for another. Obviously, defending your home land had nothing to do with the war for most of the participants. Some other justification had to be invented, some grand and fuzzy imperial purpose which would explain why 19 year olds had to get themselves killed in doomed and stupid charges in some place on the other side of the globe.

Nonviolent Direct Action in India

Since Gandhi led a movement to make India independent of the British Empire, many have looked to *nonviolent direct action* as the alternative to war. And it has worked in other times and places, most notably in the first 5 years of the 1960s in America when a movement for Civil Rights for American Negroes achieved a substantial success.

Which was later obscured by the eruption of a wave of inner city riots from 1966 on. As in India, where the terrible post *Independence* riots discredited Gandhi's achievement.

The success of the nonviolent anti Vietnam War movement of the mid 1960s was promoted by the success of the Civil Rights movement. Hundreds of **draft refusers** went to prison to oppose the war. It also originally had a good nonviolent discipline which eroded a few years later when the success of the movement attracted and enabled an influx of parasite groups with contrary and peculiar agendas.

The dynamic component of Gandhi's activist ideology was taken from the original Christian faith in the **Spirit of Truth and Love** which Gandhi learned from Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. He presented it to his countrymen as *satyagraha* or **SOUL FORCE** *the power which is born of truth and love*. It represents his attempt to translate the central teaching of Jesus Christ into the language and beliefs of his countrymen. The secularized translation or verbal description of it which came to be used in America is **NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION**.

Gandhi's three follies

Gandhi's personal faith in *the spirit of love and truth* was compromised and degraded by linking it to 1. nationalism and the pursuit of political power 2. a mass movement 3. trying to graft Christian pacifism into Hinduism and teach *nonviolence* to Moslems.

Worldly Christians won't accept it either. They are inoculated against it by Patriotic Christianity. Primitive and non-state Christianity--underground and *heretical* Christianity--is the only reliable foundation for the pacifism of Jesus Christ. [See *The Spiritual Warfare of Jesus Christ*]

To the end of his life Gandhi was trying to read pacifism into the *Bhagavad Gita* by hanging it on *ahimsa*. His sentimental foolishness pushed him to a misguided attempt to re-interpret other Hindu scriptures like the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* to mandate nonviolence. [See *Krishna versus Pacifism*] His attempt to impose *nonviolence* upon a *mass movement* led to the terrible bloodbath in which a million were killed in the Hindu-Moslem riots which engulfed India when it became independent of Britain in 1946. He tried to ignore the warrior traditions of India which had been around

long before Indians were conscripted into British armies. Of course the British built upon these traditions and incorporated them into their Indian army.

Gandhi's collaboration with those who were pursuing political power was the first major reason for his failure. He ignored what Jesus taught in John 18.36: *my kingdom is not of this world*. The supposedly nonviolent empire that Gandhi helped establish in India soon reverted to militarism, even in his life time. He showed a spiritual myopia in failing to see why that was inevitable.

relying upon the masses

His second folly was to rely upon **the masses** to carry out a moral and spiritual program of social renewal. Gandhi grossly under estimated the challenge of imposing a nonviolent discipline upon the masses of India. A faith in *the masses* and a *mass movement* is the basic fallacy of other failed movements of social reform, like *Socialism*. It arises from the humanist faith in *The People*. Contra Exodus 32.22: *you know the people that they are set on evil*. And Jeremiah 6.13: *from the least to the greatest of them, every one is greedy for unjust gain*. Too many would be *revolutionaries* have that illusion that *The People Are With Us*. It prevents them from making any realistic assessment as to who can be counted on.

Gandhi himself once said that *poverty is the worst form of violence*. The corollary, which he failed to recognize, is that violence becomes ground into people stuck in poverty over a long period of time. Violence is the ingrained habit of lower class humanity. It becomes second nature. It has deep roots. It erupts into mindless destruction and murderous riots when they are even temporarily released from the usual constraints. It isn't just that they respond to violence with violence. The passivity or vulnerability of others invites a gratuitous aggression. When the oppressor withdraws, they take his place. Other people trapped in poverty like themselves are the primary victims of this pervasive lower class criminality. You can't sell them an ideology of **poor versus rich** or **workers versus owners** when they regularly experience violence from their fellows. For every black man in Chicago or Detroit shot by a white policeman, there are 99 shot by other black men.

