

IS RELIGION THE CAUSE OF CONFLICT ?

Reverend I.P.S.G. Cosby

Faculty of International Communication, Aichi University

要約

本研究は、宗教が紛争の原因となるという仮説を検証し、そして宗教が国家間や文化が異なるグループ間での争いの原因となるという考えに疑問を呈する。リチャード・ドーキンスが *"The God Delusion"* (神の錯覚) の文献にて唱えた「神が暴力へと導く」という主張を本稿にて検証する。

本論文が示唆するものは、宗教とはその有無を選択できるものではなく、文明にとって基礎となる要素であり、欠かすことができない事象だということである。宗教は無くてもよいという考えはどれも危うい錯覚であり、その考えこそが紛争の原因となり得る。さらに、宗教の存在を否定する考えが、紛争の原因が宗教以外にあるという事実と、紛争の原因には程遠い存在である世界の主要な宗教が平和に貢献しているという事実を看過させてしまう。

-
- I. INTRODUCTION
 - II. BELIEVING RELIGION TO BE A SOURCE OF CONFLICT
 - III. RELIGION IS THE CORE OF EVERY CIVILISATION/CONCEPTS OF RELIGION
 - IV. DIFFERENTIATING RELIGION FROM WHAT MAY BE DONE IN ITS NAME
 - V. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ENLIGHTENED EUROPEAN RELIGION IS ITSELF A THREAT TO PEACE
 - VI. THE CAUSES OF CONFLICT LIE ELSEWHERE
 - APPENDICES
 - BIBLIOGRAPHY

IS RELIGION THE CAUSE OF CONFLICT?

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper looks at what gives rise to the hypothesis that religion is a main cause of conflict and questions the conclusion that religion *ipso facto* is a cause of conflict between nations or significant cultural groups. The paper examines in particular the credibility of Richard Dawkins's assertion in his book, The God Delusion that belief in a GOD that is personal and outside of Creation is more a cause of conflict than belief in 'Natural Selection.'

There is a quite widespread sense that religion will, if it has not already, become the major single source of conflict in the 21st century. It is a view that tends to be held by self-confessed atheists, who do not see themselves as belonging to a religion. The theme of this paper is that atheism itself is a religion, which for want of a better name will be called Enlightened European Atheism (EEA.) This paper in its reference to Richard Dawkin's book, The God Delusion is not concerned with the debate whether or not God exists, merely with Dawkins's charge that Religion, by which he mainly means the three Abrahamic religions, is a cause of violence, and without these religions the world would be a more peaceful place. Because foundational principles ultimately determine the parameters and character of a religion, it is suggested that EEA is somewhat more, not less, vulnerable than the religions Dawkins decries to be a cause of violence.

The paper suggests that religion is not an option that can be dispensed with but is

an inevitable phenomenon of human civilisation, which has to be accommodated. Any notion that religion is dispensable is of itself a dangerous delusion that serves to exacerbate the potential for conflict. Such notions furthermore, serve to overlook also the fact that the causes of human conflict are to be found elsewhere. It overlooks the extent to which what may be classified as the major religions of the World, far from being a cause of conflict, have served as essential agents of peace.

Any debate on whether religion is a cause of conflict, needs to take into account the recent conference statement of the G-8 Religious Leaders' Summit 2008 in Japan, which makes the following observations:

'Every possibility should be taken to avert wars....The cosmos, as the divine creation, is decorated with the enormous beauty named 'diversity.' Diversity is most spectacularly expressed in ethnic and religious cultures. Therefore no authority, religious or secular, is given the right to negate this sacred endowment. To ignore tragic incidents in our global community is irresponsible, and ultimately denial of the divine. It then becomes clear what we have to do. (Japan Times 08-07-03)

This paper will concern itself primarily with two religions: Christianity, which has as its foundation an ultimate source of Authority that is personal and beyond Man to control. Christianity sees Man as the invention of God. The other religion is Enlightened European Atheism, which recognizes Man as the ultimate source of Authority and sees God as the invention of Man. This begs the question: What is religion? This will be defined in the next section. The paper confines itself to these two religions, first, because the writer has been concerned with these two religions for some years. However incompetent he may be to discuss them, he is certainly quite incompetent to speak on any other religions. He leaves the other religions to those more competent to speak for them. Secondly, he would expect that, to a greater or less extent, those religions that believe in an authority to which man is answerable will identify with the former, although they will differ fundamentally as to who GOD is.

II. BELIEVING RELIGION TO BE A SOURCE OF CONFLICT

1. Typical Atheist Argument:

Some variant on the theme that religion is a source of conflict and if religion were

to be rendered a thing of the past, the World would be a more peaceful place tends to be a frequently expressed sentiment, usually by those of an atheistic mind set. The premise is that religion incites violence. To make the point, Dawkins quotes Sean O'Casey's epigram, 'Politics has slain its thousands, but religion has slain its ten thousand' a parody on the refrain sung by rejoicing women when they went out to meet the two returning warriors who had just slaughtered the Philistines in battle. '*Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands.*'¹⁾ [1 Sam 18:7] In the circumstances it would seem to have been an unfortunate choice of reference. When King David wanted to build a house for the LORD, He told King David, *Thou shalt not build an house for my name, because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood* [1 Chr. 28:3]. Dawkins quotes Luis Bunuel, a Spanish film director, saying, 'God and Country are an unbeatable team; they break all records for oppression and bloodshed.' (Dawkins, 233). Even Alister McGrath, a one time atheist who has converted to Christianity, admits in his critique of The God Delusion that when he was a young atheist growing up amidst Northern Ireland's 'Troubles' he remembered looking forward to the demise of religion with a certain grim pleasure (McGrath, vii.)

Dawkins rejects the idea that, 'There exists a superhuman, a supernatural intelligence who deliberately designed and created the universe and everything in it, including us.' Instead he advocates the idea that,

'any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence *only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution.* (his italics). 'Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it. God in the sense defined, is a pernicious delusion.' (Dawkins, 31)

He describes the GOD of the Old Testament in the following terms:

The God of the Old testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it, unjust, unforgiving control-freak, a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic cleanser; a mysogenistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully.' (Dawkins, 31) .

1) For translation purposes, all Biblical texts are written in italics

Dawkins says he is not attacking any particular version of God or gods. He is attacking God, all gods, anything and everything supernatural, wherever and when they have been or will be invented. (Dawkins,36) The last phrase is perhaps unfortunate from his point of view, as most believers in what he claims to detest would wholeheartedly agree with him. Do not believers believe that whatever it is they believe to be both true and not invented?

Although Dawkins decries supernaturalism in all its forms (p.36), his main concern is with what he calls the three 'great' monotheistic religions. He decries Judaism as: 'originally a tribal cult of a single fiercely unpleasant God morbidly obsessed with sexual restrictions, with the smell of charred flesh, with his own superiority over rival gods and with the exclusiveness of his chosen desert tribe.' He decries Islam for: 'adding a powerful ideology of military conquest to spread the faith.' He decries Christianity which was also:

'spread by the sword, wielded first by Roman hands after the Emperor Constantine raised it from eccentric cult to official religion, then by the Crusaders, and later by the conquistadores and other European invaders and colonists, with missionary accompaniment.' (Dawkins, 37.)

Dawkins says he will not dwell on the horrors of the Crusades, Conquistadores, and the Roman Catholic Inquisition, preferring, instead, to devote a whole chapter to the corrupting influence of religion on children. He commences his section on 'Monotheism' with a quote from Gore Vidal: 'The great unmentionable evil at the centre of our culture is monotheism... three antihuman religions... Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.'

For his purpose, Dawkins treats the three Abrahamic religions as indistinguishable, but says he has Christianity mostly in mind. He says that he is not at all concerned with what he calls, 'other religions such as Buddhism or Confucianism,' for which he says that there is something to be said for not treating these two as religions at all, but as ethical systems or philosophies of life. The writer is reminded of a former British soldier's moving account of life in a Japan prison of war camp. (Survival, by Richard Sewell). He writes without a trace of hatred and in a quite un-judgemental

or 'racist' manner, as Bishop Robert Crawley observes in his 'Forward.' Sewell deals with the question why and how such systematic, deliberate, and intense cruelty was endemic in the Japanese treatment of prisoners of war. The inference is that war is an atrocious business and given the right circumstances no race is immune from the practice of savagery, whatever their culture or religion. Japanese culture, as it happens, is one that is profoundly influenced by the strong emphasis placed on pacifism and non-violence in Buddhism. This influence is reflected also in the absence of mammal meat in the Japanese diet, (although whales seem not to have escaped the net for the time being!)

Dawkins sets out to demonstrate why we should not believe in religion, by which he means a world view that has at its core a concept of Supreme Being that is outside of Creation and whose core belief is defined and elaborated upon in the teaching of a holy book. At the same time, he himself believes in a world view which has at its core the concept of Natural Selection as defined in Origin of the Species, also a book if not a holy one. It would seem that we are dealing with two belief systems here, which begs the question, should they not both be defined as religion?

McGrath Perspective:

McGrath criticizes Dawkins for failing to distinguish between 'belief in God' and 'religion.' He points out that Dawkins has missed the phenomenon that religions possess internal means of reform and renewal one of the great themes of both the Hebrew Scriptures and the Gospels - the critique of religion. He refers to the role of the Old Testament prophets, whose role was to highlight how religion had become corrupted, and detached from faithful obedience to a God who loves justice, mercy and personal integrity. The concept is of a God who stands outside of religion from which position 'religious practice may be judged. Especially singled out for condemnation are priestly cults and the powerful who are perceived to have lost the spirit of the Law and are exploiting the weak (McGrath, 56,57.) A part of our LORD's mission was to challenge the religious forms of his day. Nevertheless, in light of his own experiences of the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland, and seeing the same at work in both the Old and New Testaments, McGrath, with good reason states that Dawkins was right when he argues that it is necessary to criticise religion when it is a cause of violence. McGrath says that our LORD was doing just that when he

condemned and flagrantly transgressed cultic regulations or practices of ritual that were coming between GOD and his people (McGrath, 57.) In light of the above we are in danger of getting ourselves in a hopeless muddle if there is no clear definition as to what we mean by 'religion.' McGrath rightly observes that it is difficult to do so and that there is already a vast body of literature on the subject. Be that as it may, it is suggested that if we are to make any headway at all in this conference, we need at least to have a working definition of some sort. An attempt to do this is made in the next chapter.

