

Spirit Empowered Peacemaking: Toward A Pentecostal Peace Fellowship

Paper presented at the 10th EPCRA conference in Leuven , Belgium,

by

Paul N. Alexander, Ph.D.

I have nothing new to say.[1] I am not even sure that I can say what I must say in a way that even sounds fresh or intriguing or inspiring. But perhaps my improvisation on an ancient yet ongoing tune can add to this jazz that is our journey.

There is a Japanese visual art in which the artist is forced to be spontaneous. He must paint on a thin stretched parchment with a special brush and black water paint in such a way that an unnatural or interrupted stroke will destroy the line or break through the parchment. Erasures or changes are impossible. These artists must practice a particular discipline, that of allowing the idea to express itself in communication with their hands in such a direct way that deliberation cannot interfere. The resulting pictures lack the complex composition and textures of ordinary painting, but it is said that those who see will find something captured that escapes explanation. This conviction that direct deed is the most meaningful reflection, I believe, has prompted the evolution of the extremely severe and unique disciplines of the jazz or improvising musician. *Group improvisation is a further challenge. Aside from the weighty technical problem of collective coherent thinking, there is the very human, even social need for sympathy from all members to bend for the common result.*[2]

So it is with a little trepidation and a lot of hope that I embark upon this attempt at description and persuasion that may very well rise to the heights of intensely attached Christian particularity. For I am a subject who has been influenced and shaped by the Word, and I speak and live in that truth. The notes I play are very much determined by those that were played before me and every one has been played before, just maybe not in this order and not with my extemporization. And now, I improve on the song of shalom with the hope for sympathy from all members to help us walk in the light of and toward our proper *telos*.

There are over six hundred million Pentecostals and Charismatics in the world.[3] One of every four Christians is a pentecostal. One of every ten persons on this planet is a pentecostal. I think about these sisters and brothers and I must admit that I am fascinated by the potential. Pentecostals have a heritage of taking Jesus and the New Testament very seriously and of placing our hope in the truth of the good news. If the gospel is truly powerful enough to transform humanity to be able to continue in the story of Jesus, then a group of people this diverse and sizeable who are committed to the Way of Christ could certainly effect change on a global scale. Although many implications come to mind, I am specifically thinking about the issues of war and other state sanctioned violence (which also include such issues as racism, classism, oppression, consumer capitalism, materialism, etc.). It is my humble belief that pentecostals should be joyfully reminded of their heritage of aggressive and prophetic pacifism, that the biblical and theological case for pacifism among pentecostals should be explicated, and that reconciliation, peacemaking, and nonviolence should be restored as integral elements of the pentecostal faith. The power of the Spirit to live *and die* like Jesus and the early Christians should be brought to the forefront of pentecostal spirituality.

Therefore, I hope to accomplish three objectives in this paper. First, I hope to remind us that our ancestors in the faith had significant concerns regarding the appropriateness of the participation of Christians in the killing of other humans, regardless of whether or not the killing was sanctioned by a government, and that we should rejoice and thank God for this. The majority of Pentecostal denominations issued statements in the early twentieth century declaring that they "cannot conscientiously participate in war and armed resistance which involves the actual destruction of human life, since this is contrary to our view of the *clear* teachings of the inspired Word of God, which is the *sole* basis of our faith."^[4] Patriotism and nationalism were condemned as idolatrous and the kingdom of God was sought above all else. Many pentecostals boldly declared that killing was incompatible with discipleship into the Way.^[5] This fact must be actively and corporately remembered.

This is made especially clear when the results of a recent survey are examined. The Society for the Study of Pentecostal Ethics^[6] conducted a survey of Assemblies of God pastors in the United States in April of 2001.

Ninety three percent of those responding agreed with the statement, "It is appropriate for a Christian to support war."^[7] Furthermore, sixty five percent of these Assemblies of God pastors agreed that "The principles of Jesus support war." And an even greater number, a significant *seventy one percent*, informed us that they *would actually kill in a war*. These are not Pentecostal lay people who support war and would kill, these are the pastors of the Assemblies of God churches in America.

However, some hesitation can be seen in the responses to the statement, "Killing innocent humans can sometimes be justified and be appropriate for a Christian?" since only eighteen percent agreed.^[8] Therefore, the majority of Assemblies of God pastors would only kill those who were guilty and deserved death while eighteen percent would also kill innocent people. Furthermore, eighty two percent of respondents could not justify killing innocent people even in a war, yet they carry the naïve assumption that wars are fought justly by the U.S. (75% agree), believe that it is appropriate to kill for democracy (49% agree), and that it is appropriate to overthrow governments with warfare (55% agree).^[9]

But are the Assemblies of God pastors simply militant themselves while also allowing room for those who oppose war in the name of Christ? Thankfully, the majority does allow some room for this since sixty percent believe that war can be opposed. However, a significant forty percent disagree with the idea that it is ever appropriate to oppose war and twenty two percent strongly disagree with any opposition to warfare. This reveals the hardened position against conscientious objection, pacifism, and even the just war tradition^[10] that the now militant U.S. Assemblies of God has arrived at.

With the American Assemblies of God being led primarily by pastors who would kill others in a war for their country (even though some of these do not think even Jesus would support this), it is appropriate for us to reexamine our heritage and contemplate the path we have trod.^[11] I wonder what the results of similar surveys of different demographics around the world and in other pentecostal denominations would yield, and I invite us to explore these uncharted waters.

Second, I believe this could and should lead to Christian participation in the violence of war again being questioned by pentecostals. In fact, pentecostals should seriously examine "the conviction that the renunciation of the sword to which Jesus called His disciples is one of the keys to the rest of the problem of Christian faithfulness and to the recovery of the evangelical and ecumenical integrity of the church."^[12] The perpetuation and expansion of nation-states (or transnational corporations) through the dehumanization and killing of people whom God loves should not be tolerated by Christians unless solid biblical and theological support can be provided. The blatant militarism and glorification of national myths of superiority or godliness exhibited by some Pentecostals today (the U.S. Assemblies of God in particular)^[13] must be critiqued and called to account. Pentecostals of all nations, whether European, African, Asian, or American, should be wary of the killing, for any reason, of their actual or potential siblings in Christ. Opportunity should be created in all pentecostal denominations (and there are fourteen thousand of them)^[14] for dialogue about these issues, and a pentecostal theology of peacemaking should be high on the agenda.

Third, I propose the development of a pentecostal peace fellowship^[15] that is international and ecumenical in scope that will promote dialogue, writing, cooperation, and action on these issues. I clearly have an agenda of promoting pentecostal peacemaking (and I blame this on Jesus), but this fellowship must include pentecostals who adhere to the just war tradition (whether chastened or not) and even those who lean more toward an activist position. The biblical concern for peace and justice would best be promoted by allowing all into the discussion. The purpose of the fellowship would be to promote and foster a concern for and participation in active peacemaking that is supported by a solid pentecostal theology. The outstanding work of the late John Howard Yoder and others who promote the Anabaptist Vision will assist us in finding our voice. However, our pentecostal contributions will assist our non pentecostal sisters and brothers in their endeavors to be Christian peacemakers as well. We have much to offer in this area, we have been silent for too long, and the Spirit is leading us to speak.

