

TREATISE

On the **LAWFULNESS** of

DEFENSIVE WAR.

In **TWO PARTS.**

By **WILLIAM CURRIE.**

Be of good Courage, and let us play the Man for our People, and for the Cities of our God. And the Lord do that which seemeth him good, 2 SAMUEL X. 12.

Except the Lord keep the City, the Watchman waketh but in vain, PSALM CXXVII. 1.

Est enim hæc, non scripta, sed nata lex, quam non didicimus, accepimus, legimus, verum ex naturâ ipsâ arripuimus, hausimus, expressimus; ad quam non docti, sed facti, non instituti, sed imbuti sumus; ut, si vita nostra in aliquas insidias, si in vim, si in tela aut latronum, aut inimicorum incidisset, omnis honesta ratio esset expediendæ salutis. Cic. in Orat. pro Mil.

Suscipienda bella, ut in pace sine injuria vivatur. Cic.

Nec magis vituperandus est proditor patriæ, quam communis utilitatis aut salutis desertor, propter suam utilitatem aut salutem. Cic. de Fin. Lib. III. Cap. 19.

PHILADELPHIA:

Printed and Sold by B. FRANKLIN and D. HALL,
at the New Printing-Office, in *Market-street.*

MDCCXLVIII.

T H E
P R E F A C E
T O T H E
R E A D E R.

TH E Publick should never have been troubled with the following Treatise on the Lawfulness of Defensive War, had it not been for a late unseasonable Pamphlet, intituled, *The Doctrine of Christianity, as held by the People called Quakers, vindicated*, in Answer to Gilbert Tennent's Sermon on the Lawfulness of War. This Divine having, at the Request of some Gentlemen engaged in the Association for Defence lately enter'd into for securing the Province against a threatening Invasion, printed a Sermon which he had preached upon the Lawfulness of Defensive War, this Pamphlet was printed and published in Answer to it: And that it might have the more universal Influence over the Province, was order'd to be given away *gratis*. In this Performance the Author has undertaken to prove, by fair and candid Interpretations of Scripture (as he tells us in the third Page) the very Reverse of what the Sermon had proved. How well he hath succeeded, the Reader will see in the Perusal of the second Part of this Treatise.

I T was undoubtedly undertaken with no other Intent but to defeat this generous Undertaking of these worthy Men (who could not possibly have any

other View in it but the general Good) by raising Scruples in Peoples Minds about the Lawfulness of what they were about to engage in. This was done at so unseasonable a Time, when every Body (but the Author and his Friends) was fully convinced, that there was an extraordinary Call for falling upon some Measures for our Security, that it gave no small Alarm to every Wellwisher to his Country ; inſomuch that many did not ſtick to ſay, it looked more like the Performance of One who was engaged in a foreign Intereſt, than of a true and loyal *English* Subject.

WHEREFORE, as a Teſtimony of my Regard for the Good of human Society in general, of my Duty to my King and Country in particular, and of true Benevolence for all my Fellow Subjects; I have ſuffered myſelf to be prevailed upon by ſome true Patriots, and Lovers of their Country, to interpoſe in the Behalf of that Doctrin, which, if once given up, the *English* Dominions, as well as thoſe of all other Chriſtian States, would ſoon become a Scene of Slavery and Oppreſſion. This I have done in the following Treatiſe, which I pray God may be an Antidote againſt that pernicious and groundleſs Principle this Vindicator endeavours to ſupport.

IN this Work I have clearly proved the Lawfulneſs of Deſenſive War under the Old Teſtament; and thence I have deduced, as an undeniable Conſequence, that it is therefore not unlawful under the New.

IN Proſecution of the Argument I have followed this Method: 1. I have ſtated this Queſtion, *viz.* Whether in any Caſe it be lawful for Chriſtians to make War under the Goſpel?

2. I have taken the affirmative Side of the Queſtion; and for the Reſolution thereof, I have proved, both from Reaſon and Revelation, that Deſenſive War was lawful under the Old Teſtament. And,

3. I HAVE

3. I HAVE made it appear (which is a plain Resolution) that as there is nothing in Christianity that can amount to a Law prohibiting Defensive War under the Gospel; therefore it cannot be unlawful for Christians, under that Dispensation, to defend themselves against a foreign Enemy: All this is contain'd in the first Part.

IN the second Part, I have examined all the Passages in the forsaide Pamphlet, that seem to affect the general Doctrine I had established in the first; which I desire the Reader may peruse with Attention. But there are two Passages especially, which, tho' I have insisted upon pretty largely in the Treatise, yet, for the farther Illustration of the Doctrines advanced in the Examination of them, I must beg Leave to add something here, in order to prevent Mistakes. The first is, where I examine what the *V.* advances against the Law and Light of Nature. The second is, where I examine his Observation concerning Mens acting in moral Matters according to their Convictions.

THAT there is such a Thing as the Law of Nature existing in the Universe, I have briefly proved in the second Part; and that notwithstanding the Fall of *Adam*, Mankind were capable of discovering the main Principles of the Law of Nature, and the necessary Duties incumbent upon them by Virtue of this Law. Now, for the farther Illustration of this curious Point, and preventing Mistakes, let me add,

1st. WHEN I say there are natural essential Differences in the Natures of Things, from whence results a Fitness and Unfitness in Actions to certain Ends; I don't maintain that these Differences are any Thing abstracted from the Will of God, this being a Speculation that has no Relation to my Subject. It is enough for my Purpose, if it be granted, that there are such natural and essential Differences in Things, whether those Differences be considered

dered as arising from the Things themselves antecedent to the Will of God, or from his Will constituting them such, tho' before they were in their Natures perfectly indifferent.

A DEAL may be said for both these Opinions ; but I incline to the latter, as being most agreeable to holy Scripture.----And tho' we place the Spring and Fountain of the Law of Nature in the Divine Will, which is free in the most unlimited Sense ; it will not follow from hence, that the Law of Nature may therefore be changed by God, or the contrary be commanded ; because he has created Man (who is the Subject of this Law) a Being not possibly to be preserv'd without the Observation of it. Now this being the Case, we cannot with any Colour of Reason suppose that God will either alter or reverse the Law of Nature, so long as he brings no Change on human Nature itself ; and so long as the Actions enjoin'd by this Law do by a natural Consequence promote the Good of Society, in which is contain'd all the temporal Happiness of Mankind, while the contrary Actions do by as strong a Necessity destroy that Society : That is, so long as Beneficence, Kindness, good Faith, Justice, Gratitude, and the like Practices, shall have a Power of engaging and winning on Mens Minds, and *vice versa*.

AND therefore supposing human Nature and human Affairs to be fix'd and constant, the Law of Nature, tho' it owed its original Institution to the free Pleasure of God, remains firm and immutable.

AND here we ought to distinguish carefully betwixt the Law of Nature as it respects God himself, who is the Author of it, and as it respects Men, who are the Subjects thereof. For tho' 'twould be Impiety to assert that the Law of Nature contains any Thing in it repugnant to the divine Holiness and Justice ; yet we are certain, that God does many Actions, which, were we to do, would be abominable


ble Wickedness : And the Reason is, because this Law is not common to God and Men. The Law of Nature, tho' it indispensibly obliges us yet it can lay no Obligation upon him. So that when we say God cannot dispense with the Law of Nature, we mean, that he cannot alter the Relations of Things with Regard to such Duties as necessarily result from the Constitution of human Nature. He cannot alter the Natures of Virtue and Vice, without altering the Constitution of human Nature. Now from this Observation, 'tis easy to answer those Instances which some give of God's dispensing with the Law of Nature ; as when he commanded the *Israelites* to destroy some Nations utterly, and to spoil others of their Possessions. Here was only an Alteration made in the Properties of Things, but the Obligation of the preceptive Law of Nature was not hereby dissolved. Murder would have been an intrinsical Evil still ; but that which was done by the immediate and special Command of God, who is the supream Lord and Disposer of all Things, and hath a fuller Right over his Creatures, than any Man can have over another, would have been no Murder. Robbery would have been Evil still ; but taking Things alienated from their Properties by God himself, who is the rightful Proprietor of all Things, was not Robbery. It cannot therefore be properly called a Dispensation of the Law of Nature, when a Man by express Command from Heaven executes God's Right upon other Men meerly as his Instrument. Circumstances may be varied, and the Object changed, and yet the Law itself suffer no Alteration. Again, when I say that the general and most necessary Precepts of the Law of Nature are discoverable by every Man possessed of the due Exercise of his Reason, I don't maintain that these general Principles are innate, or imprinted, as it were, in Mens Minds, from their very Birth, in the Manner of dis-

stinct and actual Propositions, so as to be readily express'd and utter'd by them, as soon as they arrive at the Use of Speech without further Instruction or Meditation ; because this Doctrine to me seems not to have any Foundation in Nature. Tho' I venerate the great Names of *Stillingfleet* and *Sherlock*, who are of the contrary Opinion ; yet, what I take to be the Truth, I hope I shall always prefer before a blind Obedience to any human Authority. When I say therefore, that the Law of Nature is the Dictate of right Reason, my Meaning is this, That the human Understanding is endued with such a Power, as to be able from the Contemplation of human Nature, to discover a Necessity of living agreeably to this Law. On which Account *St. Paul* declares it to be written in Mens Hearts, *Rom. ii. 15.*

AS the Understanding performs the Office of a Light to direct Men in their Actions, whereby when they are not guided aright, they must unavoidably lose their Way ; so it ought to be laid down as a certain Principle, that there ever was, both in the apprehending Faculty, and in the Judgment, such a Degree of natural Rectitude, as, upon due Attention given, will not suffer Men to be deceived in Reference to the main Principles and most necessary Duties of moral Practice ; and that neither of those Powers are so corrupted and depraved, as to put them under a Necessity of being mistaken therein. An ill-cut Mirror will present every Image in a distorted Confusion ; and the Tongue, when tinctur'd with a Jaundice, is not able to discern the Difference of Tastes : And yet it does not follow, that therefore the Senses, to which those Offices belong, are fallacious and uncertain. Neither could it have been charg'd on those who never had the Benefit of a divine Revelation, as Guilt, that they had done a bad Action, if they had not been furnished with a clear Discernment of moral Good and Evil. And it would

would be the highest Injustice to impute that Error as sinful, which was beyond Mens Power to avoid or shake off. And therefore, unless we would utterly subvert all the Morality of Action in Men before the giving of the moral Law, we must by all Means maintain, that the human Understanding ever was, and still is, so far right, as to be able to discern and practise the necessary Duties of Nature's Law, upon sufficient Enquiry and Meditation. But to prevent Mistakes, I beg Leave particularly to remark, that I am not here debating (as being foreign to the Matter in Hand) what Power the human Understanding hath about Things which depend upon divine Revelation, or what it can perform in such extraordinary Cases without the Assistance of divine Grace ; but only about the Power it hath as 'tis employ'd in regulating Mens Actions according to the Dictates of the Law of Nature. And as to this Point, I have asserted, and I hope with no Offence to any considerate Man, that there never was any Person of proper Years, and Master of his own Reason, that could not comprehend the most general and necessary Precepts of the Law of Nature, and those which are of the greatest Use in common Life ; and discern the Agreement they bear to the rational and social State of Mankind.

IT must indeed be owned, that Interest, joined with the Prejudices of Infancy, Education, or Custom, obscure the clearest Dictates of Reason ; of this we every Day see numberless Instances. Some are so blinded with Self-love, that all their fine Parts seem intirely to forsake them, as soon as any Matter comes in Debate, the Decision of which is attended with any Inconvenience to themselves ; and yet these very Persons shall go through a great many other Things, infinitely more difficult, with the greatest Facility, when they have no Tendency to their own Disadvantage. One principal Criterion of right Reason,

son, and that whereby we know assuredly that it is natural to Men, is, that the unjust Man, when he is acting in any Affair that does nowise affect his own Interest, judges exactly according to the Rules of Justice; and vicious Persons, of every Sort, have just Sentiments of Things, where they do not suffer themselves to be prepossessed by Passion. But there is another Cause of wrong Judgment besides these; viz. Precipitation and Prepossession, equally hurtful to Society with the other. A Man oftentimes becomes tenaciously fond of false or doubtful Principles, taken up without Examination or Reflection; and then 'tis no Wonder if he finds himself unable to reconcile these with the Truth of Things, or to draw from them just and regular Consequences. How few do we find, who so much as think of ever calling in question certain Principles which they have early imbibed, especially if they see them authorized by the Opinions of those whom they look upon to be their Superiors in Wisdom and Experience; or established by the Customs of the Society or Place where they have been bred? Hence we find, even Men of Parts, when pushed on by Party Animities, strenuously endeavouring to find out, not what is most conformable to the invariable Rules of right Reason and Equity (the very Existence of which they have the Assurance to  but only what to them seems most proper to justify the fanatical Notions their Party hath embraced. But tho' some Persons, thro' Indolence, may possibly never have thought of one or two Precepts; or thro' Rashness and Precipitation, may have fram'd wrong Opinions of acting; or by a Mind corrupted with vicious Habits, may have called their Truth and Necessity in question; or may have embrac'd other Rules of Action contrary to natural Suggestions; yet this no more proves, that human Nature is universally corrupted, than it proves, that, because

a Man who has put out his Eyes, cannot discern any Difference in Colours ; therefore others cannot do so, who have not put out their Eyes. For these universal Edicts are so clearly published and explain'd, and so closely interwoven with our very Being, that no Man, with the Use of Reason, can be incapable of apprehending and discerning them ; since to this End nothing more is required, than an ordinary Portion of natural Light, provided that the Mind be not vitiated and obstructed by some Distemper.

