

1983

The Early Christian Attitude to War

J.G. Brennan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Brennan, J.G. (1983) "The Early Christian Attitude to War," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 36 : No. 1 , Article 17.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol36/iss1/17>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

biography of Mao nor a book on the China scene today. Rather it is an attempt to show "an extraordinary paradox, matching the magnitude of Mao's achievement against the enormity of his errors."

Bloodworth follows the course of the Chinese revolution (a revolution that begins at the latest in 1912), but keeps the focus on Mao. Throughout Bloodworth insists on the "Chineseness" of Mao, a view that would seem risky in describing a man who professed himself to be first and foremost a Marxist-Leninist. Bloodworth helps make his point though by repeated references to two traditional Chinese books that had the greatest of impact on Mao. The first is *Water Margin* (the English translation by Pearl Buck is called *All Men Are Brothers*). This is a 14th-century Chinese Robin Hood tale that has long been a model of Chinese rebellion against the ills of society. The second book is *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms* (English translation by C.H. Bewitt-Taylor, published in Tokyo in 1959), a swash-buckling story of strategy and war set in the third century, but written in the 13th century when China had been conquered by the Mongols.

Mao referred to these books continually throughout his long life. He would use allusions and illustrations from them to admonish, exhort, instruct, and pacify his associates and enemies. This practice is common in China where literary, scholarly, or theatrical references are used by public figures in daily intercourse (one imagines Secretary James Watt invoking Birnham Wood or Dunsinane in explaining a new forest policy). What is important in Mao's case is that rebels are glorified in these books—rebels and guerrillas. One of the earliest of Western commentators on China, Thomas Taylor Meadows, wrote in 1856

that the Chinese were the most rebellious and least revolutionary people in the world. This difference is set forth very clearly in Albert Camus' *The Rebel*—the rebel is struggling against concrete injustice, the revolutionary against the total system that includes the injustice. Meadows saw the Chinese as only the former, Mao certainly thought himself the latter. But having beaten the system as a revolutionary, did he then revert to rebel and try to hamstring, by the Cultural Revolution, the very system he had played such a vital role in founding? Bloodworth concludes "he was a very Chinese hero" who "was the right man at the right moment, but if he was not born before his time, he did not die before it either."

The definitive work on Mao may be as much as a century away, but for the here-and-now, Bloodworth has given us a study that should stand alongside Stuart Schram's *Mao Tse-tung* (first published in 1966) and Benjamin Schwartz's *Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao* (first issued in 1951) in delineating the line between Mao, the Communist, and Mao, the Chinese. In so doing, Bloodworth has given us a good antidote to the fatuous nonsense of Mao worship that the trendy boys of the academic world were trying to feed us in the sixties and seventies.

J. K. HOLLOWAY
Naval War College

Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War*. Somers, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1982. 304pp. \$7.95

This book is a Golden Oldie. Subtitled "A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics," it was first published in 1919 by its author, late MacKenna Professor of Church History, Oxford, in the wake of the first World War. Its reprinting today helps to meet the rising

demand for reputable scholarly material on the morality of war, a demand heightened by growing public anxiety over the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Cadoux's book will be of particular interest to those today who believe that there is too much attention given to moral questions raised by particular weapon systems, however fearsome, and not enough to what lies behind them—the moral and physical evil entailed by war itself.

In preparing his book, Cadoux dug through all the writings of the Fathers of the early Church as well as the New Testament, collecting every significant passage bearing directly or indirectly on the question as to whether it is right or wrong for professing Christians to engage in or to support war. Cadoux terminates his investigation with the Emperor Constantine's adoption of Christianity as a lawful religion, following his vision of the Cross before the battle of the Milvian Bridge (312 A.D.). Thus Augustine, who was born only 17 years after Constantine's death, is excluded by this limitation, and thereby his distinction between the Order of Grace and the Order of Necessity which laid the foundations of later Christian just war theory.