III. RELIGION IS THE CORE OF EVERY CIVILISATION / CONCEPTS OF RELIGION

1. Definition of Religion.

It is the premise of this writer that far from being an anachronism in the 21st century, religion is foundational to civilization, and is the *sine qua non* factor of the cultural entities that exist in the world as we know them. What is religion? In the first place, it is philosophy. That is to say, it concerns itself with the fundamental questions: Was the world created? What is the purpose, if any, of existence? What is, or is not, moral, and does it matter? Does God exist? Is there life after death? etc. The point to remember here is that these questions are important and, whether we like it or not, man will address them. Religion differs from philosophy in that it provides a comprehensive and, at least to the believer, a credible set of answers to those fundamental questions. Where the culture is long established, an inheritor of that culture does not necessarily have to be a believer in the underlying religion, but by cultural upbringing can nevertheless subscribe to the culture.²⁾ Hence, we have the phenomenon of a Post-Christian as distinct from a Post-Post Christian mind set. Japan is a Buddhist cum Shinto culture where most people have little to no understanding of either the philosophy or the religion to which they belong. Yet, they still evaluate things having a Buddhist-cum-Shinto moulded mindset. A Japanese, whose mind set is moulded by animism finds nothing odd about saying: "The sea is my mother." An Englishman brought up with a Christian mind set would question the sense of that and make the grammatical correction: "The Sea is like my mother." A person identifying with the underlying religion in question trusts that

2) Simon Heffer, an atheist, supports the Church of England on this basis: 'Britain is an Old Country, Our Ways Deserve respect,' Daily Telegraph (21st Feb. 2005)

the explanations given are true. Civilization derives in great part from the application of those answers to fundamental questions to the making of laws. These, in turn, exist to determine a socio-political structure and to defend or preserve a certain moral order required by the religion. Thereby, a socio-political infrastructure is created that we recognize as civilization.

2. Atheism is a Religion:

If one accepts the above definition of religion, Atheism and Buddhism are religions as much as Christianity or Islam is. They, no differently from Christianity, Judaism and Islam, provide their own answers to the basic questions. Atheism has come up with a set of answers that its adherents believe to be the truth. As with any religion, Atheists believe that that which is contrary to what they believe to be the truth is false and unacceptable. Atheists differ from what they conventionally think of as religion only in that in answer to the question does God, (however that term is defined,) exist, the answer is 'no.' Not only is Atheism a *bone fide* faith system, it is born out of Christianity during the era known in Western Europe as the 'Enlightenment.' For this reason one might call this religion 'Enlightened European Atheism' (EEA). As a system of belief, it has the character of being a distorted mirror image of Christianity in that it replicates many fundamental Christian values. It might even be said that it is attempting to be Christianity without GOD, who has been replaced by the Sum Total of Mankind. Hence, 'Sovereignty of the People' replaces the 'Sovereignty of GOD.' One might go so far as to say it is a kind of Christian heresy. When God is said not to exist, it is the Christian God of the Bible to which reference is usually made. Dawkins admits as much (Dawkins, 37)

3. Two Commandments of the Enlightenment

It is instructive to draw attention to the extent to which 'Enlightened European Atheism' is a religion derived from Christianity. The two great commandments to which Christ refers when summarizing the whole of the Law, namely: '*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*'³⁾ [Mt.22:37,38] arguably have their counterpart in two fundamental laws of Enlightened European Atheism. These are,

3) It may be churlish to point out that these two commandments have their origin in the Old Testament: Deut.6:5, and Lev. 19:18)

to quote the French Revolution mantra, 'Freedom & Equality'. The third element of the mantra: 'Fraternity', it is suggested, is merely wishful thinking and not surprisingly has been somewhat lost sight of. Is it not, in any case, another way of saying: *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*? But the first two 'Laws' are defended with a fervour that can at times border on the fanatical, if the support for Suleiman Rushdie and the Danes' right to draw whatever cartoons they like is anything to go by. Does not common courtesy require that we do not make fun of another man's religion? (For further discussion, see: "*Dogmatic Non Belief*" - Prospect, 2004/11 p.66)

It is important to avoid confusion here, because in Christianity these two concepts: Freedom and Equality are also deep rooted. More than that, these concepts, which are so much the hallmark of Enlightened Humanism, arguably are biblical in their origin and as such have a heritage that goes millennia further back than the 18th century 'Enlightenment.' The cardinal importance and respect for human freedom is an underlying principle that is a *sine qua non* factor in the history of the biblical GOD Jehovah's relationship with his People. However great the antiquity one chooses to attribute to the account of Adam & Eve, its underlying principle is that Man created in the image of God participates in, what philosophically is termed the 'Open Order' That is to say Man is not a programmed machine, but is free to determine how he chooses to live his life. Whether he chooses to obey or reject God is necessarily Man's own decision. He is invited to obey the Law in the same way that the owner of a Toyota car is invited to obey the instructions of the car manual if he wants the car to function as the maker intended. The Mount Sinai phenomenon was about establishing a contractual relationship between GOD and His People, by which GOD would be their King and protector and the Israelites would be His People, subject to His Law. The contract was agreed and almost immediately broken and had to be made again. The rest of the Bible is about what God has done to redeem His free people who have chosen to exercise their God given freedom to live in a manner that has been displeasing to their God, and King. Yet they remain His people. Perhaps the starkest demonstration of Divine respect for Man's 'God given' freedom is the last conversation Christ had with Judas Iscariot. Having cryptically warned Judas that He knew exactly what he, Judas Iscariot, had in mind to do and what the consequences of his action would be, Christ's last words to Judas as he went out into the night were in effect. "Well, Judas if that is what you are determined to do,

you had better go and do it.” A more dramatic demonstration of respect for human freedom is hard to imagine.

When we look at the principle of ‘All Men are Equal’ we find again that we are dealing with a fundamental Christian principle here. It is that all Men are equal in so far as they are all the beloved children of GOD and are also equal in having ‘fallen’ from Grace. Whatever their race, social standing or capacity to wield power, that very power, privilege, or whatever it is that they achieve themselves, is a gift of God for which and to whom they are answerable whether they recognize it or not.

So if it is fair to say that Enlightened European Atheism (EEA) can be accused of having stolen the emperor’s clothes, how then is there a discernable difference between Christianity and Atheism when it comes to ‘Freedom’ and ‘Equality’. It occurs when we define the terms. There is a Christian as opposed to an EEA definition of these terms. Christian Freedom means accepting a certain discipline (The Law) and within the confines of that discipline to enjoy the fruits of the spirit i.e. freedom. The Humanist definition of ‘freedom’ is whim: freedom from any restraint to do whatever one wants to do. The musical *‘Hair’* was the great popular exposition of this principle in the 1960s. Considering the Christian definition of ‘equality’ referred to in the previous paragraph, it differs from the Enlightened-Atheist definition of ‘equality’, which is that there is interchangeableness. What ‘a’ can be or do, ‘b’ can be or do. Christian ‘equality’ implies not interchangeableness but the equal worth of two qualitatively different entities. It is the same concept of equality that parents apply when relating to their children. The worth and character of each is equally cherished, however different one child may be from another.

Humanistic concepts of ‘freedom’ and ‘equality,’ though different from the Christian understanding of these two terms, nevertheless have a long history. Arguably, the antecedents of the humanist concept of freedom can be traced back to the Epicurians of the classical era. Equality and the extreme preoccupation of Enlightenment inspired thinking with the individual can be traced in turn back to the Stoics. It is ironic that St. Paul confronted these two schools of philosophy when he was invited to defend Christianity at the Areopagus in Athens. (Acts 17). St. Paul won the argument and the Western world became Christian until for reasons that need not

concern us here, the stoical and epicurean inspired notions of egalitarianism, and a preoccupation with individualism and freedom were resurrected during the Renaissance. The Enlightenment era was about creating a socio-political order that did not have the Biblical God as its ultimate source of authority.

4. Separation of Church and State

Even the 'Separation of Church & State,' the '*shibboleth*' of Atheists and their world view, has its biblical antecedent. The underlying principle of 'Davidic Kingship' is that Almighty GOD actually is the King and that there is a contractual relationship between Him and His chosen people. The origin of this concept can be traced back as far as one likes to admit into the era of pre-history as preserved in the early chapters of Genesis. For our purpose, both the emergence of the Israelite nation in approximately 1,200 BC (a conservative date), and what that nation understood by temporal and spiritual authority, will serve as our start point. The foundational principle is that kingship resides in GOD Himself. For the first two hundred or so years, the period of the Judges, there were no temporal kings. Although there was a temporal spiritual authority, a High Priest in the tradition of Aaron, the Israelites saw no need for a temporal king because GOD was their King. When the Israelites clamoured for temporal kingship in the reign of the High Priest Samuel, they were granted a temporal king, Saul, with the clear warning as to the pitfalls of vesting divine kingship in human hands. (1 Sam.8) From the start, one principle applied: Temporal and Spiritual authority were kept separate. Whoever exercised temporal kingship would not be allowed to combine in that office spiritual authority, although the granting and the legitimacy of temporal office was spiritual and of divine origin. A temporal king was not to be a 'Priest-King,' in the way that the later Roman and Chinese Emperors were, but which the Byzantine Emperors and Western European monarchs were not. When King Saul [1 Sam.13] tried to usurp the role of Priest-King, as did King Uzziah (2 Chr.26), GOD rejected them with dire consequences. He replaced King Saul with King David. The defining character of Davidic Kingship is that it was conceived and granted to serve as an earthly role model of what is divine 'Messianic' kingship. Hence, Davidic Kingship embraces the concept of 'Servant-King.' Messianic Kingship is concerned with reclaiming the spiritual Kingdom of GOD in the World, and to whose authority every temporal authority (Christian or heathen) is answerable. There was ever only to be one Priest-

King in the 'Order of Melchizedek,' namely Jesus Christ, the Anointed One. The High Priest of the Temple was a different concept and was of the 'Order of Aaron.' In Davidic Kingship, a clear distinction is made between Temporal and Spiritual authority, both of whose authority derive from The Priest-King. The function of the temporal head of Spiritual authority is to anoint a temporal king that was acceptable to the people and vest him with the authority of GOD. Thereafter, the temporal Spiritual authority subjects himself in all matters temporal to the King, but continues to function as a spiritual advisor. In the case of King David and King Solomon, Zadok exercised this role, as has the Archbishop of Canterbury in England since Anglo-Saxon times.