We are inclined to believe in a sentimental caricature of the poor man which depicts him as humble and good-hearted etc. And that may be true of 1 in 1000. 1 in 10,000 anyway. But most men--and women--and children--are degraded by poverty. They absorb violence because they have to. But when they get the chance, when the prison door is broken open, they tend to lynch the first person they find who can be somehow held to blame. Any Hindu was fair game for the Moslem mob; any Moslem was fair game for the Hindu mob;

The teaching of Jesus that you should *turn the other cheek* and the example he set of accepting his own crucifixion while saying: *Father, forgive them for they know not what they do* has not been well received by most people--to say the least--nor has it been accepted by most so-called *Christians*.

They don't absorb violence. They pay it back, against any one handy. A man who has been abused and humiliated goes home and beats up on his wife. She slaps the kid. He kicks the dog. What the Zionists did to the Palestinians is excused by what the Jews had suffered in Europe and in Moslem countries. Two wrongs do make a right, as the world sees it. It satisfies their feelings.

absorbing the poison

But Gandhi did see the basic truth of the life and teaching of Jesus to which patriot so-called *Christians* remain blinded. The Hindu legend is that *Lord Siva* saved the world by drinking up all the poison. But

it was Jesus who showed his followers how to absorb the poison and get rid of it via *love your enemies, do good to those who hate you*--instead of endlessly recycling hatred as the world does.

There are Moslems now who claim that Islam is a religion of peace. Which is a praise worthy sentiment, I suppose, but it is not really compatible with the history of Islam or the character of Mohammed. It will require a very radical reform of Moslem theology to turn it into a pacifist creed. Worldly Christianity also must have a radical reformation, but it can be based upon, not only the original *radical* Christianity, but a long tradition of pacifist Christianity which has survived the persecutions of the patriotic Church.

Mohammedanism was a State religion and a military religion from the start. eb9 XVI 561 d : *In Islam, the political society and the religious are identical*. And Mohammed himself was a ruthless warrior who executed captives in cold blood and then added their widows to his harem. Neither in his preaching nor in the example of his own life can he be compared to Jesus. The best excuse for the Moslems is that the Imperial Military Christianity which they confronted in the 7th century was as bad. The eb9 writer compares Mohammed with Charlemagne. With some justice. They both married multiple women and slaughtered bunches of people to force them to convert. But it was Jesus, not Charlemagne, who founded the Christian religion and there is no way that Mohammed can be compared to Him. Or, if you insist upon making the comparison, where does that leave Mohammed ? Charlemagne was the founder of *Christendom*, which he achieved by beheading many thousands of Saxons.

the failure of *socialism*

WWI marks both the spiritual bankruptcy of *Christendom* and the moral and spiritual failure of *socialism* as the promise of a peaceable new world order. When they had to confront the challenge of nationalism and patriotic militarism, their faith in *the workers* proved to be an illusion. The national socialism--the militarized socialism--which appeared in Russia and Italy and Germany after World War I was the result. [Hochschild *To End All Wars* includes some history of the failure of the English socialists to persuade *the workers* to oppose the war]

It did seem to make sense that *the workers*--the common people-- would refuse to participate in this terrible war in which so many of them were killed and dumped into mass graves or just left out there on the battle field to rot. It is typical of war that the soldiers suffer the most and gain the least while the better off classes avoid the front line trenches or even make a profit off the war. It is a mystery as to what drives common men to go along with war. One obvious factor is that State Religion which teaches them to believe that it is their *sacred duty*. Cf. *I swear before God this sacred oath that I will render unconditional obedience to the FUHRER of the German nation and VOLK, Adolph Hitler, the Supreme Commander of the armed forces, and that, as a brave soldier, I will be ready at all times to stake my life in fulfillment of this oath*. See **Hitler Deploys the Patriot Pastors**. Like other state religions, Patriotic Christianity teaches idolatry of the state and its ruler.