Cadoux believes that the textual evidence comes down heavily on the side of the proposition that the authoritative voices of the early Church considered war, offensive and defensive (and this includes military service), as contrary both to the spirit and the letter of Christian teaching. His method is scrupulously fair. He reproduces nearly all the major relevant texts, suppresses none unfavorable to his thesis, and lets the reader judge their purport with only modest (though firm) commentary by way of personal interpretation. From an inductive standpoint, his case is strong

where the pre-Constantinian Fathers are concerned. There was fairly general agreement among the early Fathers (Lactantius, Tertullian, and Origen prominent among them) that participation in wars by Christians was contradictory to the premises of the Christian religion as set forth in the New Testament—although as early as the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A.D.) Christians in small numbers were entering military service.

Cadoux's argument is less convincing when he deals with the New Testament writings themselves, particularly with the words and attitude of Jesus and his apostle Paul. A rereading of the New Testament can do little more than indicate that Jesus was noncommittal on the subject of war. His kingdom was not of this earth, as his apparent unconcern with the historical events of his time confirm. Of his disciples, that is, those in his immediate circle, he expected and exacted obedience. This we must assume included literal obedience to the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount in which peacemakers were blessed and those who would be his disciples urged to turn the other cheek. As for this world, one must make the best of it while it lasts, make prudent use of one's gifts, whether in money or talent, and pay one's taxes to constituted authority. Paul's letters confirm his Master's position with unequivocal emphasis on the need to respect civil authority which is "from God." Paul neither asserts nor denies that participation in war is forbidden to the followers of Christ. One reason for this may be that Jews were exempt from Roman military service, and the earliest Christians were considered Jewish sectaries. Thus the question of military participation did not arise, since Rome could get all the legionaries she needed by voluntary enlistment elsewhere.

Cadoux argues that the nonviolence and nonresistance teaching of Jesus entails though it does not explicitly state that war is morally evil and that no true Christian should have anything to do with it. The Augustinian-Lutheran tradition later replied in effect, "Of course! If the world consisted of true Christians, good people! But it does not. Therefore in certain circumstances the State has the right to secure its *bene esse* by force, including military force, and to exact military service of its members." The Thomist position, though more circumspect, is not dissimilar.

No one can dispute Cadoux's perception that a crucial shift in Christian teaching on war occurred after Constantine made Christianity his religion. He draws from this fact the conclusion that Christianity thereby lost an important part of its original doctrine of peace. But the premise of this argument cuts two ways. Early Christians set themselves apart; they held no political power and thus felt little responsibility for the welfare and security of the State, an earthly entity they believed would soon disappear. Paul was shrewd enough to see the danger in this and admonished the Christian communities concerning their duties to civil authority. But once Christians came into political power, they inherited the responsibility of securing the welfare of the State which at times required the use of force, including military force. That this force was all too often sadly misused in centuries to come no one would deny. But that the proper use of this force is inherently iniquitous, therefore interdicted to professing Christians, is harder to prove.

They are on firmer ground today who maintain that the ethical question lies not so much in the fact of war *per se*, but in the purposes for which it is waged and

the means used to achieve those ends—means which even the dullest of just war theorists remind us must not be disproportionate to whatever good may be intended.

J.G. BRENNAN
Naval War College

Brayton, Ahhott A. and Landwehr, Stephana J. *The Politics of War and Peace: A Survey of Thought*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981. 294pp. \$20.50 paper \$11.50

At a time when the nation is critically examining its defense policies and organization, a review of the politics of war and peace can be most helpful. Authors Brayton and Landwehr selected carefully from 3,500 years of writing on peace, war, politics, and ethics, seeking important changes in the conduct of war. Each writer is allowed to speak for himself in order that readers have access to original sources in making their own judgments. A brief introduction and assessment of each writer's historical significance precedes the selection.

To frame the problem, General Andrew Goodpaster asks in the foreword, "What, for example, are the desires and needs—within and among men, within and among nations—that give rise to war? What is the essential nature of war? Of peace? Under what conditions and within what limits can war be justified? How do the men and institutions engaged in war, or held ready for war, relate to the society and the nation to which they belong? What goals and *whose* goals can war serve? What goals *should* it serve? How far could these goals be better served by peace, and in what ways could this be accomplished? What shared values on a worldwide scale . . . fall under the shadow of the threat of war, and how can that threat be contained, while the