5. Evolution v Creationism / Intelligent Designer

Possibly, the reason why the Evolution v Creationism / Intelligent Designer debate has become such a vitriolic one is precisely because Enlightened European Atheism is a religion. The theory of evolution and of 'Natural Selection' is a hypothesis that dispensed with any need of a Creator or Biblical God, since evolution is the product of Time and Chance. (Dawkins disputes the 'chance' factor in 'Natural Selection' on the grounds that 'Improbability' does not equal 'Chance' (Dawkins, 114.2,3.) Perhaps more than any other scientific hypothesis, 'Natural Selection' provided the intellectual foundation that Enlightened European Atheism needed in order to become a religion. To its believers Christian morality becomes dispensable, having no greater claim to credibility than any other Man conceived order. The discovery that there has been a serious and credible undermining of the hypothesis of evolution, most especially by science itself, is in effect pulling the rug out from under Enlightened European Atheism. The very body of opinion that has greatest credibility, namely the scientist, is seriously questioning this core scientific hypothesis that justifies the humanists' belief system. Anyway, it would be a daunting task to rethink the huge intellectual investment, which has gone into explaining how the world is and how its different forms of life have evolved. It explains, at least in part, the degree of intolerance expressed of other hypotheses by some who consider themselves enlightened atheists. (For further discussion on the religious character of 'Enlightened-Atheism,' see [Prospect](#), Nov. 2004)

Clearly a distinction has to be made between what is religion *per se* i.e pure religion

on the one hand, and what is done in its name by men for whatever motive or purpose, and to some extent also the ritual of applying the religion in practice. It is the distinction that the Christian makes, when he distinguishes between the Visible and Invisible Church. It is as absurd to accuse Christianity of being a war mongering religion, because of what the crusaders and those of similar ilk have done in the name of Christianity, as it is to say that the practice of pure science is war mongering because of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is not the religion, the instrument of belief, that is the cause of violence any more than the manufacture of cars or guns are the cause of accidents. Man in his wisdom, or the lack of it, in the uses to which he puts these instruments, is the cause of violence.

IV. DIFFERENTIATING RELIGION FROM WHAT MAY BE DONE IN ITS NAME

1. What Christianity actually says re. Conflict.

I leave it to other defenders of their respective religions to make their own case. Christianity, which has a claim to be the World's most populous religion (Appendix IV), for its part, has at its core a deeply entrenched moral position that warfare and conflict are absolutely not the means by which to settle differences at a personal or institutional level. To make the point that there is an extensive corpus of teaching to support this position, a selection of passages from the New Testament can be found in Appendix I. These are not sound bites, but it is carefully thought through, rationally presented, teaching with a clear theme that pervades the New Testament as a whole. I draw attention to a number of points that become clear from a cursory look through these passages. First, it is the Divine Persona, i.e. the one who is purposely rejected by the EEA religion that is both the role model and the instrumental enabler for peaceful relations, without whom the believer in all honesty could not resist the temptation to fight and hate his enemy. *Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak* [Mt. 26:41]

To the Atheist this is a make-belief 'crutch.' Dawkins then goes to some length to define another 'crutch' in his chapter 'Roots of Morality' that conforms to the hypothesis of 'Natural Selection.' The Divine, precisely because that is the believer's perception, motivates the believer to do all in his power that which is required of him.

Not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of GOD from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. [Eph.6:6-8].

Can we not recognize both truth and ourselves when St. Paul writes:

(For we know that the Law is spiritual): but I am carnal, (sold under sin.) For that which I do I allow [i.e. know] not, : for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If I do then that which I would not, I consent unto the Law that it is good (because he knows it to be of Divine origin and so beyond him or any man to alter.) For I know that in me that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that which I would not, it is no more I that hate to do it, (but sin that dwelleth within me.) [Rom.7: 14-20].

Placed in round brackets () are those parts of what St. Paul says that the religious EEA believer would not recognize because he does not recognize the concept of sin which, by definition, is to do that which is displeasing to GOD.

The second point to note is that there is a consistency between the teaching of Christ and the 1st century teaching of Apostolic Christianity by St. Paul *et. al* (or for the sceptic, what purports to be the teaching of Christ and the Apostolic teachers.) For the benefit of those who dispute that, the challenge is to disprove St. Paul's claim that he got his Gospel not from men but from Christ alone: *But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. [Gal.1:11. See also, 2:2; 1 Cor.11:23]*

The working out of the Principle in Practice.

It is one thing that the teaching and principle be expounded. Plenty of evidence is expounded to demonstrate how those who purport to be Christians or in the name of Christianity have not lived up to the teaching of Christianity. But, what of those people and movements that have endeavoured to do so? It is worth drawing attention to this, if only to demonstrate that the principle is practicable and to a

degree realizable. Where it is not put into practice, the blame surely is not to be placed at the door of the religion but at some other door, for example, the inherent Falleness of Man, however one chooses to define that term.

Passivism as a Defining Quality of Christianity:

Whatever one thinks of those endeavouring to resurrect the Gospel of Judas, it is the orthodox tradition, preserved in the New Testament Gospels, which have provided throughout the history of Christendom what has been the defining role model of the passive Christ standing for his principles and taking the consequences without resistance. So much so, that Pontius Pilate does not buy the Sanhedrin argument that Christ was a political subversive. When Pilate then asked Him if He was a king, Christ replied: Thou sayest that I am a king. [i.e. yes] *To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth.* [Jn.18:37] When the situation was beginning to get out of hand and Pilate realised he was losing control, he tried to reassert his authority remarking: *Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee and have power to release thee?* [Jn.19:10] only to be told: *Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above...* [v.11] Yet, Pilate still endeavours to release Christ. In the apostolic era, there are the role models of Saints Stephen, James the Great, Peter and Paul who willingly and passively accept martyrdom for their faith, setting an example for the victims of the later catalogue of Roman persecutions, starting with the Neronian persecutions in 64 AD.

There is, also, a general consistency between the behaviour of Christ and the Apostolic Christians, and the behaviour of the 2nd century Christians as evidenced by the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna (155 AD.) When urged to acknowledge Caesar as LORD and curse Christ by the Proconsul, who was presiding over the arena in which the crowds were baying for Polycarp's death, Polycarp replied, "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he hath done me no wrong; how then can I blaspheme my king who saved me?" When he continued to resist the Proconsul's entreaties to repent and the latter's suggestion that he instead persuade the people, Polycarp replied: "Thee I have deemed worthy of discourse, for we are taught to render to authorities and powers ordained of God honour as is fitting. But, I deem not this mob worthy that I should defend myself before them." Recall Christ's

advice, *Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesars; and to God the things that are God's* [Mt.22:21]. When the Proconsul threatened to throw him to the wild beasts, Polycarp replied "Send for them. For repentance from better to worse is not a change permitted to us; but to change from cruelty to righteousness is a noble thing." Whereupon the Proconsul opted to have him burned instead. When the moment came to nail him to the stake, Polycarp said, "Let me be as I am. He that granted me to endure the fire will grant me also to remain at the pyre unmoved, without being secured by nails." (Bettensen,13-17) The burning of Bishops Latimer and Ridley in 1555, followed by Archbishop Cranmer in 1556 in not dissimilar fashion, only serves to illustrate that passive resistance in the face of violence and provocation is a long and well trodden Christian path.

Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661)

In his book Lex, Rex, Rutherford deals at length with the constitutional rights and limitations of kings and governments to enforce their will and obedience to the Law. Briefly when faced with corrupt or wrong government, the subject's first response is to protest the wrong. If that is to no avail, a Christian's duty is to move out of the jurisdiction, which is abusing the Law. If that is not possible then his duty is to make a stand against the authority in question and bear the consequences (Rutherford)

Tolstoy / William Lloyd Garrison:

There is a more modern tradition for passive resistance in the face of provocation, which has made a profound impression on the world at large during the late 20th century. In his chapter, 'Roots of Morality: Why Are We Good?' Dawkins argues that Religion is neither necessarily nor the only means responsible for engendering moral values. People are morally good irrespective of religion. To support his argument he writes: 'Some who were religious did their good deeds because they were religious. In other cases their religion was incidental. Although Martin Luther King was a Christian, he derived his philosophy of non-violent civil disobedience directly from Gandhi, who was not.' (Dawkins, 271.2) It should be pointed out that Mahatma Gandhi, quite apart from being impressed with what he considered to be the rectitude of the Sermon on the Mount, had also read and was inspired by Leo Tolstoy's book The Kingdom of God Is within You, whose subtitle was: 'Christianity Not as Mystic religion but as a New Theory of life.' Tolstoy took his Christianity

seriously, in particular, our LORD's teaching on the subject of loving ones enemies and not retaliating. It troubled Tolstoy greatly how Russia, which purported to be a great Christian nation with a powerful and all pervasive State Church to which with scarcely any exceptions the whole population loyally belonged, could possibly be so dismissive and unmoved by Christ's teaching. Why did the Church and State fail to question warfare as a legitimate form of conduct? His great novel War & Peace agonized over the issue, and leads him to question the credibility of Western European Liberalism, which was being promulgated and forced on Europe by Napoleon's so called 'Wars of Liberation.' Undaunted, Tolstoy, inspired by the writings of Origen, Tutullian and the later example of the Mennonites, Herrnhuters and Quakers, set himself the task of researching this Christian inspired tradition of non-resistance as an effective way of confronting warfare and the imposition of rule by force against the recipients' wishes or better judgement. He was amazed to discover that slaves in the United States under the pioneering leadership of one William Lloyd Garrison were championing their liberation by this very means. Another champion of Non-Resistance was one Adin Ballou⁴⁾ who had spent fifty years preaching and promoting the doctrine of Non-Resistance and had even published what he called a Catechism of Non-Resistance (Appendix II: Tolstoy, (1984).

2. Concept of Just War

Precisely because the overwhelming corpus of Christian dogma is about reconciliation, redemption and resisting the temptation to give in to traits that all too frequently are the cause of conflict, the rightness or wrongness of warfare has been a matter of deep concern to Christians. This has resulted in extensive treatment of the subject over many centuries. The practical and relevant outcome of this to the contemporary world are conventions such as Geneva and The Hague, the Red Cross and its equivalent bodies, all of which have evolved out of a Christian inspired world view that warfare is in general wrong and that when war breaks out it should be contained. The concept of a Just War is peculiar to Western Christendom, and is an attempt to regularize warfare so as to minimize suffering. *'Beating swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning forks: when nation shall not lift up sword against*

4) Adin Ballou was a Restorationist in the Unitarian movement which held that all men will be saved after a limited period of punishment, which is not an orthodox Christian position on the subject.

nation, neither shall they learn war any more,' is an ancient biblical mindset that can be traced back to Isaiah [Is.2:4]. Can we not see in this the inspiration behind the United Nations as a concept? The discipline has a long history that can be traced back to St. Augustine of Hippo, but the main principles of a Just War were delineated by St. Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologicae* (Appendix: III p.71). It is beyond the terms of reference of this paper to discuss the concept of a Just War. Reference is made to it simply to draw attention to an important body of theological thought that generally has played an important role in restricting the horrendous effect of warfare by defining a moral code of conduct. However much Dawkins and atheists may argue the case that man has an innate disposition to being moral that owes nothing to a Divine Authority, the truth is that the Just War phenomenon and the positive attributes that have derived from it are in direct response to Christian moral teaching that is inspired by the concept of a Divine example. There is no comparable corpus inspired by a world view founded on the principles of 'Natural Selection.' It is suggested that not only the Papacy's current hostility to the war in Iraq but the great weight of public opinion in the United States and Europe that is hostile to this war and the like, is a body of opinion whose moral values have largely been moulded by the Just War principles.