Something called *Socialism* did succeed in coming to power in the aftermath of World War I. Russia and Italy and Germany all arrived at *National Socialism*. Which was patriotic socialism. Eventually, the worship of the Czar was transferred to Stalin, The worship of the Kaiser was transferred to Hitler. It shows the stubborn persistence of something in people which pushes them to the worship of the State. And is it not obvious that this worshipful attitude towards Stalin and Hitler is essentially demon worship ? We have gotten rid of Stalin and Hitler, for the time being. It is very doubtful that we have moved very far away from that demon worship which put them into power.

Armies are recruited from men who are desperately poor and thoroughly ignorant. So one antidote to armies, at least in the long run, is to somehow put a floor under poverty. Another is to educate people. *light shines in the darkness*. It is appalling how ignorant most people are of any real history, including

most of those who think themselves educated because they went to college. What they know by way of *history* is a patriotic comic book.

Buddhism versus Pacifism

The claim that Buddhism is a pacifist religion will not stand up to a serious historical scrutiny. Like Mohammedanism, Buddhism was a state religion and a military religion from the start and, pretences aside, had that same character in the various countries to which it spread. Whereas Christianity--an apostate off shoot of Christianity--did not become an imperial and military religion until 300 years after it was founded. And original pacifist Christianity has endured along with the patriotic *Christianity* which persecutes it.

Buddha was a *passivist*, not a pacifist. It isn't that he refused to go to war, he refused to do anything except sit under a tree and meditate. Before that, he walked out on his wife and new born son without even giving her a pat on the head by way of saying *good job*. That was his first step on *the road to enlightenment*.

The *Mahavamsa*, the major history of Buddhism in **Ceylon**, features the Sinhalese King **Dutthagamani** slaughtering the Tamils. When he expresses remorse for *the slaughter of a great host numbering millions*, the monks assure him: *From this deed arises no hindrance in thy way to heaven. Only one and a half human beings have been slain by thee, O lord of men. The one had come unto the (three) refuges, the other had taken on himself the five precepts. Unbelievers and men of evil life were the rest, not more to be esteemed than beasts. But as for thee, thou wilt bring glory to the doctrine of the Buddha in manifold ways; therefore cast away care from thy heart, O ruler of men.* (Chapter XXV) These monks are billed as *Arhats*--those who have achieved Enlightenment.

This king went to war with a relic of the Buddha on his spear. It resembles the story of Otho the Great who defeats the pagan Hungarians in a battle of the 10th century using the *holy lance* with a point made from the nails of the Cross. But **Military Christianity** only appeared in the 4th century and it persecuted the original **PACIFIST** Christianity which has persisted in underground and *heretical* churches to the present time. [See *The Church of the Empire* on the **Radical Christian Press.org** web site.]

Pacifist Empire ?

Based upon one inscription dug up centuries later, the claim has been made that *Asoka* was a pacifist Buddhist emperor in ancient India. The inscription advised his heirs to avoid further wars of conquest. But Asoka never dismantled the empire or disbanded the gigantic army of his grandfather which built the empire and which was necessary to maintain it.

The assumption that an empire can embrace pacifism is absurd. What is established by violence cannot be defended by nonviolence. Pacifism will not secure the gains of militarism. That is one of the illusions of the modern world which does not want to fight and which prefers to go shopping. Can Israel have peace with those it dispossessed while refusing to give back what it took ? See *Zionism versus Judaism*.