2. IN my Examination of what the *V.* hath advanc'd concerning People's acting in moral Duties according to their Convictions, I observed, That to make Men's Faith or Persuasion the Rule of moral Duties, seems to be a preposterous Way of arguing, as affecting the great Foundation of Morality, and producing very dangerous, yet necessary Consequences. For the further Illustration of which, let me add : 'Tis true, Casuists allow, that 'tis a Sin for a Man to act against his Judgment, even supposing his Judgment to be false : But then they carefully distinguish between an Error in Theory, and an Error in Practice. A Man errs in the Theory, when he fancies a Thing to be commanded, which is really forbidden, or left indifferent, *i. e.* neither commanded nor forbidden, and *vice versa*. But he errs in the Practice, when something intervenes in the Exercise of Actions, which alters their Circumstances. Now 'tis allow'd that the former Kind of Errors do not hinder their Imputation to an Agent : because he is supposed not to have apply'd sufficient Diligence in comparing his Actions with the Rule prescrib'd him ; which in Matters concerning moral Duties, is so plain, both in the Law of Nature and Revelation, that he that runs may read it. And therefore he has no Reason to think, that such Errors shall not be imputed. God has given Men a moral Law, plain and intelligible by every Body
that

that has the Exercise of Reason, whereby they are to guide their Actions: And let a Man's Persuasion be what it will as to certain Actions, it cannot alter the Nature of Things. 'Tis not his Opinion, but God's Law that makes Things Good or Evil, and therefore we shall be for ever oblig'd to do some Actions, and forbear others, whatever our Persuasion be, because we cannot alter the Nature of Good and Evil. For if the moral Goodness or Badness of Actions were to be measur'd by Men's Opinions, then Duty and Sin would be the most uncertain Things in the World; and what is Good or Evil to Day, would be the contrary To-morrow as any Man's Opinion alters: But such Consequences are intolerable. And therefore tho' a Man be convinc'd that such a Practice is forbidden, he may be guilty of Sin, and damn'd for it too, if such Conviction lead him, in other Cases, to act against a plain Law of God.

THESE are Men among us who are convinc'd that the Doctrines of Christ forbid all Sorts of War, for which Reason, they say, they cannot in Conscience join, or have any Hand in defending their Country with carnal Weapons. Now in Answer to this I grant, that if a necessary Self-defence against a foreign Enemy be really forbidden by Christ, then they are not to be blam'd: For their refusing to join in such a Practice is, in this Case, undoubtedly their Duty, even tho' their Country should be ruin'd without it. But then the Point we stand upon is this: That what the supream Magistrate (whom by the Laws of God they are bound to obey in all Things lawful) requires of them, in commanding them to defend their Country, is forbidden by no Law of Christ (as will appear in the following Treatise) And therefore their being convinc'd that the Doctrines of Christianity forbid a necessary Self-defence against a foreign Enemy, will not acquit them from the Guilt of disobeying the Magistrate, who is the Ordinance of God. They are
expressly

expressly commanded, both in the moral Law, and in the Gospel, to obey Magistrates ; and their false Persuasion will never justify their Breach of an express Command of God. So that if God's Law commands me to obey the Magistrate in all Things lawful, my false Persuasion that what the Magistrate commands me is unlawful, will not acquit me from Sin before God, if I do disobey him. To confirm this Reasoning, let me ask the following Question.

WHEN St. *Paul* thought himself bound in Duty to persecute Christians, was his Persecution sinful or no? Yes surely, for he calls himself the greatest of Sinners for that very Reason, 1 *Tim.* i. 13. 15. And therefore a Man's thinking a Thing to be lawful, will not acquit him before God for doing that Thing, if it be against God's Law (as Persecution for Conscience in religious Speculations undoubtedly is.) Nor will a Man's thinking a Thing to be unlawful acquit him before God for omitting that Thing, if by so doing he violate a plain Law of God in another Case. Again, suppose a Roman Catholick, who believes Popery to be the only true Religion, does in Obedience to it worship Images and the Host. This Person would certainly abhor these Practices did he think them to be idolatrous, but he believes them to be necessary Duties. And yet I presume this *V.* will charge Roman Catholicks with Idolatry, tho' they disclaim it, and profess they do no more than their Duty, when they give divine Worship to such Objects. And indeed they are certainly charged rightly in this ; for if it be really Idolatry by God's Word to do so, then it will be Idolatry in any Man to do so, let his Persuasion be what it will. For a Man's false Persuasion doth not alter the Nature of Things. Now the Case is alike in the Matter before us. For Disobedience to the higher Powers is as properly a Sin, as worshipping a Creature is Idolatry ; and he is as much a Transgressor, who thinks it his Duty to disobey the Magistrate

strate, as he is an Idolater, who thinks it his Duty to worship a Creature. A Man's Mistake, according to the greater or lesser Culpability of it, will more or less excuse him before God in both Instances, but it cannot change the Nature either of Disobedience or Idolatry.

NOW to apply this to the Case under Consideration, That Protection is due from the Magistrate to the Subject, and that the Subject is bound to obey the Magistrate in all his lawful Commands, is undeniably evident, both from the moral Law and the Gospel. But that the Gospel forbids a necessary Self-defence against a foreign Enemy, can at most be but probable; the first is an undeniable Truth questioned by none; whereas the last is but a probable Opinion, believed by few. Here then is a Case where there is a plain Competition between two Duties; the one is Obedience to a doubtful Precept of Christ, the other is Obedience to an indisputable Law of God, *viz.* Protection from the Magistrate, and Obedience from the Subject.

NOW this Case is easily determined, for when a Man doubts only on one Side (which is the Case here) it is more reasonable (if all other Considerations be equal) to chuse that Side which he hath no Doubt of. But then (which I desire may be attentively consider'd) if there be other Circumstances to overbalance that Consideration of Uncertainty (which is plainly the Case with the *V.* and his Friends) it will be more reasonable to chuse that Side which I did before doubt of. Nay, it is my Duty so to do. For if I doubt, I do by doubting own that I cannot certainly tell whether the Action be lawful or unlawful; and surely then the Weight of pressing Considerations (which in this Case are not wanting) such as the Preservation of my Country from Ruin, Obedience and Subjection to my Superiors, and the like, ought to turn the Ballance; otherwise I cannot answer to God and the World for
the

the Consequences that may ensue. Thus for Instance, If I have the sole legislative Power of Government in my Hands, at a Juncture when the People are threatened with a foreign Invasion; I'm oblig'd, by Virtue of a former Obligation, notwithstanding my Doubt as to the Lawfulness of bearing Arms, to make a legal Provision for the publick Security. And then as to the Case of Subjects, who are under an indispensable Obligation, both by the moral Law and the Precepts of the Gospel, to obey Magistrates in all their lawful Commands, and which Obligation they are fully convinc'd of too without any Doubt; and since (as I said before) the Unlawfulness of bearing Arms in a necessary Self-defence can never be undeniably prov'd from Scripture, and must therefore be a doubtful Case: Their Duty, in Obedience to their Magistrate's Command, is heartily to join in the Defence of the Publick, against a lawless, foreign Invader, whenever there shall be Occasion for their Assistance. Because, as in all doubtful Cases, the safest Side is to be chosen; so 'tis certain, it is safer for them, in this Case, to obey than disobey. There is a plain Law of God that commands them to obey the Magistrate in all lawful Things; and if his Command be unlawful, the only Hazard they run is, of transgressing some Precept of which they were not certain: But in a doubtful Case, it is very uncertain whether the Law of God forbid the Thing or no, and if the Command be lawful, then in disobeying they run the Hazard of transgressing a plain Law which they cannot but know, and which is of the greatest Importance to the Publick.

'TIS true (as I have observ'd in the Treatise) St. *Paul* saith, he that doubteth is damn'd if he eat, because he eateth not of Faith, for whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin, *Rom.* xiv. 23. But pray let it be considered, that there is a vast Difference between this Case, and that of those I am arguing with. The
Man

Man *St. Paul* speaks of, was at Liberty to forbear eating, and sinned in chusing to run such a needless Hazard of transgressing the Law (of giving no Offence to weak Brethren.) But when the Magistrate commands the Subject to assist in defending their Country, they are not at Liberty. In the former Case the Man might forbear without any Danger, but in the latter Case there is greater Danger in forbearing, than in acting, and therefore he is bound to act in the latter Case, tho' it might be Sin to act in the former.

A S to my Method of examining this *V's* Remarks on the aforesaid Sermon, I have this Apology to make for myself, that I had no other View in any Thing I have there said, but to vindicate Truth, and detect Error. If I have said some Things that may seem to betray a Want of Temper for his abusing his Adversary, and imposing on the World under a specious Pretence of pleading for the Truth, I hope the Reader will be reconcil'd, when I assure him, that it was neither from any Prejudice in Favour of the Author of the Sermon (to whom I am so far a Stranger, that to my Knowledge I never exchange'd a Word with him) nor from any personal Prejudice against the *V.* or any of his Friends. But upon finding a Principle, so necessary to the Support of civil Society (as a necessary Self-defence against a foreign Enemy is) attack'd by a Heap of Sophisms and wretched Arguments, contriv'd on Purpose to confound and perplex what was not in his Power to confute, I thought it my Duty to lay them out in their true Colours, that the World may see wherein their boasted Strength lies. For I know many have boasted of this mighty Performance, as an unanswerable Piece. But sure I am if it be, it is not upon the Account of solid Argument or sound Reasoning.

FOR if either the Author or his Friends can shew me but half a Dozen of Arguments in the whole Performance,

formance, that will bear the Test of Syllogism (the Touchstone of right Arguing): I will own all I have said against him to be groundless.

I SHOULD not have made so free with this *V.* upon any other Point of Controversy we could possibly have hit upon. But this being a Point of such vast Consequence to the whole Christian World; the abusive Method he has made Use of in treating of it, cannot in my Opinion be too smartly reprehended.

AND it seems not unnecessary for the Good of the Publick, that he should be told so; that the next Time he has a Mind to publish a Vindication of this Doctrine, he may chuse a more seasonable Opportunity, than when we are alarm'd with a foreign Invasion. Had not this been the Case, I do assure him, I should have employ'd my Time much better, than in an Examination of his Vindication.

AND as to his Friends, I know many of them to be Men of too much good Sense to give into his senseless Sentiments on this Point. And as to those who do, if they think I have done him any Wrong, I cannot hope they should spare me. Only I beg Leave to give this friendly Caution to whomsoever shall be appointed to answer this Piece (if they shall think it worth answering) that they would lay aside that mean Trick of dealing in general evasive Answers, and using equivocal Terms in such a Manner as to make them look two direct contrary Ways, together with some dark out-of-the-way Expressions in their own Language, which have not so much as the Face of an Argument, only that they may have it to say, there is an Answer to such a Book. And if any one concern'd really for Truth, shall undertake the Confutation of what I have here advanc'd, I sincerely promise him, either to recant my Mistake, upon fair Conviction, or use my best Endeavours to answer his Difficulties.

THE Cause in Debate between us is of very great Consequence; it concerns the whole Christian

World in general, and this unhappy Province in particular. That any Evidence in the Proposal or Defence of it, can be sufficient to conquer the Obstinacy and Prejudices of a great many among us, I have not the Vanity to imagine. But thus I think I may justly demand of every Reader, that since there are great and visible Falshoods on one Side or other, he would impartially examine on which Side they lie; and upon that I will venture the Cause in any Readers Judgment, who will but lay aside all Prejudice and Partiality, and come with a sincere Resolution to embrace what, upon the greatest Evidence appears to be the Truth: And as for him that will not do that, I care not much either what he says or thinks.

AS to the Goodness of the Performance, I can say but little in its Favour. But if I have not succeeded in it according to my Wishes, I may plead that it was drawn up under a bad State of Health, amidst a Variety of Interruptions, and a Famine both of Men and Books. This will in some Sort excuse the Author, tho' it may detract from the Performance.

I SHALL make no other Apology for becoming an Author, than that it was partly to gratify the Importunity of my Friends, and partly to satisfy every Man who has any sincere Affection for his Country, that it is not only lawful for him, but laudable and glorious to exert himself in its Defence, whenever he has a lawful Call thereto.