There are two relevant points worth making *en passant*. First, as far as the Just War concept is concerned, it is recognition that there are circumstances in which warfare is the less of two evils. That is to say, there is a perception in Western Christendom that in certain circumstances one can attribute to warfare a certain righteousness. The Orthodox Churches' position on warfare is somewhat different from that of the West. Fr. Stanley Harakas (Archbishop Iakovos Professor of Orthodox Theology, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School, of Theology, Brookline Massachusetts) makes the point that in Orthodoxy the concept of a Just War does not exist. Implicit in the concept Just War is recognition that in certain circumstance, e.g. the protection of the innocent, or to prevent an even greater evil, warfare can be seen in a positive righteous way. That is absent in Orthodoxy. It recognizes that warfare may be necessary, but warfare *per se* is always evil. Although there may be praise for those who die resisting evil and the Church may pray for victory over the nation's enemies, the perception is that there will be occasions when war is unavoidable. There is no concept that it can ever be 'just' let alone in some sense 'good.' (Harakas)

The second point refers to a common misperception as to that which the Just War concept is concerned, namely 'Bellum' not 'Duellum.' George Weigel (Sr. Fellow, Ethics & Public Policy Center, Washington DC,) defines 'Bellum' as the use of armed force for public ends by public authorities who have an obligation to defend the security of those for whom they have assumed responsibility. 'Duellum,' he defines as the use of armed force for private ends by private individuals. The Just War tradition does not start with a presumption against war or violence, It starts with the presumption that a rightly constituted public authority is under a strict moral obligation to defend the security of those for whom it has assumed responsibility. Consequently, the Just War tradition begins by defining what the moral responsibilities of governments are, and what are appropriate political ends before the question of means is dealt with. (Weigel). What applies to the individual does not apply *ipso facto* to governments. The latter are different from individuals in that they are responsible *in loco Dei* for the administration of justice in the society over which they have authority, and for which purpose the authority of GOD has been delegated to them. This applies whether or not the members of the governing body are Christian or how they conceive government to be. As St.Paul wrote:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, For there is no power but of GOD: the powers that be are ordained of GOD. Who therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of GOD: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of GOD to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of GOD, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only to wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are GOD's ministers, attending upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour. [Rom. 13:1-7]

The above is merely amplification of Christ's principle, *Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto GOD the things that are GOD's.* [Mt.22:21] The Christian understanding of governments, unlike individuals, is that they do have a GOD given function and duty to exercise justice and appropriate punishment. As far as individuals are concerned, the principle is: *vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the*

Lord. [Rom.12:19b]

The point that is being made in this chapter is that there is an extensive corpus in Christianity that is wholly committed to confronting violence and promoting peace in the World as a realizable objective. Even more to the point the Triune GOD that is at the core of this religion is bound by a spirit of love that is deliberately extended to embrace mankind, to instil in man a similar bond of loving fellowship to whomsoever and to eschew violence. At root and all pervading is that which is both personal and corporate. This is important when we come to review the contents of the next chapter, and it is in marked contrast to the impersonal and the isolation that is implicit in a philosophy inspired by 'Natural Selection'. It minimizes to the point of extinction the personal and elevates the ideal of individualism to unprecedented heights. When we look at the corpus of the Enlightened European Atheist Religion on how to deal with violence, the body of literature, if it can be said to exist at all, is by comparison thin.

V. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ENLIGHTENED EUROPEAN RELIGION IS ITSELF A THREAT TO PEACE.

1. Conflict Is Foundational to Natural Selection.

When we look at the religion of Enlightened European Atheism, (EEA) there is nothing comparable to the corpus referred to in the last chapter. Instead, when we look at 'Natural Selection', we find the core concepts of this religion are competition and conflict. Given the limiting parameters of 'Natural Selection,' which do not allow for any divine involvement in Creation, Dawkins sets about explaining the survival of what he considers to be the wasteful survival of religion and the useful survival of moral behaviour. To achieve this he invents the concept of 'Memes' — units of cultural inheritance (Dawkins, 191.2). He suggests that like genes, memes increase and decrease in a meme pool by virtue of their phenotypic proxies. Not only does the argument appear somewhat contrived in the opinion of the writer, it seems to end up with the wrong answer, namely that the moral basis of 'Natural Selection' the core concept from which everything evolves is not peace and harmony but conflict and extinction, resulting in the survival only of the strong.

When explaining how the process of 'Natural Selection' functions Dawkins states:

'In its most general form, 'Natural Selection' must choose between alternative replicators. A replicator is a piece of coded information that makes exact copies of itself, along with occasional inexact copies or 'mutations.' The point about this is the Darwinian one. Those varieties of replicator that happen to be good at getting copied become more numerous at the expense of alternative replicators that are bad at getting copied. That at its most rudimentary is natural selection.' (Dawkins, 191.2)

Christianity, it would appear, is about protecting the inexact mutations. He then goes on to explain:

'In the world of genes, the occasional flaws in replication (mutations) see to it that the gene pool contains alternative variants of any given gene - alleles - which may therefore be seen as *competing with each other. Competing for what?* [Italics mine] For the particular chromosomal slot or 'locus' that belongs to that set of alleles. *And how do they compete? Not by direct molecule -to-molecule combat but by proxy.* The proxies are their 'phenotypic traits,' things like leg length or fur colour: manifestations of genes fleshed out as anatomy, physiology, biochemistry or behaviour. A gene's fate is normally bound up with the bodies in which it successively sits. To the extent that it influences those bodies, it effects its own chances of surviving in the gene pool. As the generations go by, genes increase or decrease in frequency in the gene pool by virtue of their phenotypic proxies.' (Dawkins, 192.1)

Dawkins earlier explained to his satisfaction the survival of religion in humans, which he sees as something that is wasteful. Given that 'Natural Selection' is economical and eliminates waste, it is necessary to come up with an explanation that justifies the survival of what otherwise is wasteful. He writes as follows:

'...Darwinian selection habitually *targets and eliminates waste...*(Italics writer's) Darwin explained, 'natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising, throughout the world, every variation, even the slightest; rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good; silently and insensibly working, whenever and wherever opportunity offers, at the improvement of each organic being.' If a wild animal habitually performs some useless activity, natural selection will favour rival individuals who devote the time and energy, instead, to surviving and reproducing. *Ruthless utilitarianism trumps* (Italics writer's), even if it doesn't always seem that way. (Dawkins, 163.2)

Not so much a case of 'Dog eat Dog' as 'Stronger Dog eat Weaker Dog.' Certainly, '

Natural Selection' cannot allow any frivolous '*jeu d'esprit*.'

Nevertheless it is not obviously silly to speak of a meme pool, in which particular memes might have a frequency which can change as a consequence of competitive interactions with alternative memes. (Dawkins, 192.2)

In an earlier section headed 'The Direct Advantages of Religion,' Dawkins refers to 'Group Selection' theories:

Group Selection is the controversial idea that Darwinian selection chooses among species or other groups of individuals. The Cambridge archaeologist, Colin Renfrew, suggests that Christianity survived by a form of group selection because it fostered the idea of in-group loyalty and in-group brotherly love, and this helped religious groups to survive at the expense of less religious groups. The American Group Selection apostle, D.S. Wilson, independently developed a similar suggestion in Darwin's Cathedral. (Dawkins, 169,70)

Dawkins then describes a hypothetical example of the 'Natural Selection' principle at work:

A tribe with a stirringly belligerent 'god of battles' wins wars against rival tribes whose gods urge peace and harmony, or tribes with no gods at all. Warriors who unshakably believe that a martyr's death will send them straight to paradise fight bravely and willingly give up their lives. So, tribes with this kind of religion are more likely to survive in inter-tribal warfare, steal the conquered tribe's livestock and seize their women as concubines. Such successful tribes prolifically spawn daughter tribes that go off and propagate more daughter tribes, all worshipping the same tribal god. (Dawkins 170.2).

As he states above, 'Natural Selection' is fundamentally about some genes out performing others resulting in the extermination of weaker genes given a certain environment. The inference of the above example is that human life and the interaction of socio-political society is not random, but replicates what genes do in the 'Natural Selection' process but on a somewhat grander scale. It is not a qualitative difference, merely one of degree. In other words, what is the difference, other than one of degree, between the two following situations? On the one hand,

certain genes and memes out perform others given the particular environment they happen to be in, resulting in the extermination of the latter. On the other, the Tutsi experience genocidal massacre by the Hutu after nearly 400 years of relatively amicable coexistence, tensions having been exacerbated to breaking point by the environmental change caused by western colonial interference in the 19th and 20th century? Are not both examples of the 'Natural Selection' process at work? Both are uninfluenced by any outside or divine moral authority. If there is a moral aspect to the proceedings, it is measured in terms of the 'Natural Selection' process itself. A personal human moral judgement, if not guided by the above, presumably is irrelevant. Given that the Hutu massacre of Tutsi conforms to the moral parameters set by the due process of 'Natural Selection', presumably one can conclude that what the Hutu did was morally the right thing to have done. Because of their acts of genocide, the Hutu are now in a stronger position than they were before to survive. The only legitimate human moral judgement, if there is one, presumably is that of those whose genes were victorious and as a result have ensured their future survival. The Hutus doubtless thought that what they were doing was right.

Dawkins, of course, disputes that morality is *ipso facto* confined to the personal (Dawkins, 215). Atheists, whose religion is founded on The Origin of the Species and its concept of 'Natural Selection' logically are 'Monists.' Dawkins defines Monists as those who believe that the mind is a manifestation of matter - material in a brain or perhaps a computer - and cannot exist apart from matter. Dualists are those who believe the mind is some kind of disembodied spirit that inhabits the body and therefore conceivably could leave the body and exist somewhere else. (Dawkins, 179, 80) The latter can fall into the trap of believing that there is a personality outside of Creation, who determines things like morality. Dawkins also makes a distinction between Deontology, meaning morality is about obeying rules; Absolutism, which sees Right and Wrong as absolutes, and Consequentialists, who like himself believe that the morality of an action should be judged by its consequences. (Dawkins, 232.2). He believes that morality is something quite impersonal, and determined by the consequences of any particular action, there being no motivation *per se*. The positive or morally good consequences of any action or event is the survival of the fittest for the purpose of future propagation.