In the modern world, we have to confront, not just the illusions of violence, but the illusions of *nonviolence*--the faith that we can hold onto power and wealth while forgoing the militarism which produced it. *Pacifism* has been discredited by the illusions of those who want to believe that there is some simple way to avoid war while holding on to what was secured by the wars of the empire

Routine and perennial violence is built into the very foundation of imperial society, however much it may be dressed up in blue uniforms or brown uniforms or black judicial robes. As a Supreme Court Justice once noted in a candid observation: *law is what is at the end of the policeman's club*. It is an illusion to believe that you can eliminate war without addressing the underlying causes of war, that there is some easy escape from this perennial curse of the human race without confronting the injustice enforced by coercion which is built into the foundation of society. [see *The Unjust Economy*]

The Sermon on the Mount is the only reliable moral and spiritual foundation for pacifism. The example of the early Christians who were *martyrs*--witnesses--for a faith that caused them to refuse military service, even when they were killed, is the historical tradition upon which an anti war movement must be built. It has the moral integrity and the spiritual power which is otherwise missing.

Christian pacifism has to be distinguished from the pretended *pacifism* of various ideologies which lack any viable spiritual or moral foundation, such as vegetarianism and *environmentalism*. [See *Earth Worship and Sexual Morality*]

Success of Jesus Christ

When Jesus said that *I came not to send peace but a sword* . . . mother versus daughter etc. Matthew 10.34 he obviously did not mean a violent war of a tribal or national character. But he does call us to confront the evil of *the world* just as he did himself.

Lewis is at least half right in his disparagement of secular pacifism--the illusion that we can somehow arrive at *universal peace* from some principle of *universal benevolence*--a Brotherhood of Man which is based upon nothing except a vague humanism. The **peace** that Jesus promised to his apostles has a different foundation.

Brothers and *Sisters* in Christian parlance means that we become the adopted sons and daughters of God the Father when we receive the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ. We are called to a *community* which is actually worthy of that much abused name. Without that foundation, we are stuck in the same old fratricide. We are *Brothers* like Cain and Abel were *Brothers*.

Nonviolent Direct Action in America

From 1960 to 1965 there was a successful *Nonviolent Direct Action* movement which made basic changes in the situation of Negroes in America. The social momentum it created promoted that anti war movement which was at least halfway successful in stopping the Vietnam War. These nonviolent direct action movements are still one of the best models we have in respect to social change without violence. Even though, in the late 1960s, both movements were undermined by their success, which opened the way for movements with a contrary spirit and very different agendas. A swarm of hustlers and hucksters and political opportunists did serious damage to the integrity of these movements. *Women's liberation* and *gay liberation* soon joined the procession of causes which distracted people from peace and civil rights. The movements of the 1960s were corrupted by the pursuit of money and political power.

Both **black power** and **the new left** aimed at *power* via *revolution*, that is, through **violent** direct action. Or at least that was the pose they struck, whether or not they were serious or sane. Most of them were neither. This foolish belief in violent revolution this love for the chimera of military triumph characterized both the black militants and the new left. And they were encouraged by the New York media, which now put the **Black Panthers** on the front page.

from *The Movement* -- The Love of Violence

Aside from the gratuitous and fundamentally foolish nationalism, what struck me about **black power**--in its extreme forms--was the gratuitous lust for violence. People were taking up guns--or gun fantasies--because they wanted to, not, as they pretended, because they had to. Violence was their first choice, not their last resort. Politically, it made no sense at all. The riots put an end to the revolution. Clearly, they embraced the ideal of violence, not as a means to an end, but as a psychological end in itself. They said that violence was a necessity, but it was really a luxury, one that they could not afford, but they bought it anyway. Black people everywhere are still paying for it.

The watchwords of the civil rights movement were love and nonviolence. That was more the rhetoric than the reality much of the time, but there was a serious effort on the part of most people in the movement to live up to that spirit. By the end of the decade, the same movement was marked by murder. Murder of white and black policemen by the Black Panthers and other gangs. Murder of whites at random by groups like the Zebras in San Francisco. Murder of their own members and of rival black militants by the Panthers, by Ron Karenga's US, by the Blackstone Rangers and by many other black militant gangs and short-lived terrorist organizations that never got the funding and the fame that encouraged these groups. The riots which erupted in 200 American cities were a disorganized expression of the same spirit. Other black people were the targets of this violence more often than whites--they were more available.

