

War—not an option in the nuclear age!

Thorwald Lorenzen

When the lions roar, you can't hear the song of the nightingale. War is in the air with all its clamour. Not only in the Ukraine, Yemen, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Sudan, Syria, Myanmar, and Kashmir, but also in the heads of politicians who think that war is the only real way to solve national conflicts. But times have changed! Humanity is at a turning point. What we need today is a *culture of peace*, and social leaders with vision and imagination who will decide for an intentional *presumption against war*.

Personal experience

Those who have been in the arena of war and survived are often disillusioned and wonder whether it was worth it. Helmut Schmidt, a former chancellor of Germany, used to say that he was fearful of political leaders who had not personally experienced the horrors of war. If your wife is raped in front of you and then caste aside, if your son or daughter is killed or wounded, if your home and your city are destroyed, then the horrors of war become personal and overwhelming.

When I was a child I experienced war at first hand. I can still hear the sirens warning us of approaching aircraft bombers, compelling us to

Thorwald Lorenzen was the Senior Minister of the Canberra Baptist Church. Before that he was Professor of Systematic Theology and Social Ethics at the International Baptist Theological Seminary in Zurich, Switzerland. He chaired the Human Rights Commission of the Baptist World Alliance, was the Baptist representative at the United Nations in Geneva and participated in several ecumenical dialogues. At present he is Adjunct Professor at the School of Theology, Charles Sturt University. His publications include Resurrection and Discipleship. Interpretive Models, Biblical Reflections, Theological Consequences (1995 and 2004); Resurrection—Discipleship—Justice. Affirming the Resurrection of Jesus Christ Today (2003), Toward a Culture of Freedom: Reflections on the Ten Commandments Today (2008), and Yes! A Christian Vision of Life (2021).

seek shelter. I can still smell the damp air and sense the pervasive fears in shelters of refuge. I can still see a squadron of approaching bombers, filling the sky with bombs, which like glittering stars rained upon us, exploding round about us. I lost two grandfathers in the war, one in the firestorm of Hamburg, the other of a broken heart because he could not protect his family. A baby brother died of lack of adequate food. My mother was taken away by Russian soldiers. My immediate family was uprooted for years to come. The horror of war has accompanied me throughout my life.

Moreover, as many of us know from personal experience, when men and women return home from the field of battle they are not the same. They have changed—some for the better, most for the worse. Alcoholism, drug addiction, domestic violence, depression, suicide, and loss of faith are rampant among returning soldiers. In lives marked by war, war lingers on. It casts a long shadow and changes the fabric of family and society, as the Australian involvement in recent military operations in Iraq (Operation Iraqi Freedom) and Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom and) shows.

Can there be a world without war?

Following the Second World War, in 1945 the United Nations was founded with the specific intention to eradicate war and provide structures for shaping a world of peace and justice. It is interesting that before the *United Nations Charter* speaks about human rights, it speaks about the elimination of war:

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, . . .

and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, . . .

and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained,

and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, . . . (*UN Charter*, Preamble, emphasis mine).

To facilitate the aim of avoiding war, all members of the United Nations agreed to refrain “from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state” (SI:2,4).

That seems to be an unrealistic dream when daily we are invaded with pictures of war in the Ukraine. Yet historical memory may keep that dream alive.¹

If we had asked a Roman citizen two thousand years ago or a slaveowner in America’s south two hundred years ago whether *slavery* would ever end, they would have said “you are dreaming!” For them slavery was written into the laws of nature and ordained by their gods. They thought that their whole economy and social structure would break down without slaves. But, as we all know, slavery is almost universally outlawed today, even as it remains a pernicious problem.

Had we asked a philosopher or theologian a thousand years ago whether a *woman* is equal to a man, they would have laughed. The woman must be and always will be subordinate to the man—this is what they would have thought and quoted texts from the Christian Bible. Fortunately, at least in theory, those days are gone.

Had we asked an Afrikaner in South Africa a hundred years ago whether *apartheid* is doomed, they would have said “No”, and they would have quoted from their Holy Scriptures, which in their eyes confirmed that apartheid was an expression of the will of God.