Disseminating information about global events related to violence and oppression to pentecostal groups would be a valuable service that would raise the awareness of these concerns. Engaging in dialogue with other peace fellowships (Jewish, Episcopalian, Baptist, Orthodox, Lutheran, Catholic, etc.) and cooperating with them in pragmatic endeavors would be a powerful way of bringing pentecostals into this most significant way of life. Internships for students, surveys, teaching, discipling, publications, press releases, political involvement, and even civil disobedience are all possible ways that the good news of the peace of Jesus Christ could be advanced through this fellowship.

With my plan revealed and my convictions laid bare, I now turn to Paul's tried and true method of persuasion. I begin with the indicative mood and will then shift to the imperative. I will briefly state the facts, as I see them, regarding the pentecostal heritage of conscientious objection to war and injustice. Then I will provide a concise

pentecostal theology, based upon the biblical witness, that supports Spirit led peacemaking and reconciliation rather than killing. Finally, I will list a few reasons why a pentecostal peace fellowship is a good idea, and in so doing will exhort pentecostals to pick up their crosses and follow Jesus as we ourselves participate in this way of life that is foolishness to the world.

Pentecostals and War

?The War Church is a Harlot Church!?[16] So says an early twentieth century pentecostal preacher. But I am not the first to quote early pentecostals to show that some were against social injustice, violence, racism, greedy capitalism, and war.[17] And I also recognize that many early pentecostals were not terribly concerned with these issues, the majority probably were too busy working, taking care of their families, and going to church to get caught up in social concerns and international crises.[18] This probably remains true today. So my method of telling the story has the goal of linking an authentic pentecostal self-understanding with active peacemaking in the world. And it is not too far of a stretch. Pentecostals need to know that their ancestors wrote and spoke things that they are not used to hearing today. My approach is not a simple ?back to the good old days? because that would disregard the fact that those days had plenty of problems as well. But there was speech and act that accurately reflected a biblical, Jesus focused, Spirit empowered concern for *shalom*. To this I now call our attention.[19]

During World War I an American pentecostal, William Burton McCafferty, penned an uncompromising article that adamantly opposed combatant participation in warfare. He was responding to a previous article in the *Evangel* that had supported Christian participation.[20] The authors of the previous article had argued rationally that the Christian was obligated to defend the weak and innocent with violence. The only scriptures they used were references that supported obedience and subservience to the state (Romans 13.1-7; 1 Timothy 2.1-2; 1 Peter 2.12-17). McCafferty based his entire argument on the exegesis of scripture passages that supported nonresistance, *spiritual* warfare, and *heavenly* citizenship.

McCafferty rejected the option of fighting to defend the weak against the ?bully? because the disciples had wanted to do the same thing but were taught that it was wrong.

In Luke 22:49, the disciples asked Jesus, ?Lord, shall we smite with the sword?? They prayed, but, instead of waiting for an answer, one immediately drew the sword and went to battle. . . . Let us wait for an answer from God. Let us not begin to reason from the natural point of view. . . . What was the answer of Christ to the disciples (Christians) to this question? (Matth. 26:51) ?Put up again they [sic] sword into his place.? This is what God is saying to the Christians of today, ?Ye followers of the Prince of Peace, disarm yourselves? for ?the weapons of our warfare are not carnal.? (the musket, sword, siege gun or cannon). 2 Cor. 10:4.[21]

McCafferty did not allow reason to dissuade him from the serious application of the words of Jesus. Although it was ?natural? to defend oneself, the follower of Jesus was supposed to do what Jesus himself did.

The argument that we must go to war in behalf of the weaker nation because of its being in the right, is not consistent with the doctrines of Christ. It is also against the teaching of Christ to fight in self-defense. ?For even hereunto were we called, because Christ also suffered leaving us an example that we should follow His steps, who did no sin (violence, Isa. 53:9) who, when he was reviled, reviled not again. . . .?[22]

He also argued that Christians were not citizens of their earthly nations so they should not defend them.

Jno. [sic] 17:16. Our citizenship is not of this world, our citizenship is in heaven. Phil. 3:20. We belong to the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world are not allied. . . . Christians are separate from the world and are subjects of God?s kingdom, a kingdom of peace. . . .[23]

McCafferty employed fourteen scripture verses, all of which were from the New Testament with the exception of one reference to Isaiah 53 (which he used to equate sin with violence). He concerned himself with finding and presenting the attitude that Jesus and his disciples took regarding war. Any other argument, regardless of how ?natural? it seemed, had to be measured against the direct teachings and lives of Jesus and the New Testament Christians. This is the first article in the *Evangel* that systematically presented a pacifist argument and it revealed a paradigm that was followed by subsequent pacifists.

Both the July 3 and July 10, 1915, *Weekly Evangel*s presented advertisements for Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn?s strongly worded pacifist book, *Blood Against Blood*.[24] Booth-Clibborn employed a multitude of

scriptures and illustrations to prove that a Christian had no place in the bloodshed of war. The editors of *The Weekly Evangel* heartily recommended it.

A most striking, realistic and forceful book by Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn, an English Pentecostal Evangelist and Elder who has put into words the principles burning in the hearts of all the Pentecostal saints on the subject of whether a Christian should go to war or not. This book presents war from a Christian standpoint and is not intended for those out of Christ. Should the United States go to war with Germany what will be the attitude of the Pentecostal people. Send for a copy of this wonderful book and make a decision.[25]

High praises for a text about pacifism being the pentecostal view of war seems to reveal that the early leaders of the Assemblies of God thought this was the direction they wanted the fellowship to go. At this stage they were still asking the question, "what will be the attitude of the Pentecostal people?" but the preponderance of articles between 1914 and 1916 recommended abstinence.[26]

An unnamed author in 1915 provided evidence that some American Pentecostals were more concerned about promoting peace than supporting war.

the nations [should have] . . . spread the Gospel of Peace and made known the rule of Jesus . . . "the King of Peace" instead of obeying the "traditions of men" and preparing big guns, air craft, rapid firers [sic], submarines, a big navy, and bigger army for the destruction of human life.[27]

The following week witnessed the first article by Frank Bartleman in *The Weekly Evangel*. He voiced the concerns of the marginalized in society and condemned war in no uncertain terms. His first paragraph proclaimed that only hypocrites pray for peace while helping the war to continue. He asserted that America's claim of neutrality was a lie because America made the European war possible by selling arms to all the participants. "The nation, the voters, the church members, could stop this if they would insist upon it . . . [but] we are willing to receive these millions of blood money. We had better pluck out the stars from our flag and instate dollar marks in their place." [28] He contrasted the symbols of the nations, "wild beasts and birds of prey," with the human heart (representing peace) that Nebuchadnezzar had taken away from him. His concern for the poor manifested itself repeatedly.

The poor people must spill their blood to save the rulers fortunes. . . . The servant class must be emancipated. The lords must turn their great "preserves" into potato patches to feed the starving thousands of the common people. . . . [Soldiers are] blinded by sin, blinded by ignorance, blinded and controlled by their leaders.[29]

Bartleman also predicted terrible aftereffects of the war.