Dawkins makes much of experiments, which indicate that the differences in the level of moral rectitude between Christians (Believers) and Atheists (Non-Believers) is negligible. He goes on to argue that this is proof that an extra-creation Supreme Being is irrelevant to the level of morality (Dawkins, 226). Because he is bound by the unalterable Laws of Natural Selection as defined in the Origin of the Species, he cannot consider the hypothesis that there is a personal GOD who is outside of His Creation. Without that premise, Dawkins cannot conceive that comparable to the unalterable Laws of Physics whose purpose is to ensure the balanced ordered stability of Creation is a comparable body of unalterable Laws of Morality to ensure the balanced, ordered stability of the Stewards of that Creation. The purpose of the latter is to enable men, the 'Stewards of Creation' to coexist in peaceful harmonious fellowship amongst themselves, and with the Creator Himself into the bargain. The writer suggest for discussion that just as there is predictable Cause and Effect regarding the Laws of Physics, there is the discernable phenomenon of Cause and Effect regarding the Laws of Morality, too. Like the Laws of Physics, the Laws of Morality are universal and beyond man to alter. Given this hypothesis, St. Paul could argue that all men whether or not they choose to believe in God, do have the capacity to know God. It is this, not Dawkins' Memes, which explains the universality of Moral Law:

For therein is the righteousness of GOD revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith. For the wrath of GOD is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for GOD hath shown it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the World are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. [Rom.1:17-20]

The Christian would say that the fact that man has a moral position at all is symptomatic of a God given morality, which exists, like the Laws of Physics, whether man is there or not. If the world was left to the process of 'Natural Selection' as a believer in Enlightened European Atheism would have it, human morality would be very different, both from the biblical inspired model, but also from the religion of Enlightened European Atheism. (See below: Zeitgeist.) For the reasons mentioned earlier in this paper, the morality of the Enlightened European Atheist

religion is actually derived from, even if a distortion of Christian morality. Hence, when Dawkins declares his moral outrage at certain behaviour, Christians like many other people can frequently commiserate with him.

2. Difference between Stalin and Louis XIV

When trying to evaluate the different moral perspective between Christianity on the one hand and Enlightened European Atheism on the other, a disinterested observer is tempted to ask who is right. The former is a philosophy that has at its core a Divine Authority outside of Creation whose Laws of Morality, like the Laws of Physics are beyond man to alter. Believers of the other religion, whether or not Dawkins views are to be believed, have been brought up on a diet of secularism. They dismiss as fictional the hypothesis that the ultimate source of authority is GOD. Instead, man can determine his own moral fate. It is not the purpose of this paper to attempt to answer the question, who is right? Rather, it is to deal with the probability of violence whether it be a God centred or a Man centred religion.

When we consider, for example who is the ultimate source of authority, perhaps the proof is to be found in the proverbial pudding. What is objectively discernable are the consequences of holding to one belief system as oppose to another. With historical hindsight, is this not the basis upon which we judge one system *vis-a-vis* another? At this point it is pertinent to ask what is the difference is between King Louis XIV the Sun King, and Stalin. The former was an exponent *par excellence* of the doctrine of Divine Right of Kings, (a term frequently misquoted as a synonym for tyranny), but which recognizes God as the ultimate source of authority. The philosophical base of the latter was Sovereignty of the People. Both Louis and Stalin were vulnerable to the charge of being autocrats. Yet, common sense suggests that to regard them as being of the same order, borders on the absurd. So what is the difference between them? It is surely that Louis XIV knew that he was answerable to a higher Authority beyond himself, who would hold him to account for how he exercised his authority. This was King Charles I's defence, and the Puritan parliament could not deny it. Even if Louis XIV himself chose not to believe in a judgemental God, the socio-political system over which he presided most certainly did. Not only was it a foundational principle of that system, but it was the basis of Louis's own legitimacy. Since it was recognized that there is a universal Law of

Morality that Man has no authority or power to amend and whose only option is to convert to it, Louis was never in the position of legitimately saying I am the Law and I make the rules.

On the other hand, because Stalin's philosophical and socio-political system did not recognize the existence of GOD, Stalin could challenge the principle that sovereignty actually does reside with The People. If there actually is no authority beyond and outside of Man, what one man believes is challengeable by another. This is what Stalin did. The system may be founded on the principle that the People are Sovereign, but he knew that actually he had the power and was able to exercise it to get precisely what he wanted, and did. Chairman Mao Tse-tung was being brutally honest when he said power is in the barrel of a gun. He was harping straight back to the Renaissance philosophical world order as defined by Machiavelli in The Prince. Are not strong genes in the face of weak genes in a particular environment not being Machiavellian prototypes when they confront one another? The Machiavellian principle "Might is Right" not only has underpinned and justified the IRA's bombing campaign, the suicide bombers (whatever the doctrinal veneer given to it,) and it has spawned the greatest and most virulent tyrannies of modern times. Napoleon was the first person in modern times to harness the state infrastructure to creating and re creating Mass Armies with an appalling disregard for human life. The 20th century has seen this emulated to a hitherto unprecedented level of state violence by Stalin, Hitler, Mao Tse-tung, and Pol Pot, who in similar fashion achieved an unsurpassed level of violence and human persecution. Although it is quietly overlooked in the Enlightenment Liberal world, Communist Russia, National Socialist Germany and Communist China were all tyrannies working within the Enlightened Humanist democratic framework, and with some justification all called themselves democracies with a similar 'messianic' ambition to liberate those parts of the world that were still within the God centred sphere.

3. Zeitgeist

Dawkins devotes a whole chapter of his book, 'The Roots of Morality: Why are we Good' (Dawkins, 209-34) to justifying the existence of a moral order within the parameters of 'Natural Selection' as defined in the Origin of the Species. He then argues that man does not actually ground his morality in holy books (Dawkins, 262)

but in *Zeitgeist*, which he defines as, 'a mysterious consensus, which changes over the decades.' (Dawkins, 265.2) He shows how people's values have altered on, for example, attitudes towards women, black people and the dodo. He points out that Hitler was not quite as far outside the *Zeitgeist* of his time as he seems from our vantage point today, (Dawkins, 270.2). Dawkins goes on to explain how the moral *Zeitgeist* evolves and why its changes are so widely synchronized around the world through conversations, books and newspapers, broadcasting, the internet, political speeches, talk shows, comedian patter, parliamentary legislation, its judicial interpretation etc (Dawkins, 270.4). The point he wants to stress is that the moral *Zeitgeist* is ever on the move and is not driven by religion, certainly not by Holy Scripture, (Dawkins, 272.1).

Some lag behind the advancing wave of the changing moral *Zeitgeist* and some of us are slightly ahead. But most of us in the twenty-first century are bunched together and away ahead of our counterparts in the Middle Ages, or in the time of Abraham, or even as recently as the 1920s...What impels it in its consistent direction ? We must not neglect the driving role of individual leaders who, ahead of their time, stand up and persuade the rest of us to move on with them. (Dawkins, 270)

To the believer in a religion founded not on principles of 'Absolutism' but on 'Relativism,' the above, not surprisingly, is evaluated positively.

4. Living out Relativism

Given that Man is the ultimate arbitrator of what is or is not, there can be no constants as to what is or is not. The philosopher Hegel was vital to the process, because his conception of Thesis and Antithesis combining to create a Synthesis, which in turn becomes a new Thesis, made it possible philosophically to dispense with the principle of Absolutes. The practical consequences of this position are for example: Man becomes responsible for God, however one defines that term; all crime can be justified depending on what one's premise happens to be. A criminal can righteously stand in the dock and not be considered condemned because the parameters according to which he is being judged are not his parameters. These must ultimately have the same validity of those of the court. The killing and maiming caused by a suicide bomber or by someone who drives an aeroplane into a

building cannot objectively be called a criminal act. Adultery cannot be condemned. If a man has a physical urge to that end and he concludes that it is what he wants to do, what right has anyone else to say that he cannot do so? The Marquis de Sade, who gave his name to Sadism, was quite rational, correct and consistent when he argued that if he was capable of seducing a woman, the fact that he wanted to do so and could achieve it, made it morally right. What is the difference between that and the successful gene, or sperm penetrating an egg?

5. Rejection of Absolutes

Indivisibility of Truth.”

What is true is indivisible. It is by definition an absolute. A GOD centred order has little difficulty with that truth. For a Man centred order, whether liberal, socialist, or communist, it becomes an unanswerable dilemma.

Belief in absolute truth is not *per se* an inevitable recipe for violence and intolerance. Most religions do adhere to a concept of absolute truth, as does pure science. To say that for this reason that religion is *ipso facto* a recipe for violence is as absurd as it is to suggest, as mentioned above, that pure science is a recipe for violence, because scientists have invented bombs. Where most religions are founded on the principle of Absolutes, which means that truth is indivisible, Buddhism and European Atheism are not founded on this principle. Relativism is a core belief of the latter religion, (it has to be) because as argued above, if there is ultimately no authority beyond Man then the philosophical positions of all men have equal validity. ‘Zeitgeist’ is an ever shifting order of values, randomly depicted by fashion and a few opinions, whose virtue is that they are strongly or impressively stated. However, one evaluates the consensus to determine what is right, what that right is, is ever changing. Whatever one's position, it is ever relative. Taken to its logical conclusion there cannot be such a phenomenon as the universal or unalterable Law of Physics let alone any universal Law of Morality.

Like science, Christianity is actually based on a principle of ‘Absolutes.’ When the truth of something is not understood or known, it is a ‘Mystery.’ That a truth is a mystery does not make it any less true. There is no fundamental conflict between Christianity and Science. They are both concerned with what is absolutely true and

what is real. If something is known or conclusively demonstrated to be false it is rejected. St. Paul is very clear about this in his first letter to the Corinthians. [1Cor.15] He, like every responsible theologian and scientist is also bound to follow the truth wherever it leads, and has the integrity to do so when the evidence leads him in a direction that appears to contradict hypotheses that had previously been held to be true. A fundamentalist is someone who recognizes that there are such things as foundational principles or laws. It is the legitimate purpose of all responsible scientists and theologians to research and endeavour to understand what these in truth are. Just as the scientist says he believes something because as a scientist he studies the evidence, so St Paul advises the communities of newly converted Christians at Thessalonika, '*Prove all things and hold fast to that which is good.*' [1Thes.5:21] Dawkins is using the wrong word when he describes fundamentalists as people who, 'know they are right because they have read the truth in a holy book and they know, in advance that nothing will budge them from their belief. (Dawkins, 282.2) What he is describing is a bigot. In like manner, St. John in his epistle advises the early Christian readers to whom he is writing, '*believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.*' [1 Jn.4:1.] St John is only passing on what Our LORD Himself advised the Disciples, namely: *take heed that no man deceive you* [Mt.24:4] when they questioned him about the 'End Times.' The Papacy chose not to believe what Copernicus and Galileo had pointed out as being obviously true, in so far as they could test it. The papacy refused the scientific facts because they did not square up with a body of doctrine that was based on what had previously been believed to be scientifically true, namely that the Sun and the rest of the cosmos revolved around the Earth. In this respect the Vatican was not following a good biblical tradition, for which the Vatican has since, if belatedly, apologized. The evolutionists' reluctance, if not downright refusal, to address seriously hypotheses such as 'Intelligent Design,' or 'Irreducible Complexity' put by *bone fide* scientists working from pure science, begs the question whether Evolutionists themselves may be making precisely the same mistake the Papacy made when confronted by Galileo's and Copernicus' theories.