If such deeply entrenched institutions as slavery, apartheid, and the subordination of women can lose their significance in the historical process, and be replaced by equality and justice, why can’t the family of nations learn to solve their conflicts without the institution of war?² It certainly is a challenge to the religions of the world to refuse using the word “God” or “Allah” or “Krishna” or “Buddha” to validate violence, killing, rape, and murder. What a difference it would make if the religions of the

world demonstrated that they are servants of life, refusing to sanction killing and opposing modern warfare!

The Jewish-Christian tradition has enfolded in its memory that even during times of war and violence the dreaming of peace cannot be extinguished. The nightingale keeps singing even when peace seems to be elusive. The prophets Isaiah and Micah proclaim that the LORD

shall judge between the nations,
and shall arbitrate for many peoples;
they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.

(Isa. 2:4; Mic. 4:3 NRSV, emphasis mine)

When Jesus of Nazareth came on to the scene as messenger of God's will and God's ways (the "reign of God"), he sought a middle way between withdrawal from public responsibility and adopting ways of violence. He did not join the Essenes, who saw themselves as "children of light" and as such did not want their piety to be spoiled by the ways of the world, and therefore withdrew from public life. At the same time, Jesus also did not join the Zealot movement "who, in some cases, might use harassment, violence, or even murder to force his fellow Jews to practice strict separation from the Gentiles and their way of living."³ At times, Jesus was vehement when he was confronted with human misery and injustice, but he remained committed to nonviolence.⁴ Yet, for him nonviolence did not mean passivity. It meant involvement and engagement in matters of *shalom*.

God confirmed Jesus's commitment to nonviolence by empowering him for his ministry, reconciling the world by his death and resurrection, and validating his commitment to nonviolence by raising him from the dead. When the early Christians confessed this newly established reality, their testimony spoke of the risen Christ speaking *peace* into their lives and empowering them to the ministry of peace by breathing into them the spirit of God (John 20:19–23; Luke 24:36). Although such peace is more than the absence of war, it is not less, which should inspire all followers

of Jesus to be actively committed to the abrogation of the use of war to resolve human conflict.

Indeed, for the first two centuries after Christianity came on the scene, Jesus's vision of nonviolence determined the hearts and minds of Christians. Up to the fourth century, when Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, many Christians refused to join the military.⁵ They took seriously what they had learned from the Decalogue (not to kill) and from the Sermon on the Mount (to love one's enemy), and together with refusing to swear allegiance to the Roman emperor (which soldiers had to do), many refused to join the military.

All that changed when in 324 Constantine the Great (c. 280–337) became emperor of a reunited Roman Empire and granted power and privilege to the church in turn for its provision of social cohesion for the empire. Since then, except for some peace churches (for example, the Mennonites, Waldensians, Brethren, Society of Friends) and peace movements that have kept the dream of peace alive, all major Christian denominations have blessed war as an instrument to deal with human and national conflicts. But times have changed! Today we live in a new era.

Traditional answers no longer work

The 6th and 8th of August 1945 caused a turning point in history. Hiroshima and Nagasaki symbolise a historical irruption. Everything has changed. The possibility of nuclear war is in the air. It is like a cloud of doom hanging over us. The doomsday clock is set at 100 seconds to midnight. Humanity now has the possibility to destroy itself, poison the human DNA, and spoil the atmosphere for generations to come. Although the human community has decided not to use nuclear weapons for military purposes, the very fact that they are there, and that there is no historical precedent of weapons being produced but not used, and the fact that Russia and the USA are constantly threatening to use them, shows that we live in dangerous times.

With over 13,000 nuclear warheads held by nine countries (USA, Russia, China, France, India, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, and the UK), but also placed in Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and

Turkey—not to speak of biological and chemical weapons!—we cannot think and talk of war in traditional ways. Yet, it is these traditional ways that determine the decisions of the political class and even shape the opinion of many Christians.

Traditional theories such as “war is the continuation of policy with other means” (Carl von Clausewitz, 1780–1831), or the ancient Roman *igitur qui desiderat pacem, praeparet bellum* (if you want peace, prepare for war—recently updated by the Regan doctrine of “peace through strength”), or even the so-called “just war theory,” no longer work in the nuclear age.