As to whatever Censures the Criticks may pass upon my Performance, this shall give me no Manner of Concern; because as Vermin are led by Instinct to the best Fruits, so (saith a learned Writer) these Kind of Insects swarm about the best Writers; so that should they vouchsafe to allow me a Place among these, they would do me an Honour, which I have not the Vanity to think I deserve.

I HAVE no more to add, but that V. stands for Vindicator.

A

T R E A T I S E

On the LAWFULNESS of

D E F E N S I V E W A R.

AS the best Things are most apt to be abused, so the Abuse of them generally produces very ill Consequences. There is no Principle so good, nor Practice so beneficial, but what may be perverted to an ill Use, by the Wickedness or Folly of Men. And this I take to be the Case with relation to the Point now to be debated.

FOR tho' Self-preservation be a noble Principle, ingrafted in our Nature by the all-wise Author of our Being, for the Security of our Lives, and the Preservation of the Species; yet wicked Men do often abuse it to very ill Purposes. Whenever their Prejudices, Passions, or Interest, prompt them to fall foul on their innocent Neighbours, they always pretend that it is, somehow or other, in Consequence of the great Law of Self-preservation.

HENCE it comes to pass, that one of the noblest, and most useful Principles in Nature, and so necessary for the Good of the whole Animal Creation, that the World could not subsist without it, is per-

Federal Bureau of Investigation
 Department of Justice
 Washington, D. C. 20535
 May 1, 1964

[illegible][illegible]

Is the same as the one of the Law
of S. 1867. The only difference is the
change of the word "Law" to "Law
of S. 1867" in the title of the
Law of S. 1867. The word "Law" is
then put in the title of the

And beside this, we are glad to find among us
 who seem to have felt into a strong new Mission on
 this Subject and who of us are free from Pre-
 judice to condemn all that is better than the worst: and
 put such Considerations on certain Principles of Scrip-
 ture, as they think infinitely support their Opin-
 ion. I look upon it to be my Duty, especially at
 this Time, when we are threatened with a foreign
 Invasion, to let my self I understand so far as
 Concerns this is concerned I ought: Not to quarrel with
 a View to convince of Immaturity, as to justify the
 Minds of little good Men among us, who are wif-

king to him in Defence of their Country, by shewing them that their Undertaking is not only lawful, but generous : And that to war as they are generous, and with a righteous Spirit, and not in Disturbance of private Laws, they merit the grateful Acknowledgements of every honest Man and of us, that has any Regard for the publick Good, instead of being accused as malicious Rebels.

Now to come to this, I will, with the utmost Candour and Impartiality, state and resolve the following Questions, viz. Whether, in any Case, it be lawful for Christianes to make War under the Gospel?

But to prevent Mistakes, I will explain what I understand by the Terms, I understand War.---By War, then, therefore, I would be understood to mean no other more, than what is undertaken by one's Liberty, and that upon no other Grounds, than to defend Men's Lives and Liberties from the violent Attempts of a foreign Enemy, when this cannot be conveniently done without it.---For altho' there may be other Grounds of War, not altogether lawful, yet as my Design, in this Treatise, is only to satisfy the Minds of those engaged in our own Defence, at present, who may, perhaps, be in some Doubt about the Lawfulness, even of this Sort of War, I shall take but little Notice of them, in the Course of this Debate.

I must now I am to be excus'd is, Lawful : In Order to which, let me observe, that a Thing may be said to be lawful, either when done, because enjoined and commanded by a Law, or when there is no express positive Law, against the doing of it. For an express positive Command, is not necessary to make a Thing lawful : but a Negative prohibition by a Law, is sufficient for that. For if being the Nature of Laws, to bind up Mens Rights : what is not recommended by any Law, is thereby supposed to

be left in Mens Power still to do it. And in this Sense of the Word, I maintain Defensive War, under the Gospel, to be lawful. For which Purpose, it will be necessary to prove, in the first Place, that such a War as I now plead for, was consonant or agreeable to the Law of Nature, and not repugnant to any express Law of God under the old Testament. By the Law of Nature, I mean the Dictate of right Reason, shewing the moral Good or Evil of any Action, by the Repugnancy or Congruity it hath to rational Nature itself; and consequently that such an Action is agreeable or disagreeable to the Will of God, who is the very Author of Nature *.

THE State of the Case, therefore, is plainly this, A Defensive War, undertaken by lawful Authority, with no other View but to defend the innocent Lives and Liberties of the whole Community, when this cannot be done by any other Means, was ever consonant to the Law of Nature, and repugnant to no positive Law of God, under the Old Testament; and therefore it cannot be unlawful under the New, unless an express positive Law of Christ can be produc'd, prohibiting all Sorts of War under the Gospel. And if it be prov'd, that such a War is not unlawful, it will be enough for my Purpose; for if it be not unlawful, it will be no Violation of any Law, and consequently can be no Sin.

I SHALL now proceed to prove in the first Place, That Defensive War was consonant, or agreeable, to the Law of Nature, and not repugnant to any express Law of God under the Old Testament: And this I shall do, by Arguments drawn, both from Reason and Revelation. Whence it will evidently follow, as a Resolution of the Question, that it is lawful, in some Cases, for Christians to make War under the Gospel; because what was once lawful, by Virtue of the Law of Nature, must forever be so
(the

* See Preface, Page 5.

(the Grounds and Reasons continuing the same) unless made otherwise by a positive Law of God.

AND, *First*, That Defensive War was consonant to the Law of Nature, and not repugnant to any express Law of God, under the Old Testament, will appear from the following Arguments :

I. THERE are some Things to which every Man (at least before the Case is altered by voluntary Compact) has such a natural and immediate Relation, that he only, of all Mankind, can justly call them his ; such as his Life, his Limbs, his Liberty, &c. Hence it follows, that no other Man can have a Right to begin an Attempt upon this Man's Life, or in any Manner to disturb his Happiness, because he is suppos'd to be in a State intirely independent, and that other to have no Right of Dominion over him.

BUT, *Secondly*, Tho' no Man can have a Right to begin to hurt another, yet every Man has a Right to defend himself, and his, against Violence, when offered (always supposing the Case not to be altered by voluntary Compact) for I do not say that a Man who is become a Member of Society, has, in all Cases, a Right to defend himself against even lawless Violence, for Reasons that are obvious almost to every Body ; and far less to defend himself against lawful Violence, when he has incurred it, by violating the Laws of the Community to which he belongs. I say then (excepting this Case) every Man, and consequently every independent Society of Men, have a Right to defend themselves, and what is theirs, against lawless Violence. Now whoever denies a Man (thus circumstanc'd) this Privilege, asserts, contrary to Truth, either that he hath not the Faculties and Powers which he has, or that his Maker has given them to him in vain ; for to what End has he them, if he may not use them ? And how may he use them, if not for his own Preservation,

when he is attack'd, and in Danger of being destroy'd ? At this Rate, what becomes of the universal invariable Principle of Self-preservation, implanted by the Author of Nature in the whole Animal Creation, which serves for no Purpose that we know of, but to preserve Individuals, by prompting them to provide for, and defend themselves ?

Thirdly, To deny Men a Right to defend themselves against Violence and Ruin, must be inconsistent with the Laws of human Nature, because inconsistent with the general Good of Mankind ; for whatever is inconsistent with the general Peace and Welfare of Mankind, is inconsistent with the Laws of human Nature, and therefore wrong.

Fourthly, If a Man has no Right to defend himself, he can have no Right to any Thing ; but 'tis allowed on all Hands, that every Man has such a natural Right to his Life, his Limbs, his Liberty, &c. that he only, of all Mankind, can justly call them his : If therefore a Man has a Right, he may justly maintain that Right. It implies a great Absurdity then, to deny a Man a Right to defend himself against lawless Violence ; because it is saying, contrary to what is granted by all, that the Aggressor has a Right to assault the other, and usurp what is his. And more than that, to begin the Violence, being in Nature more than to repel it, he who begins, is the true Cause of all that follows, and whatever falls upon him by the Opposition made from the defending Party, is but the Effect of his own Act, or it is that Violence of which he is the Author, reflected back upon himself. If then he who begins to violate the Life and Happiness of another, evidently does what is wrong, he who endeavours to put a Stop to that Violence, does in that Respect what is right by the Terms.

Fifthly, If every Man, before all voluntary Compact, has such a Right to his Life, his Limbs, his
Liberty

Liberty, &c. that he only of all Mankind can justly call them his; he certainly acts agreeable to Right in using them as his; but that Man who opposes him in this, and consequently lays a claim to that which is not his, acts contrary to Right.

In fine: As every Man is oblig'd to consult his own Happiness, there can be no Doubt, but that he not only may, but even ought to defend it; because, as I am oblig'd to pursue Happiness, I'm oblig'd, at the same time, to recede as far as I can from its Contrary.

I own in so doing, I ought not to act rashly, or do more than the End propos'd requires; I ought to use all prudent Methods to stop the Violence; but when all other Measures prove ineffectual, or impracticable, I must take such other as I can, and oppose Force to Force; otherwise I will fail in my Duty to myself, and deny Happiness to be what it is.

Now to apply this Reasoning to Societies, let it be observ'd, that the Condition of an incorporated national Society or Kingdom, seems to be much the same with a single Person, as consider'd existing where there is no Benefit of Law to be had; and what one Man may justly do to another in that Position, may be done by one Nation or politick Body, with Respect to another. If one Man therefore may in such a Position have a Right to defend himself, which that he hath, is evident from the Nature and Reason of Things; then a Number of Men must have an equal Right at least, if not a greater; for there is more Reason that a Number of innocent Men should be saved, than only one of that Number, and therefore that a Number should defend themselves, than that one should. And if this may be done by every single Person in a State of Nature, before the Case is alter'd by voluntary Compact, it may be done by them in a social State, when confederated
among

among themselves; because with respect to other Nations they are still in that State, so far as they have not limited themselves by Leagues and Alliances.

UPON the whole therefore, mutual Defence being one great End of civil Society, if not the greatest, it must in a particular and eminent Manner, involve in it Defence against foreign Enemies: And therefore, as I said before, whoever from a Principle of Generosity and Love to his Country, and not in Pursuance of private Views, signalizes himself in its Defence when there is Occasion for it, does what is agreeable to the eternal Law of Truth and Right, and justly deserves the grateful Acknowledgments of every good Subject, and Lover of his King and Country.

Now these Truths, as they are built upon the indisputable Principles of right Reason, and in a Manner self-evident, will, I think, readily be granted by all Men of sound Judgment, without any farther Illustration.

I SHALL proceed therefore in the

2^d. PLACE, to prove from Revelation, that Defensive War was consonant to the Law of Nature under the Old Testament, whence it will appear at the same Time, that it was not repugnant to any positive Law of God under that Dispensation.

Now that War commenc'd upon just Grounds, was consonant to the Law of Nature, and not repugnant to the reveal'd Will of God under the Old Testament, will appear from the following Instances.

WE find, *Gen. xiv.* that the Almighty, by his high Priest *Melchisedeck*, did approve of a War made by his Servant *Abraham* upon the four Kings; who in plundering *Sodom*, had taken *Lot* and his Family Captives, who was *Abraham's* Brother's Son, and as it were, a Part of his own Family. The Text says, *Melchisedeck* blessed *Abraham*, and said, *Blessed be Abraham of the most high God Possessor of Heaven*
and

and Earth: v. 20. And blessed be the most high God, who hath deliver'd thine Enemies into thine Hand. Now here was a War made by this eminent Servant of God, without any special Commission from the Almighty for it; but he was excited thereto by the meer Law of Nature; presuming upon that Principle of Nature, that to resist, and recompence lawless Injuries, was not displeasing to the God of Nature. *Whoso sheddeth Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed,* seems to have been deeply engraven in Mens Hearts from the Beginning; which made Cain, after the Murder of his Brother, cry out, *Every one that findeth me shall slay me.*

As to the War made by the *Israelites* upon the Seven Nations, I shall wholly omit any Consideration of it here, as having no Relation to this Argument: In this Case they were not excited by the Law of Nature, but acted by Virtue of an exprefs Command of God. This Action therefore comes intirely within the Verge of the judicial Law, which being long since expir'd, is therefore quite out of this Question. Those Actions therefore that were lawful for the *Jews*, may not be drawn into Example by us Christians, because the Reason of them ceas'd when their Law expir'd. I say there were many Things lawful for the *Jews* as a Body Politick, under a Theocratical Government, which cannot be lawfully practis'd under the Gospel, because the Reason of those Things do not descend to Christians. But all those Practices among the *Jews*, which are founded upon common Equity, of which Number was that of Defensive War, may lawfully be practis'd by Christians, not by Virtue of their having been practis'd by them, but by Virtue of common Principles of Equity founded in the Law of Nature, and discoverable by our rational Faculties,

BUT such a War as was carried on by good Men, without any exprefs Command of God, and yet was manifestly approv'd of by the Almighty, must have

have been undertaken upon such Principles, as were not repugnant to his Nature, else he would never have approv'd of it ; and what could those be but the Principles of the Law of Nature, which were written in their Hearts ; since they had no System of moral Practice at that Time by Revelation ?