The political madness of the black nationalists soon eroded the support for the Civil Rights Movement. They indulged themselves in anti Jewish rhetoric. American Jews had long been a major source of financial support for the Civil Rights Movement, and they were a substantial part of the front line activists.

Students for a Democratic Society, one of the main *new left* groups, splintered into several factions. One was the pro Mao **Progressive Labor Party**. Another was the *Weatherman Underground* which bombed a few police stations. A lot of people with strange ideologies and very little sense produced the foolish fuss surrounding the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1968.

The black nationalists *supported* the three day *rebellions* which popped up in 200 American cities by the end of the 1960s. The mindless vandalism of the rioters of Newark and Detroit showed how foolish it was to put any faith in *the masses*. They burned down the buildings in which they lived and vandalized and looted the stores. After which they had to walk a mile to buy a loaf of bread. When *the masses* joined, it destroyed the movement. A 3 day riot aimed mainly at the liquor stores is a sorry substitute for a *Revolution*.

For basic economic reasons, crime is a way of life in the slums. Much of the economy of the inner city is tied to crime. Drug dealing gangs. Gambling and prostitution. It isn't really political, although groups like the Blackstone Rangers began using ideological pretensions as a cover for drug dealing. *Black Power* empowered these gangs. They got hold of the **War on Poverty** check writing machine.

Mean spirited

It is characteristic of people that they respond with violence, when they get the chance, even when it is stupid and self defeating violence. The attempt to impose a nonviolent self discipline on *the masses* was a failure in America as it was in India.

Gandhi was described as *Mahatma*, meaning someone with a *Great Soul*. And he obviously was a man of noble character, whatever mistakes he made. But movements are often invaded by those with a very different *soul*, a small and spiteful spirit. *Mean spirited* describes them. And the movement did become demon possessed in many places. As is still evident today.

When you get the chance to get back at the white man who has oppressed you, you take it. Even if the white man or white woman is a tourist who had nothing to do with it. A white truck driver, caught in the Watts riot, was hit in the head with a brick and killed.

They cherish their anger. Which does not require that you actually get hold of the person who did the dirty on you. If you hate the Jews for some reason--your cousin was once cheated by a Jewish merchant, or so he says--any Jew will do by way of getting revenge, whether he owns a shop or not. If a black man raped a white woman, any black man they could catch was in for it.

The lesson Jesus taught was that you must refuse to hate even the person who did something bad to you. Instead of that, the world believes it is all right to revenge the injury upon anyone who belongs to the same tribe. If you blow up a house in the same neighborhood, that's close enough.

The Early Movement

What did work was the **Sit In** movement aimed at segregated lunch counters in the spring of 1960. Some 20,000 people, mostly college kids attending southern black colleges participated in these nonviolent protests which launched the movement. Which was continued by the *Freedom Rides* of 1961 in which several hundred dedicated activists went to jail--I was one of them. In the spring of 1963 in Birmingham, Martin Luther King and James Bevel used kid demonstrators to capture the front page and put pressure on the President.

William James once called for a *moral equivalent of war*. That is what the Civil Rights Movement of the early 1960s became, at least in some places. Whatever disillusionment I suffered from later on, I am still sure of that. We were on the side of *the good*. We were engaged in a struggle of good versus evil.

It was a misfortune that the New York based media elected Martin Luther King as **the leader of the Negro People**--the leader of the *masses*--and thereby seriously obscured and distorted what actually happened in the Civil Rights Movement. Which was the work of a few hundred with the Courage to do something. The *masses* had nothing to do with it. They never gave it a dollar or a day of their lives. But King could command the money and the media and he had the support of the whites upon which the political and legislative success of the Civil Rights movement actually depended.

In the summer of 1963 a million people, most of them white and middle class, marched for Civil Rights for Negroes in cities all over the U.S. They were **NOT** *the masses*, but they impacted the whole country and enabled President Lyndon Johnson to get the 1964 Civil Rights Act passed. After being elected by a landslide in 1964, Johnson pushed through the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

an elite movement

In 1964, 1000 activists, most of them white college students, went to Mississippi to participate in a Voting Rights campaign in *Mississippi Summer*. It was an elite movement, not a mass movement. When 3 of them were murdered, the FBI finally went in to Mississippi to protect civil rights activists. It was the beginning of the end of the denial of voting rights for Negroes in Mississippi, which had been the fortress of segregation.