In the *corpus christianum*, the marriage between state and church in the Roman Empire, theologians took over philosophical ideas and developed the so-called “just war” theory. They applied the idea of justice to the injustice of war to eliminate its possibility. Ethical guidelines—that a war must be declared by a legitimate authority, that civilians must be protected, that the situation after the war must be better than before the war, that the war must pursue a just cause, and be declared for the right motivation—were developed with the intention to implement the Christian vision of life and to avoid war. Nevertheless, against its own intention, up to the present day the “just war” theory is used by church and state to justify war. But given the modern military technology and the widespread availability of nuclear weapons, there can be no justification for modern war.

Traditional theories of war break down in the nuclear age because in a nuclear war there can be no winner, the civilian population cannot be protected, and therefore it cannot be possible for a government to claim legitimate authority to start a war.

A presumption against war

If traditional theories that lead to legitimate wars no longer work, then we need new ways to deal with human and national conflicts. What is needed is a paradigm shift from traditional ways of approaching national conflicts to a culture of peace. As a step toward a culture of peace I would like to make the modest proposal that we make a conscious and

conscientious moral decision to agree to *a presumption against war* to solve national conflicts.⁶

Such a presumption avoids two extremes:

On the one hand it avoids an ideological and absolute pacifism. Given human greed, nationalism, and aggression, some wars may be unavoidable. If an aggressor attacks you, then, as in a school shooting, or a killer in a shopping mall, he needs to be stopped. Perhaps the Second World War, the Kosovo war, and the current war in the Ukraine fall into that category. But most wars are not necessary: in recent years I have been part of the opposition to the wars in Vietnam, Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

On the other hand, a presumption against war, while not denying human conflict, suggests that in our time war is an inadequate and ineffective way to respond to human and national conflicts. In political and strategic terms, it would mean implementing what nations have agreed to by being part of the *United Nations*. Every country has the right to defend itself. But we need to transcend the mentality of talking about “red lines” and “spheres of influence.” An international commitment to peace, justice, and order is the only way forward.

I suggest therefore that an intentional presumption against war should be the default position in our personal conscience and national culture.

If there is a departure from such a presumption, the burden of proof should be on that departure, to be taken only by a legitimate and legitimised authority. Not a Prime Minister or President, but only the Parliament as the legitimate and legitimised representative of the people would be able to overturn such a presumption.

Toward a culture of peace

An intentional presumption against war will only work if it is grounded in a culture of peace—indeed, a spirituality of peace. For a spirituality of peace, as for a culture of peace, people don't have to be religious. But a commitment to peace must sit deep in our conscience. It must be part of our personal identity. We need all people of good will to create a peaceful

society in which people abandon the possibility of solving human and national conflicts with the institution of war.

Christians could make an important contribution to a culture and spirituality of peace. But that presupposes that their faith is shaped by the “dangerous memory of Jesus” rather than by the pervasive attitude in our churches.⁷ The memory of Jesus is “dangerous” because it questions the *status quo* and seeks to transform the situation in the direction of justice and peace. By following Jesus, Christians seek and pray for alternatives to war.⁸ During the history of Christianity, it was the peace churches and the peace movements in the establishment churches who have kept the dream of peace alive.

Christians believe that we live in a graced universe. If the centre of reality were shaped by competition, conflict, and aggression—as accepted, for instance, by Sigmund Freud and Konrad Lorenz⁹—then war is an inherent part of the human condition. It is innate, built into our human make-up.

But Christians have a different view of reality! We affirm and confess that at the centre of reality there is not conflict and aggression, but *shalom*/peace. God is in charge; and God stands for love, peace, justice, and hope. Jews and Christians believe that God created a world that is good and beautiful, and when humans distorted God’s good creation by their greed, brutality, and betrayal, God did not give up on God’s creation but reconciled it with its creator.¹⁰

Christians distinguish between the *ground* and the *content* of their faith.

The *ground* is in the life of God; it is laid by God. By sharing God’s life with Jesus of Nazareth, including his death on the cross, God defused the separating power of sin and death and initiated a reality that is marked by *shalom*/peace. At the centre of reality there is not conflict but peace. Our world, God’s good creation, is not only loved by its creator (John 3:16) but has been reconciled with God (2 Cor. 5:17–21). The early Christians testified to this new reality when they remembered and confessed that the risen Christ in the power of the Spirit spoke peace into the lives of Jesus’s disciples and empowered them for a ministry of peace (John 20:19–23; Luke 24:36).