2. IN the 17th of *Exodus*, we find, that a War was commenc'd by the *Israelites* under the Command of *Moses* and *Josua* against the *Amalekites*, who had opposed them in their Passage towards the promis'd Land ; which, tho' it was not commanded to be done, yet being done, had the divine Approbation, v. 14. which certainly would not have been, if it had been repugnant to the Law of Nature.

3. AND *Deut. xx.* we find God himself prescribing certain general Rules, or standing Ordinances, how his own People should make War ; which is a sufficient Testimony that War might sometimes be just, tho' Men have no special Commission from God to make this or that War.

FOR there *Moses* makes a manifest Difference between the Case of the Seven Nations, and the Case of other People, as appears from the 10th and 15th Verses. For other People they might receive to Mercy, but they were to cut off the seven Nations utterly.

Now what I would observe from hence, is this, That seeing the Almighty did not prescribe for what particular Causes they might make a just War, how could the *Israelites* judge of those Causes, or discover when the Grounds of such a War were just, but by the Law of Nature ? Of this Nature, was that of *Jephthah* with the *Ammonites* ; and that of King *David*, for the Abuse done to his Ambassadors ; and, as some think, that of *Sampson* against the *Philistines*. And forasmuch as those Wars, which they carried on without any special Command, as to the Objects and Circumstances of them, were approved by God, they certainly were agreeable to the
Law

Law of Nature ; because he can approve of nothing done by his Creatures, that is not agreeable either to that, or to his exprefs Command.

‘ Add to this the univerfal Consent of all Nations.
 ‘ And it is, at least, highly probable, that what all
 ‘ Nations in the World unanimously agree in, is a
 ‘ Dictate of the Law of Nature : For if the Effect
 ‘ be univerfal, the Cause must be so too. But of
 ‘ so univerfal a Persuasion as the Lawfulness of De-
 ‘ fensive War, no other probable Cause can be as-
 ‘ sign’d, than that it is a Dictate of that
 ‘ Law, that is as univerfal as Nature itself. Hence
 ‘ we commonly say, and I think with a great
 ‘ deal of Reason, that whatsoever all Nations do
 ‘ grant, must needs be the Voice of Nature.
 ‘ What appears the same to all Men, must undoubt-
 ‘ edly be true.’ And tho’ there may be a few that
 disbelieve the Justice of Defensive War, yet that
 doth not invalidate the Force of this Argument ;
 forasmuch as there is no general Rule without Ex-
 ceptions. When I say, That must be a Dictate of
 Nature, that is acknowledged by all ; I mean, all
 who have sound Judgments : But if it appear other-
 wise to Men of distemper’d and perverse Minds,
 who have been corrupted thro’ an evil Education,
 imparted to them by Men of visionary, enthusiastick
 Tempers, it doth not in the least weaken the Au-
 thority of the Law of Nature, no more than it will
 prove Honey not to be sweet, because a distemper’d
 Palate cannot perceive it. From all which, I hope,
 it evidently appears, to Men of sound and unpreju-
 dic’d Minds, that Defensive War was lawful under
 the Old Testament Dispensation. We see it was
 commenc’d and carried on by good Men, without
 any exprefs Command of God authorizing them ;
 and therefore they must have been prompted to it
 by the Law of Nature, as they had no System of
 moral Duties by Revelation ; and the Practice must
 have

have been agreeable thereto, otherwise Almighty God, who cannot but hate every Thing that is contrary to his Will, would never have shewn his Approbation of it.

HAVING therefore undeniably prov'd, that Defensive War was lawful under the Old Testament, it evidently follows as a Resolution of the Question to be discuss'd, that it is lawful for Christians in some Cases, to make War under the New, because what was once lawful by Virtue of the Law of Nature, must for ever be so (the Grounds and Reasons continuing the same) unless made otherwise by a positive Law of God. It being the Nature of Laws to bound up Men's Rights, what is not expressly forbidden in the Gospel, which was agreeable to the Will of God under the Law, by Virtue of the Law of Nature, that must be lawful for Christians to practise still (the Grounds and Reasons of such a Practise continuing the same.) My Meaning is this; Defensive War being necessary under the Old Testament for the Preservation of civil Society, was lawfully practis'd by good Men; but Defensive War being as necessary under the Gospel for the like Purpose, may be lawfully practis'd now, as well as then; unless it can be made appear that the Author of the Gospel has made an express positive Law against all War whatsoever.

AND here I might rest the Cause, without giving myself any further Trouble; because as my Opponents, if they will support their Argument, must hold the Affirmative, *viz.* That there is such a Law in the New Testament (which I deny) 'tis indispensibly incumbent upon them to prove it. For by the strictest Laws of Reasoning, he that maintains the Negative of a Question, may persist to deny the Affirmative, 'till such Times as the Affirmant shall prove what he affirms.

WHOEVER therefore shall affirm, that Christ hath by an express Law forbidden all Defensive War under
the

the New Testament, ought by all Means to prove it; it being a Matter of such vast Importance to human Society either Way. For if he hath not, how will they answer for it who act as if he had? And if he hath, how will they answer for it who act as if he had not? To assert such a Thing therefore without Proof, and in Consequence thereof, to act as if it were prov'd, certainly merits a severe Reprehension. For if there be such a Law in the New Testament, it must be an easy Matter for their Men to produce it, which if they do, and can prove that our Saviour intended it as such, I think every true Christian is bound to thank them for the Discovery, and never to appear in Arms any more. But if they fail in this, as I'm confident they will, they are bound in Duty, not only to acknowledge their Fault, in condemning Men for a Practice so necessary for the Protection of civil Societies, when they can shew no Law they transgress thereby, but to lay aside their groundless Prejudices themselves, that so they may be able to answer one of the greatest Ends for which they entered into Society, viz. Mutual Defence against Injuries.

I do therefore in the Name and on the Behalf of the whole Christian World, who are in the Practice of Self-defence against lawless Violence, call upon them to produce any Passage or Passages in the New Testament, which will amount to a Law prohibiting Defensive War in all Cases without Exception. I say, which will amount to a Law (for any Thing that comes short of this, will not serve the Turn) because, as I have already prov'd, some Wars having been lawful under the Old Testament by Virtue of the Law of Nature, and the divine Approbation, nothing can make all War unlawful under the Gospel, but an express Law enacted by the Author of the Gospel prohibiting it; for an express positive Command, as I observed above, is not necessary to
make

make a Thing lawful under the Gospel, which was always agreeable to the Dictates of the Law of Nature ; it is sufficient for that, if there be no Law made against it.

BUT that I may not be thought to evade the Force of what they have to offer from the New Testament, in Opposition to what I have advanc'd, I will condescend to examine two or three of the principal Texts, upon which they lay the greatest Stress for Proof of the Unlawfulness of bearing Arms. The First is written in the 33d Verse of the 5th Chapter of St. *Matthew* ; the Words are these ; *But I say unto you, that ye resist not Evil.* The Second is in the 44th Verse of the same Chapter, in these Words ; *But I say unto you, Love your Enemies, &c.*

Now granting that these Words will amount to an evangelical Precept or Law, prohibiting some Things, which the *Jews*, thro' the corrupt Glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees, look'd upon as indifferent Actions, tho' really contrary to the Law of Nature ; such as Revenge, Impatience under Afflictions, returning Injuries, and the like ; which, in certain Circumstances, have ever been, and ever will be Evil : Yet we can find no Colour of Reason to allow, that they amount to a Precept or Law prohibiting Christian States to defend themselves against the lawless Violence of a foreign Enemy ; or that the great evangelical Lawgiver had any Intention they should, for these Reasons :----

I. BECAUSE in delivering these Words, he doth not address his Discourse to the Magistrate, who alone hath a Right to declare War, but to the Person injured. A Man may without any Breach of the Law of Nature, for some valuable Ends, remit somewhat of his own private Right ; but the Magistrate who sustains a publick Character, and is intrusted with the Care of a whole Community, cannot

not give up the Rights of his Subjects, without a manifest Violation of this Law.

2. WHERE the Law of Nature doth determine any Thing by Way of Duty, as flowing from the Principles of it, which we take to be the Case with relation to Self-defence against a foreign Enemy, there no positive Law can be suppos'd to take off the Obligation of it. For the Things commanded by the Law of Nature being just and righteous in themselves, there can be no obligatory Law made against such Things. A Man may be as well bound not to be a Man, as not to act according to Principles of Reason. For the Law of Nature is nothing but the Dictate of right Reason, discovering the Good or Evil of particular Actions, from their Conformity or Repugnancy to the Nature and Reason of Things. Whatever positive Law is then made directly infringing and violating natural Principles, is thereby of no Force at all; and that which hath no Obligation in itself, cannot dissolve a former Obligation*.

'Tis a Dictate of the Law of Nature that Men should enter into Society by mutual Compacts, in order the better to preserve themselves in their natural Rights and Privileges by such Means as are proper for that End.

Now the greatest Rights of Men are such as flow from Nature itself; and therefore, as no Law binds against the Reason of it, so neither can it against the common End of Laws. Therefore, if a positive Law should be made, that Men should not protect and defend themselves against lawless Violence, it cannot bind, being against the main End of Laws, which is, that every civil Society be protected and preserved; which, in many Cases, cannot be done, without doing what Nature requires; and
C that

* See Preface.

that is to defend themselves from unjust Violence.

AND therefore we conclude, that Self-defence against lawless Violence, being a Dictate of the Law of Nature, no positive Law can be made to disannul our Obligation to it, and consequently that our Saviour did not intend by these Precepts to prohibit it in all Cases.

3. WHATSOEVER binds Christians as an universal, standing Law, must be clearly revealed as such, and laid down in Scripture in such evident Terms, as all who have their Senses exercised therein, may discern it to have been the Will of Christ that it should perpetually oblige all Christians. And this is necessary more especially in establishing a new Law, in order to prohibit a Practice which had been lawful before. If therefore our Saviour had intended these Words as a standing, universal Law, binding all Christians in no Case to take Arms in their own Defence against lawless Violence, he would undoubtedly have declar'd himself in such distinct Terms, and in such a plain Dress of Words, as should have been liable to no Misapprehension ; it being highly necessary in such a Case, where the Matter of the Law was so weighty, and so new.

THE *Jews*, as well as all other Nations, had been bred in the full Conviction of the Lawfulness of Self-defence against unjust Violence, it having been practised all along from the Beginning of the World to that Time. If our Saviour therefore had intended by an express positive Law to prohibit it under the Gospel, he would undoubtedly have express'd himself in so plain and intelligible a Manner, as every Man of sound Judgment might have readily understood : *As, Let no Man from henceforth take up Arms to defend himself in any Case whatsoever ;* or in Words as easy to be understood. This I say was absolutely necessary in publishing a new Law of such mighty

Con-

Consequence ; especially when we consider that the Words were address'd to the *Jews*, who could not conceive nor imagine but that they were obliged by the judicial Law of *Moses*, so long as their Commonwealth should stand.

BUT this I apprehend to be very far from the Case with the Words in Question : For in order, with any Colour of Reason, to make them amount to a Law prohibiting Self-defence in all Cases, they must necessarily be understood without any Restriction or Limitation ; but if they must be understood without any Restriction or Limitation, they will prove more than my Opponents want them to prove, *viz.* That we must resist neither moral nor natural Evil. At this Rate, it will be unlawful to resist a Robber or Cut-Throat ; it will be unlawful for the most virtuous Matron to resist a Ravisher ; for a Father to resist the Violence of an unnatural Child ; or for a Master to resist the violent Insults of undutiful Servants : Nay, it will be unlawful to resist even the Devil and the strongest Temptations to Sin, contrary to the whole Tenor of the Gospel. It will likewise be unlawful to resist natural Evil, such as a raging Conflagration, an overflowing Inundation, a mad Dog, or any wild Beast, that is ready to devour us. By Virtue of this Precept, if taken in an unlimited Sense, it will be unlawful for the Magistrate to punish Malefactors with Death, and to put a Stop to other Enormities committed by his evil Subjects against the publick Peace of the Community ; and so by this Means he will bear the Sword in vain, and neither be a Terror to Evil-doers, nor a Praise to them that do well, contrary to the express Words of the great Apostle *St. Paul*.

WHEREFORE I conclude, that our Saviour never intended by these Words, *Resist not Evil*, to bind all Christians, in all Ages, never to take up Arms in their own Defence, in any Case whatsoever ; more

than he intended thereby to bind them never to resist either moral or natural Evil, or to bind the Christian Magistrate never to punish the Crimes of his evil Subjects.

Thus we see how improper these Words are to prove the Point in Question : For if they be taken in an unlimited Sense, they will prove a great deal too much ; and if we take them in a limited Sense, they will not come up to the End design'd, viz. To prove the Unlawfulness of Defensive War in all Cases.