We will have nations of murderers after this war. A generation with their hands stained with the blood of other human beings. . . . Whole nations will be fired with hatred in heart and mind against one another for coming generations. Not only men but the women and the children. Unborn generations are thus cursed.[30]

He presented the selfish motives and horrific results of war in such ways that made it completely incompatible with Christianity. He condemned specific sins of every nation, from England and America to Germany, Russia, Italy, France, and Japan, declaring that "We speak without fear or favor. . . . We favor no country." [31] Lest anyone question his lack of loyalty to the government, he provided his attitude toward national fidelity. "Patriotism has been fanned into a flame. The religious passion has been invoked, and the national gods called upon for defence [sic] in each case. What blasphemy!" [32] In this manner the answering of the war question seemed to be taking definite shape among pentecostals.

Bartleman provided another article to *The Weekly Evangel* one month later. In it he continued his tirade against the greedy nations and patriotism, his defense of the outcasts, his condemnation of war, and he added a call to repentance.

It is not worth while for Christians to wax warm in patriotism over this world's situation. . . . American capitalists, leaders and manufacturers are as deep in the mud as the others. . . . [Germans] are in the wrong sometimes also, and they are likely to stand by their country, right or wrong. England will do that also. America will do the same thing. There is not principle enough in any of these countries to overcome that.[33]

Bartleman appealed to principle as a reason to abstain and blamed "nominal Christianity" (the opposite of radical Pentecostal Christianity) for the disastrous wars. Discussing the evils of war caused him to remember the other evils in which America had participated and he thus revealed more of his social conscience.

We have killed off about all of our American Indians. What we have not killed outright we have starved. . . . Will not God deal in judgment with such a nation as this? Most assuredly! We have stolen the land from the North American Indians. . . . Our wrong to the black people was avenged in blood. What will the next be?[34]

Bartleman condemned participation in the European war and called for a transformation of thinking. He admitted that the world would continue to kill but that did not mean they needed Christian participation.

Hence we need a call at this time as a nation to repentance. I suppose it will be always possible for our nation to hire men to slay others. But the spirit of patriotism is not going to burn very bright in a people who are ruled by grafters.[35]

J. Roswell Flower penned an article and printed a letter from a reader who condemned Bartleman as "a German first and a Christian afterwards" so personally interested in the war as to have lost sight of the impartial view of a Christian.[36] Flower agreed and admitted that Bartleman's article was "too strongly worded and that it should not have appeared except in a greatly modified form." [37] E. N. Bell's absence during this time served as one of the primary reasons it did appear, "as Brother Bell was still away from the office and we could not advise with him, we allowed the article to go in the paper." [38] Even though Flower apologized for the "mistake" of printing the article he supported its antipatriotic stance and even seemed to lean toward nonparticipation in war.

We are not citizens of this world, but citizens of a better country and our interests are all for that country to which we all hope to go. In this office there is a Canadian, a Dutchman, an Englishman, and for a time a German. We have no arguments about the war as we are only interested in it from a Christian standpoint and its effect on the coming of the Lord. God's people must all get to this place, *where national prejudices must die and where the glory of God only will be sought.*[39]

Flower wanted every pentecostal to mature to the point where they felt loyalty only for God and not for their nation. This "heavenly citizenship" sentiment corresponds with the ideal of pacifism and Stanley Frodsham developed it more fully the following month.

Frodsham argued that "an attitude of strict neutrality to the warring nations" needed to be expanded to include actual rejection.[40]

When one comes into that higher kingdom and becomes a citizen of that "holy nation" (1 Peter 2:9), the things that pertain to earth should forever lose their hold, even that natural love for the nation where one happened to be born, and loyalty to the new King should swallow up all other loyalties.[41]

This absolute loyalty to God made all the affairs of the earth appear completely different. There was no room for pride and the removal of pride brought the removal of hatred and war.

National pride, like every other form of pride, is abomination in the sight of God. And pride of race must be one of the all things that pass away when one becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus. . . . When seen from the heavenly viewpoint, how the present conflict is illumined. The policy of our God is plainly declared in the Word, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [42]

Frodsham employed the New Testament to prove that Christians should not participate in the wars of this world. He set the kingdoms of this world in direct opposition to the kingdom of God and forced a choice upon his audience, "Is any child of God going to side with these belligerent kings? Will he not rather side with the Prince of Peace under whose banner of love he has chose [sic] to serve?" [43]

Choosing to follow peace rather than war meant rejection but Frodsham knew what really mattered, "The world, especially the religious world, has no use for the children of God, but the Lord taketh pleasure in his people. . . . It is important for the saint of God to remember that his citizenship is in heaven." [44] Frodsham

willingly spoke against loyalty to the government and against the related participation in war. He employed strong words and numerous scriptural arguments to inspire pentecostals to follow God rather than their idolatrous nations.

Early pentecostals spoke against war not just because the killing itself was immoral but also because of the results that it had upon its participants. They sometimes expressed their perspective regarding the intrinsic evil of war by quoting other writers.

I see the best, the most gentle men coming back transformed. I will not say that they have actually become wicked; but it is something much worse; they have grown accustomed to do evil unconsciously, to give the lie to all their lives, all that they believed, all that they desired, hitherto. To kill has become their duty, their sole object and purpose of life. . . . Their hearts are hardened.[45]

Another direct quote came from Booth-Clibborn's *Blood Against Blood* under the title "What is War?," it also served as an advertisement for the book.

General Sherman: "War is hell. . . ." George Fox, when offered a captaincy: "I cannot fight, for the spirit of war is slain within me." Sydney Smith: "God is forgotten in war: every principle of Christianity is trampled upon." Tertullian: "Our religion teaches us that it is better to be killed than to kill." John Wesley: "Shall Christians assist the Prince of Hell, who was a murderer from the beginning, by telling the world of the benefit or need of war??"[46]

It is probably no coincidence that these unequivocal antiwar citations appeared one week before the Assemblies of God informed the United States government that they were an organization of conscientious objectors. Nevertheless, these statements presented a clear message about the incompatibility of Christianity and war.

That same issue carried an article that listed scriptures that opposed war. The author attempted to address "The Crisis" of whether or not a Christian could go to war by asking "what saith the Scriptures concerning this all important matter??"[47] He then catalogued several quotations of Jesus himself to make his point.

He said of disciples on another occasion, "They are not of this world, even as I am not of the world. . . ." "Our citizenship is in heaven." (Phil.3:15 R.V.). . . . Let us be loyal to Him. . . . "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they will be called children of God." It is not those who delight in war, but those who are so permeated by the Spirit of the Prince of peace, and who seek to bring others into a blessed condition of peace with God and with their fellow man that inherit the blessing of the Master. . . . "But I say to you, That ye resist not evil. . . . Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you. . . ."[48]

The column right next to this one, written Mrs. A. R. Flower, explained that war called patriots to the aid of their country. In contrast, the child of God needed to answer the call to "deeper consecration, unceasing prayer, and earnest endeavor for souls." [49] This was the part that the Pentecostals were to take.