The reality is that a socially cohesive community of whatever size cannot survive without a concept of 'Absolutes,' without which there can be no certainty let alone

agreement as to what parameters bind a people together. What should be a certainty is reduced to chance, or whatever happens to be fashionable. What is right is what is current. Change is progress and those opposed to change are dismissed for being retrograde. The argument that it is a matter of getting used to the change is, it is suggested, a highly dangerous outlook to have, because it is true that given time people are capable of getting used to anything. To put it bluntly, butchers get used to killing chickens. Some Germans got used to killing Jews. It is chilling to discover that the Germans who ran the death camps were not deranged psychopaths, but entirely normal people, who on returning home from work at the camp were living stable middle class family lives, making sure that the children got down to doing their homework, eking out the family resources in hard times etc. They only needed to justify intellectually in their own minds that what they were doing at the camps was morally right and a necessary expedient. It was easy to conclude that what they were doing was progressive and in the general interest. Had Germany won the war they would, most probably, have been vindicated.

If we look historically at the attitudes towards homosexuality, euthanasia, or abortion for example, we see a similar process at work. Within a period of about 40 years, there has been a shift in the social consensus of opinion as to the rightness of these practices from being taboo, horrific and undermining of civilization to being entirely right forms of behaviour to teach our children. Those who continue to uphold the generally held position of 40 years ago are now dismissed for being narrow-minded bigots or emotionally corrupted. It begs the question what current taboo social behaviour will in the course of the next 40 years of 'social progress' be deemed to be 'right' as opposed to 'wrong' by progressive modernists: polygamy?, incest?, paedophilia?, bestiality? This last category will be seen in a different light, if human rights is extended to animals. That will largely eliminate any fundamental difference between man and beast. It is giving rectitude to 'Whim.' In other words, it is 'chance,' 'randomness,' 'uninhibited self assertion.' There can be no certainty about anything. With 'chance,' there can be no relationship between 'Cause' and 'Effect.' To illustrate the point, given certain physical conditions, there is an absolute certainty that an aeroplane will fly, not crash. Given a predictable change in those conditions, it is certain the aeroplane will crash. Consequently, when an aeroplane does crash, it is possible to predict with absolute certainty why it did so. In a world of 'Chance,'

there is no certainty, that given those same physical conditions the aeroplane will fly. Nor can one ever understand with certainty why it crashed. Unless one actually believes in 'Absolutes' no one would ever fly because there would never be certainty that given the conditions favourable for flying the machine would ever take off. Arguably, it is this inherent lack of certainty instilled in children by parents, who have themselves been brought up on 'Relativism,' which has given rise to the Post Modern generation. This generation is angry, disillusioned and searching desperately for Absolutes to give structure to their lives. As we shall see in the next chapter, this anger and frustration is breaking out in hideous acts of violence.

VI. THE CAUSES OF CONFLICT LIE ELSEWHERE.

1. The Fallen Man

Rather than attribute the violence that punctuates human life on this planet to pure religion, might it not be more fruitful to attribute it to certain fundamental and seemingly universal traits found in Man himself: a lust for power, selfishness, jealousy, envy, pride, moral weakness, deceit, disappointment, and one could go on. Are not these traits the root cause of most conflict from petty individual acts of violence up to institutional, national and international acts of violence and war? Irrespective of how Christians choose to understand or explain it, in terms of the way in which men behave towards each other, is not the fallenness of man an objective fact of life?

2. Terrorism as a Messianic Expression.

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI) in his book The Turning Point for Europe, makes the point that it is the very absence of religion in peoples' lives that has driven them first to drugs and then to acts of terrorism (Ratzinger, 18-24). He mused with his friend Ernst Bloch on why in the Middle Ages, when drugs could have been got, had there not been a serious market for them. Ratzinger suggested that the emptiness of the soul that drugs are attempting to fill, was satisfied by a meaningful faith. The principle of hope is that Man energetically contradicts the facts of life, which he perceives to be bad. Taking drugs is a form of protest against what is perceived to be a bad and hopeless world. At its core the taking of drugs is a protest against a reality that is perceived to be a prison. Ratzinger points out that terrorism's point of departure is similar to that of the decision to take drugs. It is a

protest against the world as it is. Fundamentally, terrorism is a moralism. He finds it not surprising that terrorism has its origins in the universities amongst young people who were strongly influenced by religion. Terrorism, he suggests was at first a religious enthusiasm that had been redirected into the earthly realm, a messianic expectation transposed into political fanaticism. Faith in life after death had broken down, but the criterion of heavenly expectations has not been abandoned. GOD is no longer seen as one who genuinely acts, but the fulfilment of His promises is demanded just as it has always been. Disgust at the intellectual and spiritual emptiness of modern society, yearning for what is completely different, the claim of unconditional salvation without restrictions is, Ratzinger suggests, the religious component in the phenomenon of terrorism. It explains the terrorists' focus on totality, terrorism being uncompromising in its character, and idealism. What makes it so dangerous is the decisively earthly character of the messianic hope: something unconditional is demanded of what is conditional, something infinite of what is finite.

3. Disillusionment / British Home Grown Terrorists

Marc Sageman, author of Understanding Terror Networks and Leaderless Jihad states in a recent article (Sageman. 08-06-13) that the original Al-Qaida terrorists responsible for the 9/11 bombings were young well educated middle class men, who had become 'radicalized' in the West. Terrorists who fit this description, have now largely been replaced by 'home-grown' youths (i.e. born and brought up in a Western European country, such as the United Kingdom,) dreaming of glory and adventure. They yearn to root their lives in a greater sense of meaning. Today's terrorists are usually poorly educated teenage children of unskilled and secular Muslim immigrants. They have been born, raised and radicalized in their host country. They join online chat-rooms and 'self radicalize' themselves through their admiration for supposed Islamic heroes. Typical of this genre is Mohammed Bouyeri who belonged to the 'Hofstadt Netwerk' in the Netherlands, and shot the Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh in 2004. Other members of this group planned to murder prominent Dutch politicians, and to: bomb the Dutch parliament, bomb a nuclear power plant, and bomb Amsterdam International Airport. Sageman refers to another such group in Toronto Canada, which plotted to murder Prime Minister Stephen Harper, and blow up the Canadian Parliament. Typically, they spent much of their

time eulogizing their terrorist heroes, and living out mujahedin fantasies on internet chat sites. The radicalization process insists of having: (a) a sense of moral outrage, (b) seeing this anger as part of a war on Islam, (c) believing that this view is consistent with one's every grievance, and (d) mobilizing through networks. For whatever reason, they must come to believe that there is a war on against Islam. Sageman notes that the new terrorists are not particularly religious, and are not intellectuals, let alone Islamic scholars. Many become religious only a few months before their arrests, and some are not religious at all. They do not go to Iraq to have theological debates, only to blow themselves up. He noted that what transforms angry young Muslims into terrorists is mobilisation by networks. Previously these had been composed of face-to-face groups: cliques of friends egging each other on, amplifying grievances, deepening their rejection of the values of their host country. Young people's beliefs are now being changed not by face-to-face radicalisation but by 'jihadist' internet forums. They are worldwide and attracting ever younger members, including women.

4. Akihabara Phenomenon: Non Political Assassinations

A not dissimilar phenomenon, that is not at all related to a religious organisation, is blossoming in Japan. It was brought to light startlingly when a young man (Tomohiro Kato) drove a van into a crowded shopping street in Akihabara, a suburb of Tokyo. He deliberately ran over people before dismounting to knife them to death. He killed in all seven people and seriously injured a number of others.

The journalist Jenni Uechi, when attempting to analyse this particular 'killing spree' noted that there was a great deal of sympathy for Kato and what he was reduced to doing. She observed that the thousands of e-mails posted on-line by Kato revealed a loneliness that haunted him in the days before implementing his murderous scheme. He had had a relatively good education, having graduated from university with ambitions to design motor cars, but ended up in a low paid temporary job checking paint work on vehicles at a Toyota subsidiary. His e-mail messages reveal that it was not the low paid job, and a preoccupation with video games, so much as a sense of utter loneliness and sense of his own worthlessness that was the driving force behind his murderous action. Dr. Seiei Muto, (Director, Tokyo Mental Health Academy) is reported as saying that this kind of mentality is

being spawned by changes taking place in the socio-economic environment. Lifetime employment has given way to a substantial rise in temporary workers who tend to be treated as disposable. They are excluded from social groupings which encourage a sense of community, and which sustain permanent employees of a business. He also points out that nowadays parents are less involved in their regional community. Muto thought that Kato was actually hoping someone would stop him, wanting someone to confront him, deal with him directly, and ask him why he was doing what he did. That, of course, did not happen. Muto thinks the Akihabara incident represents the 'tip of an iceberg,' (Uechi, 08-09-28)

Philip Brasor also commenting on the Akihabara incident reported Yuki Honda, an authority on youth malaise, telling NHK (National Japanese Broadcasting Company) that Kato represented what many Japanese young have been feeling for years but were never able to verbalize. They are no use to society but they, too, have no use for society. The 'Otaku', (young men who are obsessed by pop culture and new technology) were seen as anti-social and immature. The internet and mobile phones are rapidly expanding this class. (Brasor 08-06-29).

Dr. Naoki Sato, Professor of Information Engineering at Kyushu Institute of Technology, points out that Japanese have a low sense of individual worth. Traditionally, individuals see their identity as being in relationship with the people around them. Because there is a perception that people cannot live outside the parameters of the 'Senken,' (The society in which people live) they have to disappear or commit suicide (*ibid*). Muto is also reportedly of the opinion that Japanese will have to undergo an 'individualist revolution,' learning to assert themselves as individuals instead of looking to others to validate their existence. It is ironic that those who most profess to be indifferent about the need for senken , actually care deeply about having a place within it. Sato suggests that this sense of isolation is a peculiarly Japanese problem where the concept of 'Senken' is traditionally a supportive one, and people's sense of identity is created by the their relationships with people around them. (*ibid*)

Kato seems also to have been critical of his parents who, he believed, had been overly ambitious for him, and pushed him beyond what he felt he was capable of achieving. This is not an uncommon phenomenon in Japan's highly competitive

society. It necessarily is so, because physical survival, perhaps more than in other developed economies where there is more space, is dependent upon having a career in the socio-economic system.

There is an innate religiosity in Japanese people, and a respect for different religious traditions. Also, Japanese culture has in large measure been moulded and shaped by the traditions and ideals of Buddhism and Shinto. When it comes to worship, it is mostly thoughtless formalistic observance of ritual, and nothing much beyond that. Consequently, Japan is a society where people have lost touch with their traditional religions, which have been the foundation of their civilisation. In fact, Japanese society is empty of real religion. That void is being filled, at least in part, by a version of Enlightened European Atheism. It is not surprising that Sato made the sort of comment he did about the need to develop a sense of individualism. Those who have experienced the cultural meltdown that is taking place, where the religion puts Man and the self at the centre, know that putting the stress on individualism and on the rejection of any authority beyond Man is a short route to self-destruction. 'Optimistic Humanism' quickly gives way to its pessimistic version, whether: the Romantic Movement, 19th century Nihilism, or 20th century Existentialism that made the taking of drugs respectable. This respectability has been replaced by the appeal of the Suicide Bombers brigade, (with a veneer of 'religion,' but mainly the victims of a godless social environment,) and now we have the appalling spectacle of 'Akihara' assassins, individualism taken to its extreme.