AND as for those Words, v. 44th, *Love your Enemies, &c.* neither will these prove any such Law as is here demanded ; because the Term, *Enemies*, being applicable either to private or publick Enemies, we cannot be certain which our Saviour meant ; whether he meant only those who may be at Enmity with us in the Society where we live, or foreign Enemies, to whom we stand in no other Relation than as we are Men ; or lastly, whether he meant all Sorts of Enemies, whether foreign or domestick. What Reason any Man hath to understand the Words in either the second or third Sense, I cannot conceive ; but that they ought to be understood in the first, seems evident from hence ; that the *Hebrew* Law, which the Scribes and Pharisees had perverted and obscured by their false Glosses, commanded the *Jews* to love their Neighbour ; by whom they understood *Jews* and their Proselytes : But those Laws which forbid them to do Hurt, reach'd even to those uncircumcised Strangers that liv'd among them, as appears from *Lev. xix. 18. Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thyself.* And *v. 34. The Stranger that sojourneth with you, shall be as one Home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself ; for ye were Strangers in the Land of Egypt.*

YE have heard, saith our Saviour, that it hath been said, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour, and hate thine Enemy.*

Enemy. *Hate thine Enemy* was a false Gloss, added by the Scribes and Pharisees ; for these Words are not to be found in the Law of *Moses*. This Law, I say, commanded the *Jews* to love their Neighbours, uncircumcised Strangers among them, as well as those of their own Nation.

Now what I would observe from hence is this, That notwithstanding this Precept of loving their Neighbours, the eleven Tribes did justly make War against the Tribe of *Benjamin*, for a most barbarous Piece of Villainy committed by them, of which we read, *Judges* xix.

So, notwithstanding this Precept, did holy *David*, who is said in Scripture to fight the Lord's Battles, recover by Force of Arms the Kingdom that was promis'd to him ; and yet we do not find that he was ever blam'd for it.

Why then might not our blessed Saviour enjoin Christians to love Enemies, and yet not thereby oblige them to suffer all Sorts of unlawful Violence from them, as well as the God of the *Hebrews* enjoin'd them to love their Neighbours, and yet did not make it unlawful for them to make War upon those very Neighbours, when there was just Ground for it ? If it was not unlawful for the *Jews*, notwithstanding God's Precept to them, *Ye shall love your Neighbours as yourselves*, to make War upon their Brethren and Neighbours, when there was just Ground for it ; it can with no Colour of Reason be supposed to be unlawful for Christians to make War upon a foreign Enemy, when there is just Grounds for it, from Christ's Words, *Love your Enemies*. Because as the *Jews* did love their Neighbours, and yet sometimes did lawfully make War upon them ; so may Christians love Enemies, and yet sometimes lawfully make War against them, to defend themselves from unjust Violence.

BUT I expect it will be said, that the Gospel requires an higher Degree of Love than what was required by the *Jewish* Law : All which I readily grant ; but even then it will not follow, that we must love all with an equal Degree of Love ; our Parents and Children, I hope, are to be preferred before Strangers ; and our Neighbours before our Enemies. If this be granted, it will follow, *a fortiori*, that I ought to prefer my own Life before the Life of my Enemy ; then of Consequence I ought to destroy the Life of my Enemy, if I can by no other Means possibly save my own.

As 'tis out of Love to the Righteous, that the Christian Magistrate puts the Wicked to Death ; so it is out of Regard for the publick Good, that he makes War in Defence of his innocent Subjects. In order to preserve the publick Peace, he makes War against those that disturb it.

If it be reasonable that the greater Obligation should bind us to the stricter Duty (and that it is so, no reasonable Man will deny) then it will follow, that we cannot in Reason be bound to preserve the Guilty, when in so doing we destroy the Innocent. Let it be suppos'd, that by Virtue of this Precept, *Love your Enemies*, we are bound to love them as ourselves, which yet I presume is more than can with any Shew of Reason be inferred from the Words ; yet we are not to love them above ourselves. Now supposing us both to be involv'd in the same Danger, I would seriously ask those who are against all Defence by Force of Arms, whose Safety we are to prefer ? For my own Part, I am clearly of Opinion, that we ought to prefer our own to that of our Enemy ; for this Reason, because we are nowhere, that I know of, forbid to do so.

4. THAT our blessed Saviour never intended that these Texts should be understood without any Limitation, without which they will not serve our Adversary's

versary's Purpose, will appear from a Consideration of some other Texts in the New-Testament, express'd in Terms more unlimited than these, which yet are allow'd on all Hands to require a limited Interpretation. St. *Matthew* v. 42. our Saviour expressly says, *Give to him that asketh.* And in St. *Luke* the Words are, *Give to every Man that asketh of thee, and of him that taketh away thy Goods, ask them not again.*

Now if this general Precept to Christians, ought to be understood with a Limitation, why not those which are brought to prove the Unlawfulness of Resistance in all Cases? Nay, there is more Reason to restrain these latter than the former, not only from the Nature of the Thing, but from our Saviour's own following Words. For when he says, *Resist not Evil*, the Precept following seems to restrain the Words preceding, as if they were too general. *But if any Man strike thee on one Cheek, says he, turn to him the other.* Which Words plainly intimate, that our Saviour meant only such Injuries as were slight, and therefore easy to be borne. For otherwise it had been necessary, in order to make the Precept binding, to have said, Resist not him that injures thee, even tho' he should attempt to take away thy Life. But when he says, *Give to every one that asketh thee*, he adds no Words to restrain his Meaning, but leaves it to the Judgment of common Equity and Discretion. And yet I think no Man of a sound Mind will say, that these Words ought to be understood in an unlimited Sense. Whoever does, contradicts St. *Paul*, whom yet all allow to be the best Interpreter of his Master's Will. This great Apostle declares, that he who takes no Care for his Family (which how well he could do, that should give to every one that would ask from him, I leave the World to judge) is worse than an Infidel: And who, exhorting the *Corinthians* to extend their Libe-

ality to the Poor at Jerusalem, *Matth. xxi. 13.* *Not that others should be eas'd, and yet be serv'd. 2 Cor. viii. 13.* But that by an Equality your Abundance should supply their Wants.

Our Saviour saith, *St. Luke vi. 27.* *Leave us for the Meat which periseth.* Now can any one think our Saviour intended that these Words should be understood without any Limitation? If they do, how will they account for those other Scripture Precepts which enjoin Christians to work with their Hands that which is good, *Eph. iv. 28.* and to do their own Business, and the like? We are likewise enjoin'd to take no Thought for the Morrow; to take no Thought for Food and Raiment; not to fear them that can kill the Body; not to seek earthly Things; Children are commanded to obey their Parents, and Servants their Masters, in all Things; Christians are commanded to be subject to the higher Powers, without any Limitation; to pray without ceasing, and the like; and all in Terms as general and unlimited as those in the Text under Debate: And yet I presume no Man in his Senses will say, that these Precepts are to be understood without any Limitation: So as that by Virtue thereof, it is unlawful for Christians to use a provident Care for the Good of Society; or to endeavour to prevent Murder and Bloodshed; or that Subjects, Children, and Servants, are thereby oblig'd to obey Magistrates, Parents, or Masters, if their Commands be sinful; i. e. if they command them to do what is repugnant to the Laws of God; because in such Cases they are bound by the Law of Nature, to obey God rather than Man. And if these are not to be understood in an unlimited Sense, because of the absurd Consequences that would result from such an Interpretation, why those? Since the latter would be attended with more absurd Consequences than the former, as I have already shewn.

Is this Case it would be unlawful for the Magistrate to inflict Punishments on criminal Offenders, or to use the Sword in Defence of his Subjects, against Robbers and Cut-throats ; because this would be to resist Evil, and inconsistent with the Love of Enemies ; and then how soon would the Christian World be over-run with Rapine and Violence ? And what a Deluge of Wickedness, of all Sorts, would break in upon every Christian State ? ‘ This every one may be convinc’d of, that will but consider what sad Effects this Remission brought upon the World before the Flood ; and observe how hardly these Sins of Rapine and Cruelty are restrain’d now, notwithstanding the Magistrate’s Diligence ? There is no general Precept, how positive soever, but what implies Exceptions in extraordinary Cases ; and such are all Cases of indispensable Necessity. ‘ To the universal Voice of Nature, that Necessity creates an Exception to every general Rule. So that granting these Words to be even general Precepts, prohibiting Injury and Revenge among Christians, it will not follow, that a necessary Self-defence against unjust Violence is thereby prohibited, because it may be reasonably suppos’d to be an Exception from the general Rule, as being, in some Cases, the only Means in our Power, under God, to protect and preserve civil Societies.

In interpreting Scripture, it ought always to be a Rule with us, to endeavour to explain it so, as to free it from all Absurdities ; but surely those who interpret it so, as to make Christianity an Enemy to the Happiness of human Society, which it must be, if resisting an Enemy be unlawful in all Cases, unless they can prove that God has promis’d to interpose in ordinary Cases by a miraculous Providence, do not well consider this. For it not only implies a gross Absurdity, but reflects a palpable Calumny on the best Religion in the World, by representing it as

necessarily laying Men open and unguarded to all the Outrages the vilest Part of the World think fit to offer them. Our Saviour therefore cannot be suppos'd in these Words to put the Case of a foreign Invasion, or that we should love Russians, and Cut-throats, which is impossible.

BUT 'tis said, ' If the glorious Doctrines of the *Messiah* were universally embrac'd, there would be ' no Need of Self-defence : '---Which I readily grant ; but this can be no Argument against the Lawfulness thereof in some Cases, while there is Need of it. The Gospel hath never yet been universally embrac'd, nor is it the Case at present ; and therefore the Objection implies, that Self-defence is still necessary ; and if necessary, it must be as lawful now as formerly, since no Law can be produc'd prohibiting it.

WHEN the Doctrines of Christianity shall be universally embrac'd among the Nations, which we believe will be the Case before the End of the World ; when the Jews shall be converted, and all Nations sincerely embrace Christianity : then there will be an universal Peace : *Nation shall not lift up Sword against Nation, nor Kingdom against Kingdom, neither shall they learn War any more* : Then they may beat their Swords into Plowshares, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks, because there will be no Use for them : But it does not follow from hence, that 'tis unlawful to use them before that Time come. Then indeed it would be unlawful to use them, because there will be no unjust Violence to resist : But that does not prove, that it is unlawful to use them now, when Circumstances are such, that they are the only human Means, under God, to protect Christian Societies from unjust Violence. These Prophecies only foretel what shall be the Effects of their Accomplishment, and therefore can be no Argument that Christians may not lawfully defend them-

themselves and their Country, till such times as they shall be fulfill'd, when all Wars shall cease, and then there will be no Occasion for Self-defence ; there will be no Violence, and consequently no need of Resistance.

BUT it is ask'd, ' Is Defensive War then our only Barrier against Injustice and Violence ? ' To which I Answer, By no means ; God forbid we should think so. For as the Apostle says, *Of ourselves we can do nothing*, even in this Case, *but all our Sufficiency is of God*. And the Psalmist says, *Except the Lord keep the City, the Watchman waketh but in vain*, Psal. cxvii. 1. All we contend for is, that it is the only Means under God, as far as we have any reasonable Grounds to believe, for this Purpose. 'Tis further said, ' That there are many who depend upon, and confide solely in another Barrier, viz. the eternal and beneficent Providence of God. ' That it is the Duty of every Christian to depend upon, and confide in the Providence of Almighty God, I readily grant ; but that it is our Duty to confide *solely* (if by this Term be intended a Disuse of Means) in the Divine Providence, I deny ; and whoever asserts it, 'tis incumbent upon him to prove it ; without which, the Assertion is rash, and the Practice built upon it groundless and dangerous. 'Tis true God can protect us from the greatest Violence, without any of our Endeavours ; but it is one Thing what God can do, and another what he will or does do, in the general Course of his Providence. He can protect us from the Devil, and all his Temptations, and yet we are expressly commanded to resist him, and to strive against his Temptations. He could have protected and defended his chosen People the Jews from all their Enemies, and brought them into the promised Land, without the Effusion of so much Blood ; and yet we find he gave them special Directions in what Method they should protect and defend them-

themselves, and drive out their Enemies from before them, as the Scripture expresses it. He could, by his Almighty Providence, have saved *St. Paul* and the *Ship* without the Help of Mariners ; and yet when they were about to leave it, *St. Paul* cried out, *Except these abide in the Ship, ye cannot be saved*, Acts xxvii. 31. notwithstanding he had said, c. 22. that there should be no Loss of any Man's Life, but of the Ship ; which is a plain Demonstration, that it is presumptuous for Men, in the ordinary Course of God's Providence, to expect Protection and Deliverance from Injuries, without using their own Endeavours, at the same time that they confidently rely on the Divine Providence for Success.

He could have recovered *Ihezekiah*, when he was sick unto Death ; and yet, we find, he was ordered by a Prophet, to take a Lump of Figs, and to lay it upon the Boil, upon which he recovered, 2 Kings xx. 7.