One week later the son of Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn tackled the war question. Samuel Booth-Clibborn forcefully echoed the sentiments of his father and employed a scripture-laden approach to show the absolute nature of Christian nonresistance. He separated Christians from "Pacifists" who used mere politics and "Socialists" who, although their "zeal for peace" was admired, worshipped materialism.[50] Even though early pentecostal writers expressed pacifistic ideals they scorned the term itself because of its connection with non-Christian "human" efforts to establish world peace. Booth-Clibborn addressed his message only to Christians, "Yes, us Christians, who have been preaching this Gospel of LOVE, JOY, and PEACE so loud and so long. Now that it has come to practicing what we preach, now the fiery test will be applied—are we willing to go through for Jesus??"[51]

He discounted Old Testament accounts of warfare because they "liv[ed] in the age of Law and Judgment; whilst we dwell in the Dispensation of Grace and Mercy." He disallowed any use of the Old Testament to justify killing in warfare as "thick ignorance . . . resulting in this everlasting muddling up of O. T. and N. T. teaching, of Law and Grace, of Judgment and Mercy, of War and Peace. . . ." He established his entire position on Jesus and the New Testament.

Find me in the New Testament where Christ ever sent His followers on such a mission? On the contrary He sent them out to save men—not to butcher them like cattle. . . . No! as far as the Christian is concerned, the "eye

for an eye? system has given place to the ?Turn to him the other cheek also? of Matt. 5:39-44.[52]

When challenged with the question of self-defense Booth-Clibborn responded with a four-point answer. First, he argued that a ?murderous individual? employs his free will while wars are fought by ?poor harmless people . . . driven like cattle and **quite against their will** by godless governments into butchering each other.?[53] He then claimed that God often protected his children ?according to their faith; for they put their trust in Him rather than the police.? But should the ?brute? actually break in and threaten one?s life, ?if it should come to actual violence?Matthew 5 and Romans 12 would still remain true, and God?s Word would still have to be obeyed.? Thus, even when it seemed like Booth-Clibborn would justify self-defense because it differed from war, he did not. Obedience was key. He then made his fourth point.

Many religious persecutions which down the ages have been the inevitable accompaniment of every new and powerful movement; and yet these very persecutions have set the seal of God?s approval in the most striking way on the doctrine of Christian non-resistance. Those same early non-resisters, mind you, were the same martyrs, of whom, in recent days of **inherited** religion, the boast is so often heard, that ?their blood was the seed of the church!?[54]

Samuel H. Booth-Clibborn lauded the faithfulness of early Christians and radical movements who did not fight and who did not succumb to patriotism. This statement revealed that Booth-Clibborn wanted pentecostals to stay true to their restorationist, Spirit empowered, missions-focused origins. Pacifism provided the integral avenue for this to be accomplished.

The May 19, 1917, *Weekly Evangel* presented two pieces that addressed the pentecostal perspective on war. Samuel H. Booth-Clibborn provided the first with the second installment of his previous article. He condemned Christians who approved war in stern fashion.

It is also essential that we bring unprejudiced, humble, and earnest minds and hearts to bear on this matter, as I?ve found ninety per cent of militaristic Christians to be lacking in the above kind of ?Preparedness,??as is evidenced by a **biased**, feverish state of mind, fatal to clear spiritual thinking.[55]

He reiterated the belief that ?it was simply **God?s Holy Ghost power!**?[56] that made it possible to accomplish amazing things for God as a nonviolent person. He also implemented one of the most unique arguments against participation in war that occurred in the early Assemblies of God.

But there is another way in which **the Temple can be destroyed**, viz., by dragging into it the present horrible hatred, pride, and bloody butchery! ?Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroy (R. V.) the Temple of God, Him shall God destroy! (And ?all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.?)?[57]

Booth-Clibborn appealed to the classic ?temple of God? concept to show that the Christian must not desecrate himself by hating and killing. He argued that Christians could choose but one position regarding this question, especially since they were filled with the ?Spirit.?

J. W. Welch, the chairman of the executive presbytery of the General Council of the Assemblies of God in 1917, penned an article that related their opinion regarding military service. He introduced it by stating that the purpose was ?to interpret as clearly as possible what the Scriptures teach upon the subject, as we have from the beginning declared the Bible to be our only rule of faith and practice.?[58] The scriptural foundation allowed them to ?hope to secure the privilege of exemption from such military service as will necessitate the taking of life for all who are real conscientious objectors and who are associated with the General Council.? Welch claimed that they were merely stating ?the position always held by this company of believers? because the time had now arrived that necessitated it since conscription was imminent. He told the constituency that they should be willing to serve in any capacity that did not require killing and that he himself was appalled at the idea of pentecostal men bearing arms.

The lay reader of *The Weekly Evangel* read the military service resolution for the first time in the August 4, 1917, edition.[59] The executive presbytery (probably J. W. Welch) wrote a three-paragraph introduction to the resolution and then related the chronology of the events that had transpired since April.

Significantly, missions served as the first justification for the resolution. Early pentecostals concerned themselves primarily with spreading the good news of Jesus Christ and they did not want to adopt any stance that would work against their mission. If any person had never read anything up until this point about pentecostals and the military, their introduction to the topic, as introduced by the executives of the Assemblies of God, would have been in the context of evangelism.

From its very inception, the Pentecostal Movement has been a movement of evangelism, studiously avoiding any principles or actions which would thwart it in its great purpose. All the wings of the movement, which have grown out of the work that originated in the Southwestern States and the Pacific Coast are a unit in this respect.^[60]

In order to accomplish this goal they realized that they could not participate in warfare because the ideals of the two conflicted. They believed that telling the story of Jesus and then killing that same person served as a blatantly hypocritical contradiction. The author then recalled the Quaker heritage of the Assemblies of God and appealed to their serious approach to the words of scripture to explain their position.

From the very beginning, the movement has been characterized by Quaker principles. The laws of the Kingdom, laid down by our elder brother, Jesus Christ, in His Sermon on the Mount, have been *unqualifiedly* adopted, consequently the movement has found itself opposed to the spilling of the blood of *any* man, or of offering resistance to *any* aggression. *Every* branch of the movement, whether in the United States, Canada, Great Britain or Germany, has held to this principle.^[61]

The leaders of the Assemblies of God claimed to speak for the entire pentecostal movement and gave the impression that there were no dissenters among their ranks. The wording of the paragraph above would have led one to believe that every pentecostal person in the world was opposed to participation in warfare. The antiwarfare, pacifistic, and conscientious objection articles in the *Evangel* up to this point outnumbered the combatant participation articles by more than ten to one so the above statement seems to reflect a sentiment within the Assemblies of God that was stronger than the procombatant position, or at least the Assemblies of God believed they needed to project that appearance in order to protect their conscientious objectors.^[62]

The author then explained that previously there had been no reason to state the position of the Assemblies of God. Now that "war clouds gathered and actual war was declared" they found it necessary to commit to writing "the established principles or creed of all sections of the Pentecostal Movement, and especially that part represented by the General Council."^[63] The full resolution, with its title, read as follows:

Resolution Concerning the Attitude of the General Council of the Assemblies of God Toward any Military Service which Involves the Actual Participation in the Destruction of Human Life.