Lyndon Johnson pushed through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which did finally out law racial segregation in public accommodations. The March from Selma to Montgomery in 1965 led to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And that brought a major change to the Deep South, where Negroes had been prevented from voting.

Meanwhile, the Watts riot in inner city Los Angeles in the summer of 1965 began that destruction of the Civil Rights movement which accelerated in the late 1960s. The devastation of Detroit has followed relentlessly from the 1967 riot and the politics of racial spite which followed. The south side of Chicago, which was once the focus of the most hopeful civil rights initiatives, is a gang ridden slum with the highest homicide rate in the nation.

What mainly worked to produce the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965 was some semblance of popular support along with manipulation of cooperative media which enabled the Federal Government to pass historic legislation.

But measures aimed at alleviating the basic situation of lower class poverty, like the *War on Poverty* were de funded by the Vietnam War. And the violence of the gang ridden slums only got worse when so many people took advantage of the civil rights gains to escape from the inner city. When employment expanded and housing was de-segregated, they got out of there.

The primary victims of inner city crime committed by negroes were other negroes, who never got the police protection they needed. That is still true, and it has never been adequately reported by most of the media. In fact they have a long standing policy of not reporting it--of concealing it in effect by the way they report it.

color versus class

The major ideological deficiency of the Civil Rights Movement was that it tended to focus narrowly upon *color* and ignore **class**. So the insufficient number of colored professors at Harvard and Yale and the Union Theological Seminary was addressed while the challenge of millions stuck in slums never got the serious attention it needed. Of course it was relatively cheap and easy to do something about the one issue. The other *issue* is not so easy to deal with.

The eruption of riots in 200 American cities in the late 1960s was a startling revelation of how deep a hold nationalism and tribalism and racism has on people, and especially those at the lowest level of society, who are addicted to fantasies of violence. Their sense of being powerless is alleviated temporarily by the euphoria of crowd courage. An eruption of mindless violence is the result. They burn down the buildings in which they live, loot the liquor store and the TV store and that is *The Revolution*.

The black nationalists targeted other blacks. The **Revolutionary Action Movement** planted bombs in department stores where black people shopped--serves them right for patronizing white-owned stores. Herbert "Rap" Brown was wounded and captured when he attempted the armed robbery of a black social club in Harlem. Brown once said that *violence is as American as apple pie*. He might have added that it was as basic to inner city black society as *soul food*.

the supreme commander

Huey Newton dubbed himself the **SUPREME COMMANDER** of the Black Panthers and tried to be just that, posing for his official picture in a throne like chair with an armed man standing at attention on either side. The black nationalists sought power over their own people, the kind of power that only

effective coercion can give you. They preached a faith in *revolution* which made no sense whatever in the actual situation of American Negroes, 10 per cent of the population, most of whom wanted what desegregation in jobs and housing would give them, if they had any sense.

There is something in people which pushes them to set up a **Commander in Chief** to foster that military unity which brings victory in war. The ancient Hebrews demanded that The Lord give them a king so that they could be as strong as rival nations. 1 Samuel 8.20 And they thereby rejected the Kingdom of God. 1 Samuel 8.1-22. [See the argument in *Turning the Other Cheek* pages 5-8] It is understandable that the tribe might rally around the war chief to repel the invasion of another tribe. But after they do that, they follow up by looting and exterminating that tribe, or any other weaker tribe. It is a common feature of primitive warfare. They go on to become a city state and a nation and an empire. The limit to their reach is the rivalry of other empires. The reach of Huey Newton's **Black Panthers** was limited by the rapid growth of other gangs with political pretensions. Despite the patronage they got from the New York cultural elite. They were featured at one of Leonard Bernstein's cocktail parties, and they could command the front page for a while.