God Almighty, if he pleased, could not only keep us from, but cure us of, all Diseases, by his all-powerful Providence ; and yet he not only permits, but requires us in Holy Scripture, to use all prudent Methods of resisting and stopping their Fury ; and is far from expecting that we should lie down and do nothing to save our selves from perishing in such Calamities.

AND as God, in the general Course of his Providence, protected and defended his own peculiar People from the Violence of their Enemies, not without, but always by the Use of second Means (except when he was pleased to work a Miracle in their Favour, which yet was very seldom notwithstanding they were under a Theocratical Government, whereby God himself was their King ; this I say being the Case with God's peculiar People under an extraordinary Providence, we who lie under a common Providence, as to our civil Policy, can have

have no Ground to expect any miraculous Interposition for our Protection and Defence from Violence ; nor can any good Reasons be assign'd why we should. Nothing can be a sufficient Ground for such an Expectation, but an express Promise in the New-Testament ; without this, a Belief that God's Providence will protect us, without using our own Endeavours, would be Presumption, and not Faith * : For that cannot be a right Faith that has no sure Grounds to rest upon ; and nothing can be a sure Ground of Faith, but God's Promise respecting that which is the Object of this Faith. If God has given Christians any such Promise, let it be produc'd ; but till this is done, let no Man blame them for using those Means for the Preservation and Protection of the publick Safety, with a pious Dependence on the Divine Providence for Success, which good Men in all Ages have made use of with his Approbation.

And thus I have endeavour'd to make it appear, that those Texts, which are the strongest Bulwark for supporting the Doctrine of the Unlawfulness of War in all Cases under the Gospel, cannot amount to a Law prohibiting Christians to defend themselves against the lawless Violence of a foreign Enemy.

T H E R E are some other Texts alledged by our Adversaries, in favour of this Doctrine ; but none of them I think can even be pretended to amount to a Law ; but are only to be adduced as collateral Proofs ; the two I have already considered, being the chief Basis upon which the whole of their Doctrine is built.

I SHALL examine one other Text, which, next to these, seems most to favour their Doctrine ; and that is written, Rom. xii. 17. *Recompence to no Man Evil for Evil : Dearly beloved, avenge not your selves, but*

* By Faith in this Place we are to understand what the Latins call *Fiducia*.

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 Drink, &c.*

1. As to these Words, *Recompence to no Man Evil for Evil*, they being our Saviour's Words, repeated by St. Paul, with some little Variation in the Phrase, tho' not in the Sense ; what hath been advanc'd in Answer to those, will be a sufficient Answer to these. They are not address'd to the Magistrate, who hath the sole Right of making War. but to the injured Party ; and therefore it cannot reasonably be inferr'd from them, that St. Paul intended hereby to forbid all War under the Gospel.

2. And as to those, c. 19, neither can any good Argument be drawn from them against all Sorts of War ; forasmuch as some Sorts of War may be commenc'd without any Desire of Revenge, but merely from the Principle of Self-preservation.

3. But that no conclusive Argument can be inferr'd from these Words against all War under the Gospel, will farther appear from hence ; that at the very Time when God appropriated to himself the Sword of Vengeance, saying, Deut. xxxii. 35. *Vengeance is mine, I will recompence*, Laws were actually in being for regulating and making War. And the Jews at the same Time that they were bound by the Law of God not to revenge themselves upon their Enemies, if Countrymen or Strangers, admitted to live among them (because Vengeance belonged to God, and he had promis'd to recompence it) might yet lawfully make War in some Cases, without a positive Command of God, as to this or that particular War ; as is evident from the many Directions he had given them concerning this Matter, in the 20th Chapter of this same Book.

St. PAUL

St. PAUL therefore might enjoin Christians not to revenge themselves upon their Enemies (because Vengeance belonged to God, and he would recompence it) as well as God had enjoin'd the *Jews* not to do so, for the same Reason, and yet not thereby intend to prohibit all Sorts of War under the Gospel. For as God in speaking these Words to the *Jews*, did not design they should prohibit all Sorts of War among them, as appears by what has been said already, and which St. *Paul*, and those Christians to whom he wrote, could not but know; so if St. *Paul* had intended that this Precept should oblige them to any Thing farther than what he had oblig'd the *Jews* to, he should certainly have mentioned it. As the Words when spoken to the *Jews*, imply'd nothing but a Prohibition of private Revenge, how could the Apostle imagine that the *Romans* could understand them as prohibiting all Sorts of War under the Gospel, unless he had told them so in express Words? For what had been constantly practised by God's own People from the Beginning to that Time, and universally received as just and lawful, could not be reputed otherwise by any Thing the Apostle could say, less than an express Prohibition of all Sorts of War in plain Terms.

If therefore he had intended that this Precept should oblige all Christians, or even those Christians to whom he wrote this Epistle, not to defend themselves against the unjust Attempts of a foreign Enemy, he would undoubtedly have said so in express Words; since otherwise it was not to be expected they could understand the Words, *Revenge not yourselves*, to import any such Thing: But as he did not, we may reasonably conclude, that he did not intend thereby to prohibit all Sorts of War under the Gospel.

4. BUT that no conclusive Argument can be infer'd from these Words, against all Sorts of War under

under the Gospel, will still further appear from this Consideration : The Apostle, Chap. 13th of this Epistle, says, *Let every Soul be subject to the higher Powers ; i. e. the Magistrate : And §. 4. he tells them, That he beareth not the Sword in vain ; that as he is the Minister of God for Good, so is he the Minister of God for Vengeance ; a Revenger to execute Wrath on him that doth Evil.*

Now in telling them that those higher Powers are the Executioners of God's Wrath in punishing Evil-doers, he clearly distinguishes between Revenge in the Magistrate, and Revenge in private Persons. The Magistrate he owns is to be a Revenger, that is, he is to execute Wrath, or inflict Punishment on them that do Evil, and that by Virtue of his Office, as he is God's Minister, whose alone Prerogative it is to recompence Vengeance on the Guilty ; when at the same time he had expressly prohibited it before, in the general Precept, *Avenge not yourselves.* Whence it plainly appears, that he did not intend by this Precept to prohibit Christian Magistrates the Use of the Sword to defend their Subjects from lawless Violence.

To suppose the contrary, would make the Apostle guilty of an Absurdity. ' For if we include in ' that negative Precept, that Revenge which is inflicted by the Magistrate for the publick Peace, ' what can be more absurd, than after he had charg'd ' all Christians never to take Arms in their own Defence, as our Adversaries contend he did, to have ' immediately subjoin'd in the same Epistle, that to ' this very End God had ordained Magistrates, that ' they, as his Ministers, should defend Christians by ' Force of Arms, for so the Power of the Sword ' must needs signify, if any Thing.' To say, as some do, that St. Paul by the Sword here means an inward and spiritual Sword, is something so idle and impertinent, that it doth not deserve an Answer.

Nobody

Nobody will say so in earnest, that has not renounced common Sense, and given up his Reason for a Spirit of Delusion; and when once this is the Case with any Man, it is in vain to reason with him: For as we have no other Way to convince a Man of the Truth of any Proposition but by Reasoning, 'tis not to be imagined that ever he will be convinced, who is so far from being determined by right Reason, that he denies the very Existence thereof; and yet whoever does so, must argue against Reason, either with Reason, or without it; in the latter Way he does nothing, and in the former he betrays his own Cause, and establishes that which he labours to dethrone. ' To prove there is no such Thing as right Reason, by any good Argument, ' is indeed a paradox; because that would be to ' prove there is such a Thing, by the Manner of ' proving there is not.' Such wild Absurdities are those of men upon, who have given up their Understandings to Whim and Enthusiasm.

But perhaps it will be said by our Adversaries on this point, That they don't deny a Right of making War to Christian Magistrates; so far from it, that they rather applaud them for so doing, ' By declaring they think it probable, that God will bless ' their Arms with Success: ' Which must certainly imply a Belief that such a Practice is lawful, unless we can suppose that they can with Success to an unlawful Action, provided they themselves have no Hand in it. But I will put no such uncharitable Construction on their Words; but supposing them to be sincere in this Declaration, shall beg Leave to assure them, that if they will make it appear, that 'tis their real Opinion that the Christian Magistrates may lawfully defend their innocent Subjects from the lawless Violence of a foreign Enemy, They and I shall be Adversaries on this Point no longer: For I

perfectly agree with them, not only that all War is to be avoided under the Gospel, when this can be done without incurring a greater Evil; but that 'tis the sole Right of the Magistrate to commence even a lawful War: Nay, I will agree with them farther, that 'tis unlawful even for the Christian Magistrate himself to commence and prosecute any sort of War but what is justly grounded; which I think no War can be, even the Defensive, that is undertaken purely from a Principle of Revenge, when the Good of the Publick does not necessarily require it.

BUT, after all, I must own myself at a Loss how to reconcile this specious Pretence with the general Doctrine these Men have delivered on this Point: For they have expressly asserted in all their Writings on that Subject, that all bearing of Arms against an Enemy, is inconsistent with the true Profession of Christianity*; nay, that all Use of the Sword by Christians, tho' to save themselves from Thieves, Robbers or Cut-throats, is not only inconsistent with the Profession of Christianity, but as bad as Atheism, as being a distrustful of Providence in restraining evil Men. Now, this being the Case, I cannot see, and indeed he must have good Eyes that can, how that can be lawful in the Christian Magistrate, which, by virtue of Christianity, is not only unlawful in itself, but as bad as Atheism?

IF all War be unlawful under the Gospel, by virtue of Christ's Command, as they say it is, it must, in my humble Opinion, be a Sin in any Christian, whether Magistrate or Subject, to engage even in a Defensive War against a lawless Invader, unless it can be made appear that the Magistrate is an Exception

* See Declaration to the King, *Anno* 1660.

ception from the general Rule. And besides, if it be not unlawful for the Christian Magistrate to defend his Subjects from lawless Violence, how can it be unlawful for those Subjects to help to defend themselves at their Magistrate's Command? If the End be lawful, the ordinary Means for obtaining it must be so likewise. Now, the ordinary Means whereby the Christian Magistrate can defend the Publick from Ruin against a foreign Enemy, is the mutual Assistance of his Subjects; it cannot therefore be unlawful for Christian Subjects to assist the Magistrate in Defence of the Publick against a foreign Enemy*: Nay, so far is it from being unlawful, that it is their indispensable Duty, inasmuch as they are obliged, by the Laws of Christianity, to be subject to the higher Powers, and obey the Magistrate, in all Things lawful; and what is lawful for him to command, cannot be unlawful for the Subject to obey; so that our Adversaries, on this Point, must either shew where Christianity has made War lawful for Christian Magistrates, while at the same time it has made War unlawful for Christians; or else it will follow, from the whole Tenor of their Doctrine on this Point, that it is as unlawful for Magistrates as for Subjects: But how this can be reconciled with their thinking it probable that God will bless their Arms with Success, I own is more than I can account for, with any Advantage to their Character.

Away then with that idle Distinction (to call it no worse) That tho' Christians may not make use of carnal Weapons in their own necessary Defence as Christians, yet they may as Magistrates. By this very Argument the *Romish* Antichrist defends the Lawfulness of using the temporal Sword to cut off Hereticks; which, whatever Weight it may have

D 2

with

* See Preface, p. 10, 11.

with some People, it is so far from having any with us, that we heartily abominate it.

AGAIN, If it be not unlawful for the Christian Magistrate to defend the Publick from the Violence of foreign Enemies, why do *Quaker Magistrates* among us so peremptorily refuse to lend the least Assistance towards it, when we apprehend ourselves in so great Danger? They cannot be ignorant, that it is the Magistrate's Duty to use his utmost Endeavours for the Protection of the Subject from all lawless Violence and Oppression, which in many Cases cannot be done, without opposing Force to Force by the carnal Sword. Now what can make them so backward to assist those who are willing to exert themselves to the utmost of their Power in defending of their Country, but that they think the Practice is unlawful? How then can any one of that Persuasion think it probable, that God will bless the Arms of their Sovereign, if it be inconsistent with the Principles of the Christian Religion to use them at all? And if it be not, how can they answer it to God and their own Consciences, who absolutely refuse to do that which is their Duty to do, and without which, this Part of his Majesty's Dominions, for any Thing they know to the contrary, may be quite ruined?

BUT here we shall be told, that the Friends, tho' principled against bearing Arms themselves, yet have never condemned such in the Use of them, who are not convinc'd that the Dispensation of the Gospel forbid them. These smooth Words, in my Opinion, mean nothing at all. For if being charged with a Practice that is inconsistent with the true Profession of Christianity, nay with Atheism, and a total Disbelief of Divine Providence, be not a very severe Condemnation, I submit to the unprejudic'd Reader to judge. And that they have
done

done so often than once, appears from the most authentick of their own Writings*.