The theme of this paper is that the necessary anchor for stability is not individualism. Stability is achieved when there is a credible personal authority that is beyond man, to whose authority, societies that have that religion as their cultural foundation are answerable, and with whom the individual is able to identify. It is in this context that the Government of China has taken an altogether revolutionary stance on its hitherto rejection of religion. Instead of trying to legislate religion out of existence in the tradition of the old Communism, the government recognizes that religion has a vital stabilizing role. This is particularly the case as the spectacle of social unrest looms in the wake of rapid uneven economic development. To meet this need the government has radically revised its Religious Affairs Regulations in State Council Decree No: 426. (Danny Yu, 07-07-04). Reflecting this change of attitude the

Nanjing Amity Printing Co⁵⁾, a company sanctioned by the State, now has already printed 50 million copies of the Bible in 75 languages. It has now expanded its facilities to print 12 million copies per year. The domestic market buys up 75% of the company's output. The other major printer of Bibles is the press of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. It publishes 3 million copies per year. With its outdated facilities, it has difficulty handling the light weight paper that Bibles need. (Japan Times 08-07-06)

In the context of this conference, Dawkins's concept of religion as a cause of terrorist violence appears to be somewhat wide of the mark. There are other more relevant causes related to: the breakdown of family cohesion, to the low quality of life of people trapped in low cost housing estates in large conurbations, to a serious shortfall in effective elementary education, for whatever reason, but it is often to do with a lack of discipline. Any one of these will seriously undermine an individual's sense of self-worth and inhibit a clear perception of any purpose to life. Kato and his ilk have had no exposure whatever to religions that have a perception of a Supreme Being beyond creation. Rather, they have circumstantially been caught up in a western secular culture that to a greater or less extent has a perception of the world that is modern and western and which to some extent, at least, is a product of Enlightened European Atheism, and reflects its values.

5. Binary Opposition

McGrath draws attention to the work that is currently being done on the concept of 'Binary Opposition' (McGrath 51). Divisions within humanity 'are ultimately social constructs, which reflect the fundamental sociological need for communities to self define, identifying those who are 'In' and those who are 'Out.' There is a debate as to whether such 'Oppositions' determine the shape of human thought or are the outcome of human thought. Group identity is often fostered by defining 'the other.' He points out, what is well known to observers of the situation in Northern Ireland, that the binary opposition, namely Catholic - Protestant, came to be perceived as normative. The religious names identified the competing factions. In reality it was a

5) Nanjing Amity printing Co, founded in 1988, is a joint venture company established by a Chinese Christian Society and the United Bible Societies.

socio-political, not fundamentally a religious confrontation, where the defining parameters were determined by a long history of complex cultural differences. As McGrath states in italics, '*It was not a specifically religious phenomenon.*' (McGrath, 52). At no time were the competing factions arguing about doctrinal religious issues. On the contrary, there was outside the area of confrontation, if anything, respect for the other man's religion, especially when it came to funerals. In fact, the official religious bodies were conspicuously working together, using their offices, to bring about peace between the warring factions. These bodies only had a marginal impact, because, in reality, issues other than religion were the driving force behind the conflict.

The above observations, seen from various sources, seem to qualify somewhat Dawkins's belief that 'only religious faith is a strong enough force to motivate a suicide bomber to leave a widow and small children all for the sake of being promised immediate entry into paradise for blowing himself up.' It also makes somewhat wide of the mark, Muriel Gray's observation in the Glasgow Herald 'The cause of all this mayhem (commenting on the London Bombings in July 2005) violence, terror and ignorance is of course religion itself.' (Dawkins, 304.3). It begs the question, to which religion are Dawkins and Gray referring? Could the blame be directed, at least in part, to the widespread adoption of Enlightened European Atheism, whose philosophical ideas have played their part in the break up of the family as the basic stabilizing factor of society and in undermining the confidence of 'Generations X and Y.' to make sound judgements?

APPENDIX: I:

ANTI: WAR, VIOLENCE HATRED CORPUS OF NEW TESTAMENT - SAMPLES

Exemplary Role Model of the Divine:

Rom 5:10 - For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.

Col.1: 20, 21 - And, having made peace through the blood of his Cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.

1 Jn. 3:15-16 - Whoso hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. Hereby perceive we the love of GOD, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

It is not for Man to seek Justice in the face of his enemies:

Luke 1: 69-74 [Benedictus] - He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David: As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from our enemies and from the hands of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our forefathers, and to remember his holy covenant;...that we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies might serve him without fear.

Law:

Mat. 5:21-25 - Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of judgement: But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgement: and whosoever shall say unto his brother, Raca (=vain fellow) shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of hell. Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first

be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge . .

Mat.5: 43-48 [Sermon on the Mount] - Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy, but I say unto you, Love your enemies and bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect as your Father which in heaven is perfect.

Luk. 6: 29-36. - And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak forbid not to take away thy coat also. Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them likewise... And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? For sinners also lend to sinners to receive as much again.... And your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.

Luk.6: 36-38 - Be ye therefore merciful, as your father also is merciful. Judge not and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned; forgive and ye shall be forgiven....For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.

Rom.12: 17- 21 - Recompense no man evil for evil....If it be possible, as much as lieth within you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst give him a drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

2 Thes.3:14-16. And if any man obey not your word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. Now may the Lord of Peace himself give you peace always by all means.

Jas.4:1-3,5-8a, 10-12. - From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume that ye may consume it upon your lusts.... Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy? But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you.... Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up. Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law; but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?

Handling 'Hate'

Mat. 10:22 - And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.

Mat. 24:6,7,9,13,14a - And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled....Nation shall rise against nation, and there shall be famines and pestilence, and earthquakes in divers places....Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake.... But he that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the World for a witness unto all nations.

Lu.:22,23a. - Blessed are ye when men shall hate you and shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward is

great in heaven:

Jn.3:20,21 - For everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deed may be made manifest, that they are wrought in GOD.

Heb.1:9 Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore GOD, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Tit. 3:34 - For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of GOD our Saviour toward man appeared.

1 Jn.2:9-11. - He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness has blinded his eyes.

1Jn. 4:20-21 - If any man say, I love GOD, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love GOD whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth GOD love his brother also.

APPENDIX: II

CATECHISM OF NON VIOLENCE

By Adin Ballou

Q. Whence is the word 'non violence' derived?

A. From the command, 'Resist not evil.' [Mt.5:39]

Q. What does this word express?

A. It expresses a lofty Christian virtue enjoined on us by Christ.

Q. Ought the word 'non resistance' to be taken in its widest sense - that is to say, as intending that we should not offer any resistance of any kind of evil?

A. No; it ought to be taken in the exact sense of our Saviour's teaching - that is, not repaying evil for evil. We ought to oppose evil by every righteous means in our power, but not by evil.

Q. What is there to show that Christ enjoined non-resistance in that sense?

A. It is shown by the words he uttered at the same time. He said, Ye have heard it was said of old, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you resist not evil. But if one smites thee on the right cheek, turn him the other also; and if one will go to law with thee to take thy coat from thee, give him thy cloak also. [Mt.5:39,40]

Q. Of whom was he speaking in the words, Ye have heard it said of old?

A. Of the patriarchs and the prophets, contained in the Old Testament, which the Hebrews ordinarily call the Law and the Prophets.

Q. What utterances did Christ refer to in the words, "It was said of old?"

A. The utterances of Noah, Moses, and the other prophets, in which they admit the right of doing bodily harm to those who inflict harm, so as to punish and prevent evil deeds.

Q. Quote such utterances.

A. - "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." [Gen.9:6]

- He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death....And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." [Ex.21:12, 23-25]

- He that killeth any man shall sure be put to death. And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour, as he hath done, so shall it be done to him: breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth. [Lev. 24:17,19,20]

- Then the judge shall make diligent inquisition; and behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother, then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother....And thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot. [Dt.19:18,21]

- Noah, Moses and the prophets taught that he who kills, maims, or injures his neighbour does evil. To resist such evil, and to prevent it, the evil must be punished with death, or maiming, of some physical injury. Wrong must be opposed by wrong, murder by murder, injury by injury, evil by evil. Thus taught Noah, Moses and the prophets. But Christ rejected all this. I say unto you, is written in the Gospel, "resist not evil," do not oppose injury with injury, but rather bear repeated injury from the evil doer. What was permitted is forbidden. When we understood what kind of resistance they taught, we know exactly what resistance Christ forbade..

Q. Then the ancients allowed the resistance of injury by injury?

A. Yes, but Jesus forbids it. The Christian has in no case the right to put to death his neighbour who has done him evil, or to do him injury in return

Q. May he kill or maim in self-defence?

A. No.

Q. May he go with a complaint to the judge that he who has wronged him may be punished?

A. No. What he does through others, he is in reality doing himself.

Q. Can he fight in conflict with foreign enemies or disturbers of the peace?

A. Certainly not. He cannot take any part in war or in preparations for war. He cannot make use of a deadly weapon. He cannot oppose injury to injury, whether he is alone or with others, either in person or through other people.

Q. Can he voluntarily vote or furnish soldiers for the government?

A. He can do nothing of that kind if he wishes to be faithful to Christ's Law.

Q. Can he voluntarily give money to aid a government resting on military force, capital punishment, and violence in general?

A. No, unless the money is destined for some special object, right in itself; and good both in aim and means.

Q. Can he pay taxes to such a government?

No; he ought not voluntarily to pay taxes, but he ought not to resist the collection of taxes. A tax is levied by the government, and is exacted independently of the will of the subject. It is impossible to resist it without having recourse to violence of some kind. Since the Christian cannot employ violence, he is obliged to offer his

property at once to the loss by violence inflicted on it by the authorities.

Q. Can a Christian give a vote at elections, or take part in government or law business?

A. No; participation in election, government or law business is participation in government by force.

Q. Wherein lies the chief significance of the doctrine of non resistance?

A. In the fact that it alone allows of the possibility of eradicating evil from one's own heart, and also from ones neighbour's. This doctrine forbids doing that whereby evil has endured for ages and multiplied in the world he who attacks another and injures him, kindles in the other a feeling of hatred, the root of every evil. To injure another because he has injured us, even with the aim of overcoming evil, is doubling the harm for him and for one. Satan can never be driven out by Satan.. Error can never be corrected by error, and evil cannot be vanquished by evil. . True non resistance is the only real resistance to evil. It is crushing the serpents head. It destroys and in the end extirpates the evil feeling.