The *content* of Christian faith and the Christian view of reality is defined by the Jesus story as God's revelation of who God is and what God does. The most intense confession of God's self-revelation in the story of Jesus is found in the confession that "God is love!" (1 John 4). But this divine reality must be applied to each and every new situation. Regarding the topic of war, the guidelines from the story of Jesus are clear.

Central to the Jesus story is the reality that surfaces in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5–7) and the Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:20–49):

Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth.
Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness,
for they will be filled.
Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy.
Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God.
Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called
children of God. . . .
You are the salt of the earth
You are the light of the world
let your light shine before others,
so that they may see your good works
and give glory to your Father in heaven.
(Matt. 5:1–16 NRSV)

The reality of *shalom*/peace is also reflected in related sayings:

You have heard that it was said,
"An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."
But I say to you,
Do not resist an evildoer.
But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the
other also;
(Matt. 5:38–42 NRSV).

And then there is the counter-intuitive exhortation to love our enemies:

You have heard that it was said, "You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy." But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise

on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? . . . And if you greet only your brothers and sisters, what more are you doing than others? . . . Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. 5:43–8 NRSV).¹¹

Jesus's radical interpretation of love, extending it to the enemy, is echoed in the early Christian churches¹²—indeed, it determined the life of Christians until the beginning of the fourth century, when Constantine the Great became the emperor of the Roman empire and moved Christianity towards becoming the official religion of the empire. Up to that time Christians suffered several terrible persecutions, but their faith in Jesus helped them to endure suffering, and at the same time hindered them from causing it.

The exhortations to love one's enemy must not be romanticised. It is the logical and rational attitude if one recognises that God *is* love, who “makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous.” Richard B. Hays speaks for many when he concludes: “Thus, from Matthew to Revelation we find a consistent witness against violence and a calling to the community to follow the example of Jesus in accepting suffering rather than inflicting it.”¹³

I am aware, of course, that there are texts in the gospels that seem to portray another reality. But in careful studies St Mark's David J. Neville has shown that the nonviolence of Jesus is determinative. In *A Peaceable Hope*¹⁴ Neville examines the apparent tension between “the portrayal of the historic mission of Jesus in peaceable terms and expectations of end-time vengeance on the part of the returning Jesus,”¹⁵ and he concludes after carefully examining all relevant texts in the gospels that Christian hope is ultimately peaceful. In the other study, *The Vehement Jesus*,¹⁶ Neville examines those texts, like the various versions of the cleansing of the temple, with Jesus saying “I have not come to bring peace, but a sword” (Matt. 10:34), and the rhetoric of rage in Matthew 23, which tend to portray a more violent Jesus. He concludes that Jesus occasionally, when he was

confronted with injustice, was *vehement* but never violent: “the vehement Jesus of the biblical Gospels is nevertheless the peaceful Jesus.”¹⁷

A text which has often been used to justify a state’s right to declare war is Romans 13:1–7. Here the state is seen as “instituted by God . . . to execute wrath on the wrongdoer.” But apart from the fact that this view no longer works in the nuclear age, the immediate context of Romans 13 makes quite clear where the apostle’s theological heart beats:

Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them. Rejoice with those who rejoice, weep with those who weep. Live in harmony with one another; do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly; do not claim to be wiser than you are. Do not repay anyone evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all. If it is possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all. Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave room for the wrath of God; for it is written, “Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord.” No, “if your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink; for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads.” Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good. (Rom. 12:14–21 NRSV).

The words immediately preceding Romans 13:1–7 are underscored by what immediately follows:

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law. The commandments, “You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet”; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law. (Rom. 13:8–10 NRSV).

By believing in the “God of peace”¹⁸ and following Jesus, the “Lord of peace” (2 Thess. 3:16), Christians can significantly contribute to a culture and a spirituality of peace.

Peace must be waged!