Our Principle is, that it is a Duty indispensibly incumbent, both on us and them, to defend ourselves and Country from the lawless Attempts of a foreign Enemy by outward Means, at the same Time that we rely on Divine Providence for Protection : And till they can prove the contrary from the New Testament, which I am confident they cannot, we cannot help thinking, that in condemning this Practice as inconsistent with the Christian Religion, they condemn all who are in the Use of it, notwithstanding this specious Declaration to the contrary. We are not convinc'd that the Dispensation of the Gospel forbids any Christian Community to defend themselves from the Violence of a foreign Enemy ; because, as I have already shewn, it is evident almost to a Demonstration, that there is no Ground for such a Conviction in the New Testament ; and therefore if our Adversaries, on this Point, be so convinced, it must be by other Arguments than any that can be drawn from thence ; which we looking upon as the only Rule of our Faith and Practice, think ourselves bound in Conscience to abide by it, and to be determin'd thereby, as to every Point of Duty. What it hath enjoin'd, we willingly observe ; and such Practices as were lawful before, and not made unlawful by it (there being an equal Necessity for them now as before) we think we may lawfully, and with a good Conscience, embrace. This is our Rule, and our Practice in this Particular, we hope, is not contrary thereto. We are therefore determin'd to regard no private Spirit, under whatever specious Colours of Sanctity and Perfection it may appear ; because many lying Spirits are gone out into the World, and such we

D 3

believe

* Coll. of *Barclay's Works*, Page 870. Declaration to the King, 1660. Tryals of *George Keith*.

believe every Spirit to be, that attempts to make void the Law of Nature, introduce Principles as Doctrines of Christianity, which, in the present Circumstances of the World, would soon destroy Christianity, and bring all the Christian States on Earth, into the most absolute Slavery and Oppression.

AND thus I hope I have made it appear, to the Satisfaction of every unprejudic'd, intelligent Reader, that it is not unlawful in all Cases for Christians to make War under the Gospel.

The End of the FIRST PART.

A
T R E A T I S E

On the LAWFULNESS of

DEFENSIVE WAR.

P A R T S E C O N D.

I SHOULD now conclude, were it not that a certain Author, in a late Pamphlet, entitled, *The Doctrine of Christianity, as held by the People called Quakers, vindicated; in Answer to Gilbert Tennent's Sermon on the Lawfulness of Defensive War*; hath undertaken to prove, by fair and candid Interpretations of Scripture, as himself expresses it, that War in any Shape (for so he must be understood to mean, if he means any thing) is inconsistent with the Christian Religion. And because some of his Remarks may seem to affect the general Doctrine I have endeavoured to establish in the First Part of this Treatise, I think it my Duty, for the better Support thereof, to examine all such Passages as have the least Tendency that Way.

THE first of his Remarks that seems to affect my Doctrine, is Page 3. in these Words, ' God created
' Man good, upright, and holy; and had he con-
' tinued in this State, there never would have been

any War, and consequently Need of Self-defence ; but Man falling through Disobedience, his Nature became corrupted, his Faculties depraved, and the whole intellectual System disorder'd. Thus began shedding of Blood, and the Earth was early fill'd with Violence. This was the unhappy Consequence of Sin. Nobody, says he, I hope, will say that God was the Author of Nature thus corrupted. The Nature, and the Light of Nature, that he was the Author of, was holy, innocent, and perfect, but the Corruption of Nature, from whence proceeded Violence and Bloodshed, was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan.' Answer,

THAT if Man had not fallen from his State of Innocence, there would have been no War, and consequently no Need of Defence, every One will readily grant : But that immediately upon the Fall, Man's Nature was as highly corrupted, as this Vindicator represents it, in my humble Opinion, wants Proof. For tho' it pleas'd God, for wise Ends, best known to himself, to permit Man to fall, yet he was so far from abandoning him hereupon, that he takes Care to provide for his Happiness, by entering into another Covenant with him, in these Words ; *The Seed of the Woman shall bruise the Head of the Serpent.* 'Tis true Men being left to the Freedom of their own Wills, some of them, no Doubt, made a bad Use of their Liberty, and abandon'd themselves to great Enormities ; but it does not appear that this was the Case with all of them, or that it was a necessary Consequence of the Fall, because there were good Men notwithstanding this, who did many Things agreeable to the Dictates of the Law of Nature ; as *Adam, Seth, Enos, Methusalem, Noah* ; and it doth no where appear that those Patriarchs had any other Rule whereby to guide their Practice, but this eternal Law of Righteousness ; which is nothing else

else but the unchangeable Will of God, constantly acting according to the eternal Rules of infinite Goodness, Justice, and Truth : Which Will of God, is engraven upon the Natures of Things, and to be discovered by the due Use of Mens rational Faculties. This Law hath God for its Author, was to have been the Rule of Duty in Paradise, and was so to the Patriarchs till *Moses's* Time, when God was pleased to make a particular Revelation of it to his chosen People in the Decalogue ; which is only a Transcript of this Law.

BUT to clear this Subject from the Rubbish of Words, under which this *V.* hath buried it, I will prove,

I. THE Existence of the Law of Nature ; and that it was the Rule of Duty, in ordinary Cases, to Mankind before the giving of the Law to *Moses*. And secondly, That Man's Nature by the Fall was not so corrupted, but that he could discern it to be so, tho' he had not Power sufficient to perform it in all Cases.

I. THAT there are natural, essential Differences, in the Natures of Things, as between Truth and Falshood, Good-faith and Perfidiousness, Gratitude and Ingratitude, Love and Hatred, Just and Unjust, Right and Wrong, &c. And hence a Fitness and Unfitness in Actions to certain Ends, has ever been evident to the common Reason of Mankind*.

THESE, and the like eternal Truths, considered as a System of moral Principles, which have their Foundation in the Nature and Reason of Things, are what we call the Law of Nature, Right Reason, the eternal Rule of Righteousness, or the unchangeable Will of God, written in the Books of Nature. This is the immutable Standard of moral Duty ; whatever is agreeable to it is morally Good, and *vice versa*. Virtue and Vice are not meer arbitrary Things,

* See Preface, Page 5.

Things ; what is morally fit and proper is virtuous ; what is morally unfit and improper is vicious. And the same wise and good Being, who constituted Nature in such a Manner, that this Fitness or Unfitness should immediately result from it, must intend that every intelligent Being, so far as he is capable of discerning these Things, should act agreeably thereto. This Law, we say, God is the Author of, because those moral Principles, which are founded in the Nature and Reason of Things, were originally constituted such by him, who is the Supreme Author of Nature. This was *Adam's* Law in Paradise, and continued to be a Law to Mankind, as far as we know, till the Time of *Moses*, when a Transcript of it was delivered to him in the Mount. For tho' God made some special Revelations to the Patriarchs, he never gave them any System of Laws to be a Rule of Practice before this. And thus it appears, that there exists in Nature such a Law as we plead for.

BUT by the Account the *V.* gives us of human Nature after the Fall, this Law was of no Use to Mankind, because they were incapable of discovering what Duties were incumbent by virtue of it.

HE gives such a strange Description of the Corruption of Man's Nature, and the Depravation of his Faculties, as if he thought the Patriarchs neither had any Law to guide their Practice, nor were capable of obeying it if they had. But how he came to discover such a total Depravation immediately upon the Fall I know not. Certainly he never learnt it from the History of *Moses*. For so far as I can find there, what *Adam* lost by the Fall was Paradise, and the Tree of Life ; *i. e.* in other Words, he lost Bliss and Immortality. The Penalty annex'd to the Breach of the Law, with the Sentence pronounced by God upon it, shews this. The Penalty stands thus, *Gen. ii. 17. In the Day that thou eatest thereof,*

of, thou shalt surely die. How was this executed? He did eat, but in the Day he did eat, he did not actually die, but was turned out of Paradise from the Tree of Life, and shut out forever from it, lest he should take thereof, and live forever. This shews that Paradise was a State of Immortality, which he lost that very Day that he eat: His Life began from thence to shorten, and waste, and to have an End.

Now is it at all likely, that as soon as *Adam* was turn'd out of Paradise, his Faculties became so depraved, that he lost all Knowledge of that immutable Rule of Duty, with which he must have been perfectly well acquainted in Paradise? 'Tis true his Posterity, thro' Length of Time, became very debauch'd, both in Principle and Practice; but still as there were many good Men, both before the Flood, and from thence to *Moses's* Time, they must have had some Law to be a Rule of Practice, and this Law they must have been capable of knowing, otherwise it could be no Rule to them, and consequently they could have been guilty of no Sin, because where there is no Law, there can be no Transgression; and Sin is only a Transgression of a divine Law. And tho' a Law exists, yet if it be impossible for Men to come at the Knowledge of such a Law, 'tis all one, in regard to them, as if there were none; it being impossible for them to obey a Law, the Knowledge of which 'tis impossible for them to come at.

BUT that Mankind, notwithstanding the Corruption of Nature this *V.* talks of, were not ignorant of the Law of Nature, nor altogether incapable of obeying its Dictates, will farther appear from what follows.

THO' *Moses* was the first Man that had a written Law for a Rule of Practice, whence it is called, *Lex Moralis*, or the Law of Morals, yet they who lived

liv'd before *Moses* were not without a Law, because they had this moral Law written in their Hearts ; *i. e.* by the due Use of their rational Powers, they discovered the Will of God concerning their moral Duty to be founded in the Natures and Reason of Things. The *Gentiles*, both before and after *Moses* (as saith St. *Paul*) doing by Nature, or finding it reasonable to do the Things contained in the moral Law ; these having not the moral Law written on Tables of Stone, were nevertheless a Law unto themselves : What to do ? Not what they pleased, not what their irregular Appetites prompted them to ; but they were a Law unto themselves, to do the Work of the Law of Nature, or the moral Law written in their Hearts, instead of Tables of Stone. The Apostle, by a common Figure, puts the Effect of the Law for the Law itself, which indeed is equivalent thereto, as he shews thus ; Their Consciences bore Witness, and their Thoughts reflecting on their Actions, accus'd, or excus'd them in what they did. Thus it appears that there is such a Law as that of Nature, which exist'd long before any positive Law was given : That it is the universal Law of all reasonable Creatures, and that it was the only Rule of moral Practice before that Transcript of it was given to *Moses*, which we call the Decalogue. Thus doth St. *Chrysostom* expound this Passage of St. *Paul*, ' The Gentiles by Nature, saith St. *Paul*, ' that is, saith *Chrysostom*, by the very Dictates of ' right Reason ; in this, says he, are they to be ' admir'd, that they stood in no Need of *Moses's* ' Law to guide them ; they were guided only by ' the Use of Reason, and the Light of their own Con- ' sciences.' Thus also saith *Tertullian*, ' long before ' *Moses* wrote the Law in Tables of Stone, there was ' (as I will justify) a Law naturally understood and ' observed by the Patriarchs.' ' Even Men com- ' mend many Things truly, saith St. *Augustine*, and reprove

‘ reprove many Things as justly ; but by what Rules
 ‘ do they so? Whence do they learn that Men ought
 ‘ to live so, seeing they live not so themselves? Why,
 ‘ says he, these Rules are right and good, and they
 ‘ cannot but see them to be so, tho’ their Minds be
 ‘ not so; the Rules are unchangeable, tho’ their Minds
 ‘ be mutable.’ But further, that Mankind had not
 only the Knowledge of the Law of Nature, but that
 in the great Branches of Morality, they regulated
 their Practice thereby, will appear from a particular
 Consideration of the Decalogue itself, which is the
 great Pandect of this Law ; which, when Men by
 the Abuse of their Faculties had in a great Measure
 crazed out of their Hearts, Almighty God was gra-
 ciously pleased to commit it to Writing, that by having
 an Opportunity of viewing it in more legible Charac-
 ters, they might again revive the Knowledge of it in
 their Minds.

1. To begin with the first Precept, we find *Gen.*
xxxv. 2. That *Jacob* commanded his Household to put
 away their strange Gods. *Pythagoras* says, ‘ If any one
 ‘ shall say that he is a God, but he that made all
 ‘ Things, let him prove it, by making a new
 ‘ World.’ *Sophocles, Varro, Orpheus, Plato, &c.*
 all maintain’d the Unity of the Deity.

2. For the Second, we find that *Jacob* buried
 the Idols under an Oak, *Chap. xxxv. 4.* And the
Gentiles agreed, that every God should be worship-
 ped according to the Manner that himself should think
 best ; and *Varro* did much approve of the *Jews* Re-
 ligion, as *St. Augustine* informs us, because it exclu-
 ded Images, holding it the best Way to keep Re-
 ligion undefiled by excluding them ; and that if all
 People else had taken that Course, it had been a
 Means to take away much trifling.

3. For the Third, we find *Abraham* caused his
 Steward to put his Hand under his Thigh, and
 swear by the Lord of Heaven and Earth ; and we
find

find also a solemn Oath pass'd betwixt *Jacob* and *Laban*, Chap. xxiv. 3. and Chap. xxxi. 53.

AND it was a Law among the *Egyptians*, as *Diodorus* reports, *Let the perjurd be punish'd with Death*. And there was a Law in the twelve Tables at *Rome*, *Swear not rashly*. And *Sopiscles* saith, 'When an Oath is taken, the Soul will be more cautious to Sin against God, and to injure Man.'