There was a basic absurdity when so many of *the masses* embraced the illusions of *Black Power* and jumped into the riot instead of supporting the nonviolent direct action movement which had begun to make major positive changes in the situation of American Negroes. It was a self destructive evil spirit which shows how deeply people are infected by the spirit of *nationalism* and *militarism* and how much destruction it can cause when it gets loose.

The Peace Movement was originally organized around a half dozen Christian pacifist organizations which had been at it for many years. The success of the anti Vietnam War movement after 1965 promoted them for a while but also over whelmed them and displaced them with a miscellaneous movement that rejected *nonviolence*. Throwing rocks and bottles at the police became the norm in a movement which once had a nonviolent discipline and a Good Spirit. The new movements included *Black Power*, *The New Left* and *The Women's Liberation Movement* which revived the **anti family** doctrine of the Old Left--the original 19th century *Communist* ideology. There also developed a generic "youth movement" which plunged into *drugs and sex and rock and roll*.

Today, there is a proliferation of protest movements in the U.S., everybody and his brother out there with a picket sign and pushing ritual arrests to garner a little publicity. Movements of very doubtful integrity compete for political mileage and owe their temporary fame to media favor. They cheapen the currency of protest. Much of the media is infected with a virus of vagrant ideologies which are all that remain of discredited and discarded old Left beliefs.

my participation in nonviolent direct action movements

I was active in both the Civil Rights movement and the anti war movement. I spent 4 and 1/2 months in the Mississippi State Penitentiary from June to November 1961 as a *Freedom Rider*. I organized a *peace team* at the New York Catholic Worker to visit Catholic Colleges in New England in the fall of 1965. I spent 10 months in the Danbury Federal Correctional Institute from July 1966 to May 1967 as a *draft card burner*. Actually, I tore the card in two and mailed the pieces to the Justice Department after a press event in New York City. It was a *4F* draft card because I got tuberculosis working at a Catholic Worker house in Chicago in 1960.

For the past 29 years, since 1989, I have been active in the anti abortion movement, doing pro life *Sidewalk Counselling* in front of Rocky Mountain Planned Parenthood in Denver. We have had more than 100 tickets or arrests over the years for various bogus complaints--*disturbing the peace by loud talking* etc.-- because Planned Parenthood has major influence with the pro abortion wing of the

Democratic Party which controls the court house. The situation we were up against was basically similar to that in the Deep South in the early 1960s when the segregationist wing of the Democratic Party controlled the court house. My longest jail sentence was 45 days in the spring of 1990. We have rescued hundreds of babies from abortion. On December 26th 1999, three babies were born the same day to three different women we had *Sidewalk Counseled*.

Nonviolent Direct Action means **Bearing Witness to the Truth** via leaflets and signs like **Let Your Baby Live**. It sometimes requires the courage to face arrest and going to court and going to jail when you have to. See *Remembering the Rescue Movement* and *Shouting with Al Garcia* on the [www.Radical Christian Press.org](http://www.RadicalChristianPress.org) web site.

Sidewalk Counseling saves a substantial number of babies every year all over the United States, in the entire absence of legal or political victories and in the face of a relentlessly hostile mainstream media. When they can't smear us, they ignore us. The only time the TV camera shows up is when someone somewhere starts shooting. See *The Media Murders the Pro Life Movement*.

But the lack of political success and the lack of media attention has protected the Pro Life Nonviolent Direct Action Movement from some of the forces that overwhelmed and destroyed the movements of the 1960s. When there is little money to be made and not much chance of arriving at political power, it sets up something of a barrier which keeps a lot of people out while it promotes the integrity of those who do join. They have to find some other reason to participate.

The main enemies of the Civil Rights movement were the state governments and a substantial part of the white population of the Deep South who intimidated other Southern whites. The main enemy of the anti Vietnam War movement was the Federal government supported by many Americans early on, although support for the war steadily eroded as the folly of the war became more apparent. War is a folly most of the time, but that folly is concealed by the censorship imposed upon the media which is required to become the channel for government patriotic propaganda. When the Johnson Administration failed to impose censorship on the media, as had been done in all previous wars, the folly and wickedness of the war could not be concealed.