Immanuel Kant, one of the shapers of the Enlightenment whose writings also influenced the *United Nations Charter*, penned an important essay in 1785 on “Perpetual Peace” (*Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*). In it he reminds us that war is what comes to us naturally, while the state of peace “*muß . . . gestiftet werden*”.¹⁹ Peace, in other words, must be *intentionally waged!* Here is the text from Kant:

A state of peace among men who live side by side is not the natural state (*status naturalis*), which is rather to be described as a state of war: that is to say, although there is not perhaps always actual open hostility, yet there is a constant threatening that an outbreak may occur. Thus the state of peace must *be established*.²⁰

This effort to actively pursue peace fits in well with the Christian vision of reality. The reality of *shalom*/peace which God has established longs for *implementation!* During his earthly life Jesus of Nazareth did not withdraw from public responsibility but practiced solidarity with people in need and as such made *shalom* a personal and social reality in people’s lives. So much so that he met opposition and was captured, tortured, sentenced, and executed. But God validated Jesus’s engagement for *shalom* by raising him from death, thereby facilitating the continuation of his mission of *shalom* rather than retaliation against those who were responsible for his crucifixion.

The apostle Paul also emphasises the need for implementation by insisting that the *event* of reconciliation includes the *ministry* of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:18); yet the ministry of reconciliation must correspond to the nature of the event. It must therefore be nonviolent. The authority form of the gospel is the request: “we entreat you (*deometha*, beg, woo) on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God” (2 Cor. 5:20). Any kind of coercion would be foreign to the nature of the Christian gospel.

We have the same interlocking of indicative and imperative in the Sermon on the Mount—“You *are* the light of the world . . . let your light

shine” (Matt. 5:14–16). And when the early Christians spoke about the resurrection appearances of Christ, they always included the call to mission: “Jesus said to them again, ‘Peace be with you. *As the Father has sent me, so I send you.*”²¹ The Christian vision of life calls for the implementation of God’s love in a needy world.

Application

What would it mean if we would actively participate in creating a culture and spirituality of peace and make an intentional decision against war?

There are personal and structural dimensions to such an engagement. The personal dimension is the intentional decision to accept personal responsibility for creating a culture of peace and use our influence to avoid war as an instrument to deal with national conflicts.

On a structural level we would vote for those parties that come closest to aiming to create a culture of peace and avoid war. A culture of peace would include the following dimensions:

- *Transparency.* We are a democracy. Our government is to represent us, the people. We must be informed on decisions that determine our future and the future of our children. Do we know, for instance, what is going on and what is being planned in Pine Gap? Do we know the reasons why AUKUS was created, and why we need nuclear-powered submarines? Have we, the people, agreed to station nuclear-capable bombers in the Northern Territory?
- *Strategy of defence.* China, the USA, and Russia are talking of spheres of influence. A strategy of defence tries to be free of such expansionist ideas and focus on defence strategies. Every country has the right and duty to defend itself against an aggressor, but we should be careful not to be drawn into strivings for global hegemony. Australia needs to seek its security not from Asia, but in Asia.
- *Diplomacy.* Diplomacy and development are the two most important alternatives to war. Australia needs competent, educated, and sensitive women and men in the diplomatic service. They must be well-versed in global strategic realities, culturally

sensitive, and representing a government that is committed to avoiding war at all costs.

- *Development.* Peace needs justice to thrive. In aiding the Ukraine in its fight for survival, the US, Canada, Europe, Japan, and Australia have found billions of dollars to battle against Russia's illegal and brutal aggression. Why can't such amounts of money be raised to distribute food and water more evenly among the global community? It is only when we succeed lifting people out of poverty and oppression, and granting them a future, that we also have a chance of solving human conflicts without the institution of war.
- *Peace studies.* We need to encourage peace studies at schools and universities. There are peace institutes in Sydney and Melbourne and several universities offer courses in peace studies. This tendency needs to be intensified and integrated into the school curriculum.
- *International relations.* Our government needs to intensify respectful relationships with our neighbours in Asia and the Pacific, and try to be neutral in the global struggle for international hegemony.
- *Peace churches.* In our churches, theologies, and relationships with other religions we need to identify and implement elements that make for peace. We need to examine and unmask ideas and practices that encourage violence and war. The Roman Catholic theologian and founder of the Global Peace Project (*Stiftung Weltethos*), Hans Küng, used to say that "there will be no peace among the nations without peace among the religions." Whatever Christians think and do, it must be an expression of our God who in the story of Jesus has been revealed as compassionate love.