Q. But if that is the true meaning of the rule of non-resistance, can it always be put to into practice?

A. It can be put into practice like every virtue enjoyed by the law of God. A virtue cannot be practiced in all circumstances without self sacrifice, privation, suffering, and in extreme cases loss of life itself. But he who esteems life more than fulfilling the will of God is already dead to the only true life. Trying to save his life he loses it. Besides, generally speaking, where no resistance costs the sacrifice of a single life of some material welfare, resistance costs a thousand such sacrifices.

Non-resistance is Salvation; Resistance is Ruin.

It is incomparably less dangerous to act justly than unjustly, to submit to injuries than to resist them with violence, less dangerous even in one's relations to the

present life. If all men refused to resist evil by evil our world would be happy.

Q. But so long as only a few act thus, what will happen to them?

A. If only one man acted thus, and all the rest agreed to crucify him, would it not be nobler for him to die in the glory of non-resisting love, praying for his enemies, than to live to wear the crown of Caesar stained with the blood of the slain? However, one man, or a thousand men, firmly resolved not to oppose evil by evil are far more free from danger by violence than those who resort to violence, whether among civilized or savage neighbours. The robber, the murderer, and the cheat will leave them in peace, sooner than those who oppose them with arms, and those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword, but those who seek after peace, and behave kindly and harmlessly. Forgiving and forgetting injuries, for the most part enjoy peace, or, if they die blessed. In this way, if all kept the ordinance of non-resistance, there obviously would be no evil nor crime. If the majority acted thus, they would establish the rule of love and good will even over evil doers, never opposing evil with evil, and never resorting to force. If there were a moderately large minority of such men, they would exercise such a salutary moral influence on society that every cruel punishment would be abolished, and violence and feud would be replaced by peace and love. Even if there were only a small minority of them, they would rarely experience anything worse than the world's contempt, and meantime the world, though unconscious of it, and not grateful for it, would be continually becoming wiser and better for their unseen action on it. And if in the worst case, some members of the minority were persecuted to death, in dying for the truth they would have left behind them their doctrine, sanctified by the blood of their martyrdom. Peace, then, to all who seek peace, and may overruling love be the imperishable heritage of every soul who obeys willingly Christ's word, "*Resist not evil.*"

(Tolstoy, 11-16)

APPENDIX: III
PRINCIPLES OF THE JUST WAR

1. A just war can only be waged as a last resort. All non-violent options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
2. A War is just only if it is waged by a legitimate authority. Even just causes cannot be served by actions taken by individuals or groups who do not constitute an authority sanctioned by whatever the society and outsiders to the society deem legitimate.
3. A just war can only be fought to redress a wrong suffered. For example, self defence against an armed attack is always considered to be a just cause (although the justice of the cause is not sufficient.) Further, a just war can only be fought with the 'right' intentions: the only permissible objective of a just war is to redress an injury.
4. A war can only be just if it is fought with a reasonable chance of success. Deaths and injury incurred in a hopeless cause are not morally justifiable.
5. The ultimate goal of a just war is to re-establish peace. More specifically, the peace established after the war must be preferable to the peace that would have prevailed if the war had not been fought.
6. The violence used in the war must be proportional to the the injury suffered. States are prohibited from using force not necessary to attain the limited objective of addressing the injury suffered.
7. The weapons used in war must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Civilians are never permissible targets of war, and every effort must be taken to avoid killing civilians. The death of civilians are justified only if they are unavoidable victims of a deliberate attack on a military target.

APPENDIX: IV⁵⁾

POPULATION: CHRISTIAN / MUSLIM STATISTICS WORLDWIDE

i. Population Statistics

First, when we look at population figures, the areas of major population growth are those where there is a strong positive commitment to either Christianity or Islam.

Compare diagrams 5.1 and 8.1 below (Jenkins, 167)

Nation	1975	2000	2025	2050
1. India	622	1,014	1,377	1,620
2. China *	918	1,262	1,464	1,471
3. USA (? *)	216	276	338	404
4. Indonesia	138	225	301	338
5. Nigeria	59	123	205	304
6. Pakistan	75	142	213	268
7. Brazil	109	173	201	206
8. Bangladesh	76	129	178	205
9. Ethiopia	33	64	115	188
10. DRp.Congo	25	52	105	182
11. Philippines	44	81	122	154
12. Mexico	61	100	134	153
13. Vietnam *	48	79	106	119
14. Russia *	134	146	136	118
15. Egypt	37	68	95	113
16. Japan	112	127	120	101
17. Iran	33	66	88	100
18. SaudiArabia	7	22	48	91
19. Tanzania	16	35	60	88
20. Turkey	41	66	82	87
21. Sudan	16	35	61	84
22. Uganda	11	23	48	84
23. Germany *	79	83	85	80
24. Yemen	7	17	40	71
25. Thailand	42	60	71	70

Table 5.1 The Most Populous Nations in the World, 2025 and 2050 [in millions] (Jenkins, 84). - * What might loosely be called 'Enlightened Humanist' states (not highlighted as such in original table:5.1)

5) Lifted from: 'Charting the Demise of the Enlightenment Era' (pp.35-37) - A paper presented by Rev. Ivan Cosby to Oxford Round Table 'History' Conference. Oxford, 2006

IS RELIGION THE CAUSE OF CONFLICT ?

Muslim	Muslim / Christian Minority	Christian	Christian / Muslim Minority	$\frac{1}{2}$ Christian $\frac{1}{2}$ Muslim	Non Christian / Christian & Muslim Minorities*
8 .Bang- ladesh	15.Egypt	7 .Brazil	23.Germany	9.Ethiopia	2 .China
17.Iran	4 .Indo- nesia	12.Mexico	11.Philip- pines	5 .Nigeria	1 .India
6 .Pakistan	21.Sudan	14.Russia	22. Uganda	19.Tanzania	16.Japan
20.Turkey		3 .USA	10.Zaire		25.Thai- Land
18.Saudi- Arabia					13.Vietnam
24.Yemen					

Table 8.1 The Religious Balance of Power among the 25 largest nations of the Twenty-first Century (figures refer to order of population size in 2050.) (Jenkins, 167) [* Heading modified]

From the above tables certain pertinent observations can be made with regard to the demise of Enlightened-Humanism. First, apart from say half the United States, Germany and Russia and China (bearing in mind the caveats referred to above), none of the heartland states where Enlightened Humanism has the character of a religion rather than a political expediency even makes the list. Of those that do, for the sake of the point being made, it is assumed that China and Vietnam have monolithically humanist population, which is highly unlikely. The combined populations of the 'Enlightened Humanist' (marked *) states declines as a percentage of the twenty-five most populous regions of the World from 44% to 30%. Given the above caveats his must be considered a conservative estimate. On the other hand Christian and Muslim populations of the world are rapidly increasing demographically.

Secondly, those two areas of largest population: India and China, have confidently divested themselves of the 'doctrinal' influence of Enlightened-Humanism and have

an ancient indigenous God-centred cultural order that is confidently reasserting itself.

Thirdly, when one looks at the Christian world, Western Europe which has been the great bastion of Western Christianity since the Dark Ages, is now giving way to Brazil, Mexico, the Philippines, Nigeria, Uganda, Zaire, Sudan. Only the United States remains a bastion of western old Christendom. If we are seeing the beginning of a significant conversion to Christianity in China, which the Chinese government's sensitivity to the Vatican's right to appoint its own bishops may suggest, China like South Korea (now 30% Christian) may shortly have a significant Christian minority that is demographically large enough to become another bastion of Christianity. The point being made is that Christianity ceases to be either essentially a European / North American phenomenon or culturally associated with Enlightened-Humanism.

Fourth, where the Christian Muslim religions border one another, as in Nigeria, the Sudan, Ethiopia, these are likely to become the future areas of world tension, but also the area where Christianity is most relevant to peoples' lives. This border of conflict could well extend to Western Europe where the main protagonists will be Enlightened-Humanism versus Islam. It is probably true to say that that conflict is already getting under way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY / REFERENCES

Books

Bettenson, Henry. Documents of the Christian Church, OUP (World Classics-Galaxy Edition), London, 1947

Dawkins, Richard. The God Delusion. Bantam Press. London, 2006

McGrath, Alister. The Dawkins Delusion. SPCK. London, 2007

Jenkins, Philip. The Next Christendom, The Coming of Global Christianity. OUP, 2002 (pbk.2003)

Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph. The Turning Point for Europe. Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1994.

Tolstoy, Leo. The Kingdom of God Is Within You, (Trans. Constance Garnet) Bison, 1984
(Reprint of Original: Cassels, New York, 1894)

Journal Articles

Grey, John. Prospect, *Fanatical Unbelief*. (Nov. 2004, pp.)

Weigel, George. First Things. 'Moral Clarity in a Time of War,' (January, 2003. No: 128. pp.20-27)

Newspapers Articles:

Brasor, Philip. 'Akihabara Killer Followed Plot Mapped by the Media'. The Japan Times, (08-06-29)

Deguchi, Most Ven. Jyuntoku, (President) 'Religious Leaders Summit's Proposal to Leaders of the Group of Eight.' The Japan Times, (08-07-03)

Gray, Muriel. Glasgow Herald, (2005-07-24)

Japan Times (Los Angeles Times). 'China Set to become the Biggest Printer of the Bible in the World.' The Japan Times, (08-07-06)

Sageman, Marc. 'AlQuaida's New Generation,' Japan Times [Washington Post], (08-06-13)

Uechi, Jenny. 'Society's Role in Kato's Crime.' . The Japan Times, (08-06-30)

Internet Articles

Harakas, Fr. Stanley. 'No Just war in the Fathers.'

http://www.ourworld.com/serve.com/homepages/jim_forest/Justwar.htm (03-05-22)

International Relations Programme. Just War Principles (Pol.116), Mount Holyoke Academy, Massachusetts, USA . <Http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pol116/justwar.htm> (03-05-22)

Moseley, Alexander. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 'Just War Theory.'

<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/j/justwar.htm> (03-05/22)

Raymond, Br. John. 'The Just War Theory.' <http://www.monks-of-adoration.org/justwar.html>
(03-05-22)

Rutherford, Samuel. Lex,Rex. Question XXX et al. <http://www.constitution.org/sr/q30.htm>
(08-07-08)

Yu, Danny. Christianity in China. China Contours.
http://www.christianityinchina.org/Common/Admin/showNews_auto.jsp?Nid=478&...

This paper was presented to the Oxford Round Table Conference on: 'Religion: The Politics of Peace & Conflict,' held at Jesus College Oxford in July 2008. The Advisory Group of The Oxford Round Table Foundation has authorized publication of this paper in Civilisation 21.

Postscript:

The *Los Angeles Time* (17th Nov. 2011) commenting on Army Captain Ryan Jean's petition to be recognized in the US Armed Services Chaplaincy Programme as an 'Atheist Lay Leader,' and citing the US Supreme Court's definition of religion in the Murray vs. Curlett case, concludes, "recognition of atheism as a religion is perfectly logical." (Report: *Japan Times* 2011-11-19)