Role of the Media

The major New York based news media played a major role in promoting the Civil Rights Movement and the anti Vietnam War movement. The publicity given the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1956 and the Greensboro sit in of February 1st 1960 launched the movement. The Freedom Rides of 1961 were on the front page and the prime time evening TV news. And that kind of support continued through Birmingham in 1963 and the Selma march of 1965.

They gave similar coverage to the anti war movement. When David Miller of the New York Catholic Worker burned a draft card at a rally in October 1965, in defiance of the new law, he made front pages all over the world.

Later on, they put the **Black Panthers** on the front page. They put the rioters of Newark and Detroit on the front page. That was one of the reasons that riots spread to 200 cities. They provided the *Women's Liberation Movement* with a media blitz. And more or less created the so-called *hippie* movement by giving it a name and a ton of publicity. They taught people to pose for the media and gave the black nationalists far more publicity than they merited. A black leather jacket and a beret made you a *revolutionary*.

The media often harmed the movement more than it helped. By focusing so exclusively on Martin Luther King they allowed the movement elsewhere to struggle in obscurity. They concealed King's immorality and they concealed President John Kennedy's immorality, allowing both of them to present an image to the world that was a fiction.

The media spotlight attracts publicity seekers like moths swarming around the street light. Media attention throws gasoline on a bon fire. But it soon burns out if there is no substantial fuel. That often happens today when they put the spotlight on something which was little more than a publicity stunt to start with.

The media calculus has been changing steadily in recent years as newspapers go out of business and internet news in various formats keeps multiplying. In places where there is nothing resembling a free press, the cell phone camera and the internet have provided a substitute.

The entire lack of media coverage for Sidewalk Counselling has actually been a blessing to the pro life movement. It discourages those with political ambitions or something to sell while it has little effect on those who really do care about rescuing babies from the trash at Planned Parenthood.

The pro life direct action movement, especially the *sidewalk counselling* which still continues all over the country, is properly focused upon the abortion customers themselves, not the government. *Roe versus Wade* is not the cause of abortion in America. Americans themselves who **love money** and pursue it via *Careers for Women* are the cause. See **The Roots of Abortion**. And **Pricey House--No Kids**.

The Pro Life Nonviolent Direct Action movement succeeds despite the lack of media support, or popular support, or political success. Because of that really. It shows what *nonviolent direct action* can accomplish--having the Courage to Bear Witness to the Truth. Which also means the willingness to go to jail when you have to. Which is not the same thing as getting yourself arrested deliberately, when there is really no purpose in doing it, except for the chimera of publicity. See *Remembering the Rescue Movement*.

Christian warfare

Relying upon Bearing Witness to the Truth is the essential characteristic of Christian warfare. That Spirit of Truth is the same as the Spirit of Courage is the same as the Spirit of Love.

Can you rely upon the power of the truth and at the same time rely upon the endless lies which are the necessary accompaniment of carnal warfare ?

Is Jesus *the father of lies* ? If not, how can a type of warfare which depends entirely upon promoting falsehood at every level have any claim to be *Christian* or *Righteous* as Lewis calls it ?

There are obvious differences between the warfare engaged in by empires which pretend to be *Christian* and the warfare which was characteristic of Jesus Christ and his first followers. I try to describe it in *The Spiritual Warfare of Jesus Christ, Turning the Other Cheek, Render, Not Sur-Render Unto Caesar, Christian Pacifism* and other essays. Christian warfare relies upon the two edged gospel sword of truth.

The Courage which Jesus and his first followers displayed, the Spirit of Courage which enabled them as individuals to face the evil powers of this world, stands in stark contrast to that military courage which is imposed upon a crowd only by coercion. The officer's revolver is his mandate to go forward into battle.

Christian warfare relies upon *THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT, which is THE WORD OF GOD*. It relies upon the Spirit of Truth to be used against *Satan, the father of lies*. Ephesians 6.17

Terry Sullivan