While recognizing Human Government as of Divine ordination and affirming our unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States, nevertheless we are constrained to define our position with reference to the taking of human life.

WHEREAS, in the Constitutional Resolution adopted at the Hot Springs General Council, April 1-10, 1914, we plainly declare the Holy Inspired Scriptures to be the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, and

WHEREAS the Scriptures deal plainly with the obligations and relations of humanity, setting forth the principles of "Peace on earth, good will toward men." (Luke 2:14); and

WHEREAS we, as followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, believe in implicit obedience to the Divine commands and precepts which instruct us to "Follow peace with all men," (Heb. 12:14); "Thou shalt not kill," (Exod. 20:13); "Resist not evil," (Matt. 5:39); "Love your enemies," (Matt. 5:44); etc., and

WHEREAS these and other Scriptures have always been accepted and interpreted by our churches as prohibiting Christians from shedding blood or taking human life;

THEREFORE we, as a body of Christians, while purposing to fulfill all the obligations of loyal citizenship, are nevertheless constrained to declare we cannot conscientiously participate in war and armed resistance which involves the actual destruction of human life, since this is contrary to our view of the clear teachings of the inspired Word of God, which is the sole basis of our faith.[64]

The first ?whereas? stated that scripture served as the only determinant of doctrine and ethics. Supposedly, any belief needed to be defended only with scriptural support since it was ?all-sufficient.? Furthermore, they argued that their sole authority, the Bible, ?plainly? provided one unequivocal position about participation in warfare. They expressed this single principle by quoting five scripture verses, four from the New Testament and one from the Old Testament. The fourth and final ?whereas? declared that many more scriptures than they had even listed had ?always? been interpreted by pentecostals to forbid killing. It is quite significant that all four ?whereas? paragraphs refer to scripture to justify their conclusion. They did not appeal to reason or any philosophical principles. They appealed only to scripture.

The final paragraph of the resolution recognized that it did not support absolutely loyal American citizenship by incorporating the word ?nevertheless.? But it also could have been interpreted to allow noncombatant service since it did not involve ?the actual destruction of human life.?[65] The presbytery then once again defended their principle of conscientious opposition to war and killing by mentioning the ?clear teachings? of the Bible as the ?sole basis? of their faith. The multiple references to scripture revealed the manner by which early pentecostals justified and defended their nonparticipation. They introduced their resolution by referring to evangelism, Quaker principles, and Jesus Christ.[66] They loaded their resolution with praises for scripture, descriptions of scripture, and scriptures themselves: ?Holy,? ?Inspired,? ?all-sufficient,? ?rule,? ?obligations,? ?principles,? ?Divine commands,? ?precepts,? and ?sole basis.?[67] This early method stands in stark contrast to the manner in which the Assemblies of God justified their military service resolution fifty years later.[68]

Three articles and a poem by Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn appeared in 1918. He rejected ?anti-Bible ?pacifism? advocated by large sections of the Labor Party in Great Britain and the United States of America.?[69] Instead, he believed the pentecostal Christian should have a ??conscientious objection? to war based, so to speak, on a **previous engagement** with Christ in a truly missionary, a truly witnessing or martyr spirit.?[70] His article revealed the close relationship between missions and pentecostal conscientious objection, ?The true conscientious objector is the sort of Christian who is gladly willing to go unarmed among savage heathen, far beyond the ?protecting? reach of a six inch shell. He is equally ready to dispense with all ?protection? in ?civilized? lands.?[71] Booth-Clibborn based this idea on the fact that early Christians had died because of their faith and love and end-time Christians must do the same. ?A bloody Calvary, a Pentecost of fire, and the hostility of an entire world? both required and enabled complete rejection of any participation in war.[72]

Toward a Pentecostal Theology of Peacemaking

After hearing the voices of pentecostals from almost a century ago, my attempt to explicate a contemporary theology of peacemaking for pentecostals will not be new and may sound tame. However, I believe that their concerns, since they were neither misdirected nor misinformed, need to be reiterated and bolstered with a systematic connecting of pentecostal emphases and peacemaking.[73] For pentecostals have much in our heritage and in our current worldviews that promotes *shalom* and that can be used to emphasize once again its integral nature. The presence of a concern for peacemaking among our ancestors is not justification in and of itself for such an emphasis now. The justification must be supplied by a biblically based theology. This may be a short section in this paper but it is the area that I hope enjoys further development by many.[74]

First, although the Spirit has enjoyed significant attention among pentecostals, Jesus Christ himself has been quoted freely and seriously. This priority of place for the Messiah is certainly appropriate when addressing peacemaking. Jesus is the one who said, ?blessed (good for you!) are the peacemakers? and ?love your enemies.? His life, death, and resurrection should be joined with his words to reveal a lifestyle of nonresistance that is imperative for the children of God, the joint-heirs with Jesus who share in his sufferings as well as his glory. Pentecostals of all people should be appalled at the marginalization of Jesus when it comes to discussions of ethics. We should start and end with Jesus, the author and finisher of our faithfulness, who revealed to us the way of God. It is by him that we have been redeemed and for him that we seek the redemption of the world. Oppression, exploitation, greed, nationalism, and violence can never be justified without moving Jesus to the

side, and this should not be acceptable to pentecostals. Jesus was faced with real options in his life and he was obedient to God, we must follow his example.

Second, evangelism/missions is integral to the self-understanding and theology of pentecostals.[75] This can be both negative and positive. It is bad when it causes us to compromise important aspects of the gospel in order to grow, and it is good when it causes us to evaluate ourselves in light of the gospel we preach to be sure we are who we say we are. It is common for pentecostals to say, "You're either a missionary or a mission field." Pentecostal participation in war requires missionaries to kill mission fields. In view of the actual practice of many pentecostals, two new options would need to be added for the axiom to be true, "You're either a missionary or a mission field, or a patriot or an enemy deserving to be killed."

Pentecostal theology of mission has several critical points at which a critique of war and killing can enter. If all people are supposed to be led to Jesus (and this is a safe theological point for most pentecostals),[76] at what point does a person cease being a subject worthy of redemption and love and become an object deserving death? Furthermore, at what point does a witness of Jesus/missionary (and all pentecostals are supposed to be this) cease converting and start destroying? The common answer might be, "When the government says so." But this allows a redefinition of who we as pentecostals are and who the rest of the world is that places national namings, "ally" and "enemy," above Christian namings, "believer" and "unbeliever." Rather, we say as the disciples said, "we obey God rather than men." Pentecostal evangelism is not supposed to be a part-time occupation or an element of Christianity that gets laid to the side sometimes when more important matters call (safety, security, prosperity).[77]

Third, the bible is taken seriously by pentecostals and this should lead to a high regard for peacemaking and significant questioning of violence, oppression, and the subordination of the kingdom of God to national lusts of self-preservation. Critical biblical scholarship does indeed support a Christianity that is not nationalistic and not violent. Pentecostals would do well to consider the implications of their belief that God has actually revealed his way in the bible. Yoder observed that "the prima facie biblicism of early pentecostals never matured into a solid ethical hermeneutic,"[78] but that can and should be corrected. The respect for the bible is not a hurdle that has to be overcome, it is a strength that should be directed and developed. Pentecostal theological ethicists can be free to exegete scripture because the communities we serve regard it highly, and taking the biblical stories seriously should lead one toward an ethic of excessive love.