Conclusion

I have suggested that although the clamour of war is all around us and even within us a world without war is possible. It needs some intentional effort, but it is possible. Indeed, following the Second World War the United Nations was created with the specific intention of abrogating war by creating a world in which justice and peace reign.

Such a vision of life concurs with the Christian view of reality. Christians and their churches have, therefore, enough reason to join all people of good will to shape a world in which human and national conflicts can be solved without the institution of war.

What has been in the dreaming of humanity for a long time becomes a necessity in the nuclear age! Can we stop the spiral of violence turning, or will it say on our gravestones that we saw it coming but did not have the imagination and courage to stop it?

Endnotes

1. On the occasion of the tragic death of former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjöld, the then US President John F. Kennedy addressed the *United Nations General Assembly*, saying: "Mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind," September 25, 1961, <https://www.jfklibrary.org/archives/other-resources/john-f-kennedy-speeches/united-nations-19610925>, accessed December 8, 2022).
2. The United Nations *Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace* (1984) proclaims that "the peoples of our planet have a *sacred right to peace*" and "demands that the policies of States be directed towards *the elimination of the threat of war, particularly nuclear war*" (emphases mine). Today (December 1, 2022) I attended a seminar organised by the Embassy of Costa Rica at the occasion "of the abolition of the military in Costa Rica in 1948" (letter of invitation from the Embassy of Costa Rica, Canberra, November 16, 2022). Costa Rica is one of 39 countries who do not have a military.
3. John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Vol. III: Companions and Competitors* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 565–66.
4. See the important study by St. Mark's David J. Neville, *The Vehement Jesus. Grappling with Troubling Gospel Texts* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017). For Jesus's relation to the Zealots see Wolfgang Schrage, *Ethics of the New Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1988), 107–15.
5. Roland H. Bainton, "The Early Church and War," *The Harvard Theological Review* 39, no. 3 (July 1946), 189–212; Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace. A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960), 66–84.
6. The idea of a "presumption" is adopted from J. Philip Wogaman, *Christian Moral Judgment* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989).

7. The helpful concept of the “dangerous memory of Jesus” is adopted from Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society. Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*, trans. David Smith (London: Burns and Oates, 1980), 109–11, 184–85, and the “Excursus: Dogma as a dangerous memory” (200–4).
8. See the discussion by Jürgen Moltmann, *Ethics of Hope*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012), part IV.
9. See the discussion in Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (New York: Open Road, 1973), Introduction and part I, chapter 1. Fromm writes: “All these works contain basically the same thesis: man’s aggressive behavior as manifested in war, crime, personal quarrels, and all kinds of destructive and sadistic behavior is due to a phylogenetically programmed, *innate instinct which seeks for discharge and waits for the proper occasion to be expressed*” (32, emphasis mine). He comments: “This theory of an innate aggressiveness easily becomes an *ideology*” (32).
10. For details see my *Yes! A Christian Vision of Life* (Adelaide: ATF, 2021), chapters 4 and 11.
11. See David J. Neville, “Love of Enemies. New Testament,” *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception Online* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), volume 17, <https://doi.org/10.1515/ebr.loveofenemies>, accessed Nov 14, 2022.
12. See, for instance, 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Cor. 4:11–13; Rom. 12:9–21; James 5:6; 1 Pet. 3:8–12; Didache 1:3–5.
13. Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament. Community, Cross, New Creation* (San Francisco, CA: Harper, 1996), 332 (see also 317–46).
14. David J. Neville, *A Peaceable Hope. Contesting Violent Eschatology in New Testament Narratives* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013).
15. *Ibid.*, 247.
16. David J. Neville, *The Vehement Jesus. Grappling with Troubling Gospel Texts* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017).
17. *Ibid.*, 255.
18. Rom. 15:33; 16:20; 1 Cor. 14:33; 2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 13:20.
19. Immanuel Kant, “Perpetual Peace. A Philosophical Sketch,” in *Kant’s Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss, trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 93–130, at 98, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/46873/46873-h/46873-h.htm>, accessed November 4, 2022.
20. *Ibid.*
21. John 20:21 (emphasis mine). There are many similar texts in the New Testament that inter-relate the resurrection of Jesus with the call to become involved in the mission of God: Matt. 28:19–20; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:46–9; Acts 1:8; Gal. 1:15–16.