Finally,[79] it would be an understatement to say that the baptism in the Holy Spirit has been an integral aspect of pentecostalism. It has been touted as the highlight of Christian spirituality and the gateway to God's special empowerment and leading, not to mention all the gifts of the Spirit. But the ethical implications of this experience have unfortunately been left too often to merely personal and individualistic applications. The Spirit may be mentioned regarding the consumption of alcohol, gambling, or marital fidelity. But we must recognize the already existent biblical link between this powerful enabling of God and the ability lay down one's life for others. It is the Spirit who enables us to love our enemies, do good to those who hate us, bless those who curse us, and pray for those who mistreat us (Luke 6.27-36).

Luke portrays Jesus as the Spirit-filled person, *plhrow tou agiou pneumati* (4.1), who was led by the Spirit (4.1), empowered by the Spirit (4.14), and anointed by the Spirit (4.18) to teach and live the way he did. He then encouraged his followers to emulate him after they were empowered by the same Spirit (24.46-49). He makes his priorities clear to them and continually rejected violent revolution and the sword. Luke 22, which is often used as a justification for the use of the sword since Jesus said to buy one, is better interpreted within the context of temptation. Judas had succumbed to the tempter (which Jesus had successfully rejected so far, even his offers of safety, security, wealth, and power), and all the disciples were to be sifted.[80] Jesus reminded them that his kingdom was not the way of the world: exercising authority and controlling through power. Rather, God's way is to serve, to suffer, and even to die for others.

Then Jesus reminded them they did not need money, provisions, sandals, or swords to follow him. But now at this hour of temptation they would have the opportunity to forsake him and seek these other things. The two swords they had were "enough," not for the actual defense of the disciples but certainly enough for their temptation. After Jesus' prayers and requests for prayer to withstand the coming temptation, Peter still succumbed by attacking with the sword and then followed his physical denial of the way of Jesus with his verbal denials. It is not by accident that this incident occurs before the day of Pentecost. Peter's misunderstanding of Jesus (from telling Jesus he would not suffer and die to his use of the sword) was prior to the vindication of the resurrection and the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit to walk in God's way. He was quite different afterwards, both in the sermon immediately following and in his later writing, "don't render evil for evil, or insult for insult, but on the contrary blessing." [81]

The Spirit empowered reconciliation of Acts, the reversal of Babel, the preaching of Jesus as the Messiah of God, is best understood from the perspective of true repentance (changing the way one thinks). The Spirit led

rejection of justified self-defense and the complete acceptance of forgiveness is portrayed clearly by Stephen. Luke tells us that he was "full of faithfulness, power . . . and the Holy Spirit," that he recounted the history of Israel right up to the death and resurrection of Jesus, and that while being murdered he quoted Jesus, "Lord, forgive them this sin." The Holy Spirit has not come just so that pentecostals can get excited or even that we can simply speak powerfully. The unity and reconciliation of the arrival of the Spirit in our communities announces that the way of God will be lived in our lives and that we will pass on the grace that has been passed on to us. The Spirit leads us in obedience, and both obedience and mercy are better than sacrifice.[82]

Why A Pentecostal Peace Fellowship Is Needed

How will *another* organization help the kingdom of God? Aren't there enough already? These are legitimate questions and deserve answers compelling enough to justify the organizing of a pentecostal peace fellowship. So now I humbly offer some reasons why such a fellowship will help us follow the Spirit.

First, my critique of pentecostal approval of war and other forms of violence and oppression is not unique. Various lay people, pastors, and scholars reveal concern on various occasions in various ways. But these efforts are random and not well organized, an article here, a proposal there, or an occasional chapter in a book.[83] Sharing this idea with pentecostals around the world has brought encouraging responses.[84] In Europe there is a hope that "a charismatic spirituality could provide a bridge between humanly-devised barriers: men and women, black and white, and poor and wealthy . . . [and] a global concern for the poor, the oppressed and the marginalized would make Christianity a force with which to be reckoned." [85] The very nature of this conference, dedicated to recognizing the importance of ethics for pentecostals, shows that there is a growing global concern that the pentecostal witness be consistent not only in its doctrine but also in its ethics. A pentecostal peace fellowship would be dedicated to bringing together and broadcasting these authentic pentecostal voices who speak and live for the peace that only Christ brings.

Second, thousands of people are being educated around the world in pentecostal institutions and are not being given the theological resources with which to critique nationalism, patriotism, war, and other divisive issues. A pentecostal peace fellowship would be able to encourage teaching (in many media formats) on the significance of peacemaking as an essential element of the Spirit filled life. Through pamphlets, articles, perhaps a journal, audio, video, and online, a wealth of material could be organized that deals with the biblical, theological, and practical issues of pentecostal peacemaking. Racism, classism, materialism, and other international issues could be consistently addressed in responsible ways so that any who were interested could benefit.

Third, this fellowship could serve global pentecostalism as a forum for those voices from around the world who are of the Spirit yet differ greatly on these significant issues. It has already been shown that the majority of Assemblies of God pastors in the U.S. would kill for their country. Perhaps pentecostals from other parts of the world have something to say about this. This would be a place where voices unified by the Spirit, yet not necessarily uniformed, could speak to these issues and present their understandings of the significance of being pentecostal in a world divided by hostility and selfishness. Jean-Daniel Plüss hopes for "a shift from a theology of victory to a theology of humility," "a theology of listening rather than a theology of telling," and for "the believers in Europe to stretch out "the right hand of fellowship" to minorities and marginalized communities and together address global concerns with a vibrant message adequate to answer the pressing spiritual and moral needs of the world." [86] A pentecostal peace fellowship would actively foster these positive developments.

Finally, this fellowship could be a place that promotes actual participation in reconciliation efforts around the world. Writing, reading, and discussing certainly have their place (for the Messiah taught consistently) but it must be accompanied by participation in the way of the cross. Pentecostals have a heritage of following the leading of the Spirit to the difficult places, and that must remain true of this fellowship dedicated to reconciliation and love of fellow humans. Those involved should be dedicated to active involvement in reconciliation in their local communities. This can be done by finding those who are ostracized or oppressed and befriending them, by speaking truth in public to the powers that exploit, and by not being ashamed that we live from the particularity of our redemption in Christ. I know students who would be honored to do a "peace internship" with pentecostals who are in perilous areas working for the cause of Christ. The mission of the church must include this supposed foolishness and a peace fellowship will assist many denominations (both pentecostal and non) to work together to make the witness of God's work in our lives extremely visible.[87]

And so I end my fleeting solo and pass it off to you. I have been neither objective nor unbiased, but have contributed my piece as someone who claims to have been transformed by the power of Jesus Christ. Our bible, our theology, and our heritage supports an active and public peacemaking, let us be faithful, obedient, and Spirit-filled followers of our Savior as we seek peace. To paraphrase a famous reformer, "In this way I walk, I can do no other." [88]

[1]This is true. Joel Shuman even pre-used my title with his article "Pentecost and the End of Patriotism: A Call for the Restoration of Pacifism Among Pentecostal Christians," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9 (1996): 70-96. Actually, his article helped me realize that there are pentecostals who really are concerned about these issues as more than just topics of historical study and I highly recommend it.

[2]Bill Evans, "Improvisation in Jazz" liner notes to *Kind of Blue: Miles Davis*, original 1959 LP release by Columbia. Emphasis added.

[3]Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee, eds., *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 813. From this point forward I will use the term pentecostal to refer to both Pentecostals and Charismatics as those who trust the power and gifts of the Spirit and the authority of scripture to help them follow Jesus. This is similar to the way James William McClendon, Jr. uses "baptist" to refer to those who recognize the authority of scripture and their continuity with it [*Doctrine* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994), 45], and John Howard Yoder's understanding of the "Anabaptist vision" as "the recourse to Scripture as an authoritative guide for church renewal." "Anabaptist Vision and Mennonite Reality," in *Consultation on Anabaptist-Mennonite Theology*, ed. A. J. Klassen (Fresno, CA: Council of Mennonite Seminaries, 1970), 5.

[4]"The Pentecostal Movement and the Conscription Law," *The Weekly Evangel*, 4 August 1917, 6. Sixty two percent of pentecostal denominations formed by 1917 were pacifistic at some point in their history. However, this refers only to those denominations formed in the United States, European pentecostals also evidenced pacifism in the early twentieth century. Jay Beaman, *Pentecostal Pacifism* (Hillsboro, KS: Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies, 1989), 30, 32-33.

[5]In this recollection I am not seeking or claiming to have found a perfect first generation of pentecostals that can lead us to the promised land. As Everett Wilson astutely observed, "is not the desire to find an ideal first generation more an idolatry than it is a frank recognition that the Pentecostal movement is essentially God's working with finite, defective, men and women whom he uses to demonstrate his purposes not because of some special merits but despite the absence of them?" Rather, the recognition that it was one time an important part of pentecostalism can open the door to accepting its relevance now. "They Crossed the Red Sea, Didn't They?" in *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*, ed. Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus, and Douglas Petersen (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 1999), 99-100.

[6]This society was formed in the spring of 2001 by myself and some Southwestern Assemblies of God University students who were interested in studying Pentecostal ethics. The first project was to conduct a survey of Assemblies of God pastors in the United States of America regarding their perspectives of various ethical issues. The survey was conducted by mail and enough responses were received to provide a margin of error of +/- 10%. At this time the society consists of only a few members. The complete results are provided at the end of this paper.

[7]Twenty seven percent *strongly* agreed.

[8]It is possible that some were thinking of abortion when responding to this question but it was under the section, ?Christians and War.?

[9]A disturbing nine percent believe it is appropriate to kill for the gospel. Eighty four percent believe it the duty of Christians to be patriotic to their nations, and twenty four percent think it is appropriate for Christians to enforce evil laws.

[10]The just war tradition must allow room for objection to warfare if it is to be able to distinguish between just and unjust wars. This forty percent who think it is never appropriate to oppose warfare reveals the crusade mentality that is present among many.

[11]I have told some of this story to a limited extent in *An Analysis of the Emergence and Decline of Pacifism in the History of the Assemblies of God*, Ph.D. diss, Baylor University, 2000.

[12]John Howard Yoder, *The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1998), 8.

[13]Ibid., chapter 4.

[14]Burgess and McGee, 811.

[15]The actual name has not been chosen yet. It should be decided by all of those who are interested so that it accurately reflects the nature of the organization. ?Pentecostal Charismatic Peace Fellowship International? has also been suggested.

[16]Frank Bartleman, ?War and the Christian,? circa 1922.

[17]Jay Beaman, Murray Dempster, Walter Hollenweger, Howard Kenyon, Joel Shuman, Roger Robbins, and others have pointed this out.

[18]I concluded in my dissertation that there was a minority in the Assemblies of God who were against war and a minority who supported it, while the majority did not bother themselves with worrying about it or actively teaching their children one way or the other (the absence of such teaching may allow it by default).

[19]The rest of this section is a compilation of some of the European and American pentecostal voices against war and other social evils during World War I. A more complete description can be found in *An Analysis*, chapter 2.

[20]?Is European War Justifiable?,? *The Christian Evangel*, 12 December 1914, 1-2. This was the only article in *The Pentecostal Evangel* that supported Christian participation in warfare between 1914 and 1916.

[21]Burt McCafferty, "Should Christians Go To War?" *The Christian Evangel*, 16 January 1915, 1.

[22]Ibid. McCafferty appealed to the life of Jesus as an example to be followed. In so doing, he aligned with the type of pacifism Yoder called "the imitation of Jesus." Its content is not abstract commands but rather the life and word of Jesus. His command and example are to be followed without calculation of social possibilities. . . . It does not expect widespread acceptance, but neither does it acquiesce in the world's noncompliance with Jesus' norm." John Howard Yoder, *Nevertheless: Varieties and Shortcomings of Religious Pacifism* (1984; repr. 1994), 120.

[23]McCafferty, "Should Christians Go To War?" 1.

[24]Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn, *Blood Against Blood* (1901; reprint New York: Charles C. Cook, 1914).

[25]"Blood Against Blood," *The Weekly Evangel*, 3 July 1915, 3. "Blood Against Blood," *The Weekly Evangel*, 10 July 1915, 3.

[26]The ratio was at least 10:1 in favor of nonparticipation. However, war remained a minor concern compared to missions, revivals, and doctrinal debates.

[27]"Tithes and Free Will Offerings," *The Weekly Evangel*, 3 July 1915, 3.

[28]Frank Bartleman, "The European War," *The Weekly Evangel*, 10 July 1915, 3.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Frank Bartleman, "What Will the Harvest Be?" *The Weekly Evangel*, 7 August 1915, 1.

[34]Ibid., 2.

[35]Ibid.

[36]J. Roswell Flower, "What Will the Harvest Be? Article in Last Week's *Evangel* Receiving Just Criticism," *The Weekly Evangel*, 14 August 1915, 2.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid. The fact that Bartleman's article elicited a rebuke from a reader, an apology from the editor, and an admission that not all agreed with it revealed that the Assemblies of God contained a pacifist minority and a militant minority. Each of these could get their message out depending on the situation in which the leadership and the country found themselves.

[39]Ibid. Emphasis added.

[40]Stanley H. Frodsham, "Our Heavenly Citizenship," *The Weekly Evangel*, 11 September 1915, 3.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid. This was evidence that Frodsham viewed pentecostals as being outside the religious establishment.

[45]Baron D'Estournelles de Constant, "The Sinister Education of War," *The Weekly Evangel*, 20 January 1917, 2.

[46]"What is War?" *The Weekly Evangel*, 21 April 1917, 2.

[47]"The Crisis," *The Weekly Evangel*, 21 April 1917, 7.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Mrs. A. R. Flower, "Daily Portion From the King's Bounty," *The Weekly Evangel*, 21 April 1917, 7.

[50]Samuel H. Booth-Clibborn, "The Christian and War. Is it too Late?," *The Weekly Evangel*, 28 April 1917, 5. Booth-Clibborn rejected pragmatic conscientious objection and revealed that he was a pacifist who appealed to the example of Jesus and completely rejected any form of noncombatant military service. "A truly enlightened Christian will have the spiritual perception to see that this so-called 'non-combatant service' is only a part and parcel of the whole machine. Men and women thus employed are every bit as guilty in the Supreme Court of Heaven of the murder of their fellow-men, as are those in the trenches." Samuel H. Booth-Clibborn, *Should A Christian Fight? An Appeal to Christian Young Men of All Nations* (Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, n.d.), 83.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid. For a better way to deal with this issue, see "If Abraham is Our Father," in *The Original Revolution*, 91-111.

[53]Ibid. Emphasis in the original.

[54]Ibid. Emphasis in the original.

[55]Samuel H. Booth-Clibborn, "The Christian and War," *The Weekly Evangel*, 19 May 1917, 4. Emphasis in the original. Note the designation "militaristic Christians" he employed as he addressed the Assemblies of God, he did not want his audience to be so defined but he recognized that some were.

[56]Ibid. Emphasis in the original.

[57]Ibid. Emphasis in the original.

[58]J. W. Welch, "An Explanation," *The Weekly Evangel*, 19 May 1917, 8.

[59]The resolution had been mailed to all ordained Assemblies of God ministers in May.

[60]"The Pentecostal Movement and the Conscription Law," *The Weekly Evangel*, 4 August 1917, 6.

[61]Ibid. Emphasis added. They declared that no single person deserved to be killed and absolutely no aggression was to be resisted.

[62]Evidence exists that shows that the noncombatant and pacifistic positions were not unanimous. See, *An Analysis, 'Freedom to Fight, 1914-1940.'*

[63]The Pentecostal Movement and the Conscription Law, *The Weekly Evangel*, 4 August 1917, 6.

[64]Ibid. Emphasis in the original.

[65]At the least, they did not explicitly forbid noncombatant military service and it did explicitly state their desire to be loyal citizens.

[66]These were arguments employed by the Booth-Clibborns and Bartleman.

[67]Ibid.

[68]The Assemblies of God made not one single reference to scripture in the 1967 article on military service that reversed the historic position. "As a movement we affirm our loyalty to the government of the United States in war or peace. We shall continue to insist, as we have historically, on the right of each member to choose for himself whether to declare his position as a combatant, a noncombatant, or a conscientious objector." *General Council Minutes*, 1967, 35. It was significant that this was written as an American statement, despite the fact that the majority of the Assemblies of God constituency (seventy percent) were not citizens of the United States in 1967. Now there are 38 million Assemblies of God people worldwide with less than 3 million (seven percent) in the United States.

[69]Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn, "Nigh, Even At The Doors," 7 September 1918, 2.

[70]Ibid. Emphasis in the original. This is evidence of Booth-Clibborn's vocational pacifism.

[71]Arthur Sydney Booth-Clibborn, "Nigh, Even At The Doors," 5 October 1918, 6. It was possible that Booth-Clibborn purposely contradicted E. N. Bell's earlier appeal to American forces for the protection of Pentecostal missionaries. Booth-Clibborn and Bell were diametrically opposed on this issue. E. N. Bell, "Wars and the Missionaries," *The Christian Evangel*, 12 September 1914, 1.

[72]Ibid.

[73]This does not mean that I agree with every methodology or argument they employed, but it does mean that the issues they were addressing need to receive significant focus now as well.

[74]Joel Shuman argued that abandoning pacifism was a "grievous error" for pentecostals. He then provided a good theological rationale for [his] assertion that the gradual and eventually complete loss of pacifism is among the most compelling signs that the Assemblies of God has, at least in practice, abandoned its self-understanding as a community of radical Christian witness. He did this by showing that the moral ramifications of the doctrine of Spirit baptism must be understood eschatologically (as they initially were) in order to undergird a restoration of Pentecostal pacifism. "Pentecost and the End of Patriotism," 71-72.

[75]L. Grant McClung, Jr. claims that "Pentecostalism by its very nature is intrinsically missiological." "Try to Get People

[76]I admit that it could be debated but that is outside the scope of this paper. It holds true for the majority.

[77]Furthermore, evangelism that focuses on souls being saved rather than disciples being matured into the way of Jesus also suffers from self-destructive tendencies. The saving of the soul allows for the killing of the body, or the use of our bodies for killing. This separation limits the power of the gospel, for God saves the whole person and not just the soul. See Rodney Clapp, *Border Crossings: Christian Trespasses on Popular Culture and Public Affairs* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2000), 9-15.

[78]John Howard Yoder, forward to *Pentecostal Pacifism*, by Jay Beaman (Hillsboro, KS: Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies, 1989), iii.

[79]This is certainly not the end of the theological rationale, indeed, it is barely a beginning.

[80]The plural ὑμεῖς (all of you) is used to describe Satan's desire to sift the disciples.

[81]First Peter 3, ?Let him turn aside from evil, and let him do good. Let him seek peace and pursue it . . . if you suffer for good, good for you! For you don't fear what they fear [death].? The scope of this paper does not allow for a more nuanced treatment, but it will be forthcoming. In the meantime, see John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), *The Original Revolution* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1971), or Lisa Sowle Cahill, *Love Your Enemies: Discipleship, Pacifism, and Just War Theory* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994).

[82]Frank Macchia defines speaking in tongues as ?an experience with God that continually urges the people of God to move beyond the confines of private piety or even church fellowship to the global issues of justice, peace, and the redemption of the world. . . . Contemporary Pentecostals must [believe] that tongues connect individual Christians and churches with the need for global justice, reconciliation, and redemption.? ?The Struggle for Global Witness: Shifting Paradigms in Pentecostal Theology,? *The Globalization of Pentecostalism*, 18.

[83]See *An Analysis*, chapter 4, for an overview of the pentecostal voices concerned about peace that have emerged recently.

[84]An array of pentecostals have told me they would support and join such an organization: missionaries in Taiwan and China, lay people and pastors in Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Ghana, Albania, and the U.S., professors at Duke, COG Theological Seminary, etc., and the president of an Assemblies of God university.

[85]Jean-Daniel Plüss, ?Globalization of Pentecostalism or Globalization of Individualism? A European Perspective,? in *The Globalization of Pentecostalism*, 175-176. Plüss envisions an ?ethic of global concern? which would naturally include the importance of pentecostal peacemaking.

[86]Plüss, 180. He also rightly believes that pentecostal spirituality should have a ?common Christian attitude of respect and love towards the other because of the overriding awareness of God's active Spirit. Such a community could be called a culture in the sense that believers have been socialized to live a meaningful metaphor of Christ's life, death and resurrection, respecting the voices of all people and mutually experiencing God's Spirit moving through and with them.? These communities can rightly be

called the church when they are willing to die, rather than kill, for their God.

[87]Less this seem to be purely social work (in the derogatory sense of the term), I am actually describing the fruit of a converted and transformed life.

[88]If you are interested in being involved in any way, please contact me at palexander@sagu.edu.