4. FOR the Fourth, we find the Observation of it before the giving of the Law, *Exod.* xvi. 23. And tho' as to the particular Day to be spent in the Worship of God, the *Gentiles* knew but little, as being rather positive than moral; yet they all agreed that God was to be worshipped, this being an indisputable Dictate of the Law of Nature. And even as to the particular Day mentioned in this Commandment, I must confess, that the general Consent of Nations, as to the seventh Part, if it were fully clear'd, would speak fair to be the Voice of Nature, or at least a Tradition received from the Sons of *Noah*.

5. FOR the Fifth, we find how *Esau* stood in awe of his Father, tho' he was otherwise prophane, for he would not kill his Brother *Jacob*, while his Father was alive, *Gen.* xxvii. 41.

AND *Homer* saith of one that had a Misfortune, that it came because he honoured not his Parents. He would not render the Duty of a Child to his Father, therefore his Days were not prolonged. And *Menander* saith, That he who honoureth his Parents, shall live long and happily. And *Charondas*, in his Laws, saith, The Neglect of our aged Parents, is Extremity of Wrong.

6. FOR the Sixth, We see a plain Precept, *Gen.* ix. 6. *Whosoever sheddeth Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed*. And every Nation held it a Canon of their Law, *Let a Murderer expect Loss of Life*,

Life, as he depriv'd another of it. And therefore they all punished Murder with Death.

7. FOR the Seventh, *Judab* would have burnt *Tbamar* for playing the Harlot, *Gen. xxxviii. 24.* And *Seckem* was slain for ravishing *Dinab*, and the whole City spoil'd by her Brothers : For their Answer to their Father was, *Should he deal with our Sister as with an Harlot ?* And it was the Saying of *Lycurgus*, ' Avoid Adultery, so shalt thou avoid untimely Death.' And *Menander* censureth Adultery as a disgraceful Sin, because the Price of it is Death.

8. For the Eighth, The putting *Joseph's* Cup into the Mouth of the Sack, was enough, tho' among the *Egyptians*, to clap his Brethren in Prison ; And God forbid, say they, *that we should do this*, Chap. xlv. 7. And *Demosthenes* against *Timocrates*, urges the *Lacedemonian* Law, in the very Words of this Precept, *Thou shalt not steal.* And *Hesiod's* Precept enjoins Men not to possess stolen Goods.

9. FOR the Ninth, Because *Judab* had promised to send a Kid, he would not break his Promise, tho' (as he thought) he had given it to a Harlot, Chap. xxxviii. 17. 20. And it was one of the Laws of the twelve Tables at *Rome*, ' He that shall bear false Witness, let him be cast down from the *Tarpeian* Rock.' And *Phocylides* adviseth, not to utter Lies, but to speak the Truth in all Things.

10. AND for the Tenth, There was no Act that we can learn in *Abimelech* against *Sarah*, and yet the Sin of Concupiscence was punished in him by God, Chap. xx. 3. So *Pharaoh* was plagued for her in the same Case, Chap. xii. 17. And *Menander* hath this Saying, ' Do not *concupiscere*, or desire another Man's Pin or Button.' And indeed tho' the Laws of *Gentile* Nations do not express this, yet the Scope of them all did tend to this End, *Non concupiscere*, not to covet other Men's Properties. Whence we may conclude with *St. Paul*, That the

Gentiles

Gentiles having the Law written in their Hearts, were inexcusable.

FROM all which it appears, that notwithstanding the Corruption of Nature (this *V.* talks of) by the Fall, Mankind were not only sensible of the Obligation of the Law of Nature, but, in all the principal Duties of Morality, were able to comply with it. And as all good Men were directed to their moral Duties by the Dictates of this Law, so were they to that of a necessary Self-defence: For considering that the Preservation of themselves, and those under their Care is a Dictate of the Law of Nature, they could not but conclude that Self-defence, when this cannot possibly be done otherwise, must be a Duty resulting from this Law; it being an indisputable Truth, that whenever it is our Duty to prosecute an End, it must likewise be our Duty to make Use of those Means, without which that End cannot be obtained. Hence all those Wars which good Men undertook without any special Command from God, were agreeable to this Law, as appears from their having been approved of by him after they were commenc'd. But having fully discours'd this Point in the first Part of this Treatise, I shall now proceed to an Examination of the *V.*'s Reasoning here, where perhaps we may discover something not much to the Credit of his Cause.

HAVING first represented human Nature as fit for nothing but to be Fuel for the Fire of Hell, he adds, 'I hope Nobody will say, that God is the Author of Nature thus corrupted.' In which Words he endeavours to delude his ignorant Reader, by including a General in a Particular. He first describes Man's Nature as a meer Mass of Corruption, and then, hoping his Reader would look no farther, he exults as if he had gain'd his Point; for he hopes no Body will say that God is the Author of Nature thus corrupted. And tho' they do
not,

not, his Argument will be never a whit the more conclusive. Here then we have a Specimen of his Candour : For can it be supposed that he is so ignorant as not to discern the Fallacy of his own Reasoning ? I think not. Was all Nature comprehended in the human Nature ? The Nature of Man is, I hope, but a Part, a small inconsiderable Part of Nature ; but can a Part contain the whole ? Granting human Nature was corrupted, doth it therefore follow, that all Nature must be corrupted ? Must the Corruption of Man's Nature alter the Nature of Things, confound Right and Wrong, and take away all Distinction between moral Good and Evil ? If not, then a Man may justly say, that God is the Author of that Part of Nature which never was corrupted, and this is all we contend for. But we cannot help thinking, that God is the Author of that Part of Nature too which is thus corrupted, tho' not of the Corruption itself ; which to deny, would incur such a Censure as this *V.* I presume, would not like. ' The Nature, says he, and the Light of Nature he was the Author of, was holy, innocent and perfect.' Is not this an evident Insinuation, that the Law or Light of Nature was corrupted by the Fall, as well as Man's Nature ? That the eternal Law of Righteousness, which would have been the Rule of Man's Practice, had he kept his Innocency, was by the Fall destroyed ? His Words can be construed no otherwise than to import, that that Nature, and the Light of Nature, which was holy, innocent, and perfect, and of which God was the Author, was now nowhere existing ; whence he concludes, that Nature being universally corrupted by the Fall, 'twas absurd in his Adversary to speak of a Law or Light of Nature. If this be a wrong Construction of his Meaning, he must blame himself, for his Words will admit of no other.

BUT that Nature was universally corrupted by the Fall, is an impious Falshood. For the natural and eternal Relations of Things, as Goodness, Justice, Righteousness, Love, Gratitude, good Faith, and the whole System of moral Principles, which constitute that eternal Law of Righteousness, whereby every rational Being is bound by the very Constitution of his Nature to regulate his moral Actions (as I have shewn already) is as holy, innocent, and perfect, since the Fall, as before. The Fallacy lies in the Word *Nature*, which he should have limited to the particular Nature he had been describing; but this would not have serv'd his Turn, *viz.* To prove there was no such Thing as the Law of Nature: And therefore like a true Sophist, he lays hold of the equivocal Term *Nature*, and after having describ'd one particular Species of Nature, and made it as black as Hell, he attributes to universal Nature, what he had described as peculiar to that particular Species; and so thinks he has overfet his Adversary's Doctrine taken from the Law or Light of Nature.

THIS is just such wretched Reasoning, as if one should say, in Opposition to another, maintaining, that Christ is the Author of the Catholick Church;
 ' The Catholick Church is so monstruously corrupted, that she is become a meer Chaos of Anti-
 ' Christian Darkneſs (meaning the Church of *Rome*)
 ' will any one venture to say, that Christ is the Au-
 ' thor of the Catholick Church thus corrupted?
 ' The Catholick Church that Christ was the Author
 ' of, was holy, innocent, and pure.' Now will any Man say, that this would be a good Argument against the Existence of the Church of Christ? Because a Part of the Catholick Church is degenerated, doth it therefore follow, that the whole Company of the Faithful are so far degenerated, as that Christ hath now no Church upon Earth? And yet
 the

the Opponent by the equivocal Terms, *Catholick Church*, which, as apply'd by the Papists, are special, but as apply'd by other Christians, are general, imposes upon his Reader's Assent; that Christ cannot be the Author of the Catholick Church, and so imposes a Falshood upon them : Will any Man say, says the Opponent, that Christ is the Author of the Catholick Church thus corrupted ? No; I believe no Man will say that Christ is the Author of the Corruption : But doth it therefore follow, that he is not the Author of the Catholick Church, which consists of the whole Company of the Faithful ?

Just so is it, as to the Point in Debate ; because Man by the Fall corrupted his own Nature, doth it therefore follow, that the Law of Nature was corrupted ? And because God cannot be said to be the Author of the Corruption of Man's Nature, doth it therefore follow, that he cannot be said to be the Author of human Nature, and the Law of Nature ? ' The Nature, and the Light of Nature, he was ' the Author of, was holy, innocent, and perfect ; ' but the Corruption in Nature, from whence proceeded Violence and Bloodshed, was occasioned ' by adhering to the Voice of Satan,' says the *V*. If by the Light of Nature he means the Law of Nature, as his Words necessarily import, I have made it appear to every unprejudiced Reader, that this Law is as holy, innocent, and perfect, as ever it was ; as being nothing but the immutable Will of God himself, written in the great Books of Nature. And if by the Light of Nature he means those rational Powers, whereby we discover this Will of God, and our Duty therein contained, I have shewn likewise on this Head, that human Nature was not so much depraved by the Fall, as thereby to render Men wholly incapable to discover this Will of God concerning their Duty. And what follows doth not in the least affect our Argument, because we are not

E 2 plead.

pleading for Violence and Bloodshed, but for a necessary Self-defence ; and tho' it be true, that Violence and Bloodshed proceeded from that Corruption of Nature which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan, yet it will not follow, that necessary Self-defence is sinful, more than it will follow, that because the Necessity of earning our Livelihood with the Sweat of our Brows, was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan, therefore 'tis sinful to labour with our Hands the Things that are good, for the necessary Support of ourselves and Families. If Violence and Bloodshed happen to ensue upon a necessary Self-defence, this indeed proceeds from the Corruption of Nature occasionally; but not as a Cause : That the Corruption of Nature which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan, was the Occasion of what Bloodshed and Violence might ensue from a necessary Self-defence, I grant ; because if there had been no Corruption, there would have been no lawless Violence ; and had there been no lawless Violence, there would have been no Need of Resistance ; and consequently no Bloodshed and Violence ensuing from thence : But there is a wide Difference between a necessary Effect, and an accidental Consequence ; between a Cause and an Occasion. Sin is the Cause of our greatest Sorrow, but it is only the Occasion of that godly Sorrow that worketh Repentance. The Fall of *Adam* was the Occasion of Christ's Sufferings ; but it would be very absurd to say that this was the Cause of his Sufferings, whether efficient, instrumental, or final. As absurd is it in this *V.* to insinuate, that that Bloodshed and Violence which may accidentally ensue from a necessary Self-defence against lawless Violence, hath that Corruption for its productive Cause, which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan. He may as well say, that tilling the Ground, and labouring for the Support of ourselves

and

and Families, proceeds from that Corruption which was occasion'd by adhering to the Voice of Satan as its productive Cause ; for as the latter is only a Consequence of that Corruption, so is the former.

BUT, further, if all Bloodshed and Violence proceed from that Corruption which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan, as a productive Cause, and is therefore unlawful ; what will this V. say to all the Bloodshed and Violence committed by the Christian Magistrate in the legal Punishment of Malefactors ? Will he say that all this is unlawful, because it proceeds from that Corruption of Nature which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan ? And if he reply that this cannot be said, because the Objects of such Violence have forfeited their Lives, by becoming Pests to the Community where they live, and therefore may justly be put to Death ; so say I with regard to that Violence that may ensue upon a Community's defending themselves against a foreign Invader : The Assailants having violated the Laws of God and Nature, and put themselves into a State of War with the Defendants, by attempting to destroy them without any just Provocation, have thereby forfeited their Lives to all Intents and Purposes, as much as a Robber or Murderer ; and therefore, by the Law of Nature, may be as justly put to Death as the other, when the Defendants can by no other Means escape their Fury. If the Violence practis'd by the Magistrate then, upon notorious Offenders, be not unlawful, tho' it proceed from that Corruption of Nature which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan ; neither is that which may ensue upon a Nation's defending themselves against those who have turn'd Rebels to God and Nature, unlawful, tho' it occasionally proceed from that Corruption of Nature which was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan, when they cannot escape their Violence by

any other Methods. Whoever asserts the latter, must by a Parity of Reason maintain the former.

WHEN the *V.* says, ‘ It is not from the degenerate fallen Light of Nature that Arguments are to be drawn for the Formation and Establishment of Christian Principles ;’ he says just nothing at all to the Purpose. For we draw our Arguments for establishing our Doctrine, not from the degenerate, fallen Light of Nature, but from that eternal Law of Righteousness, which is as immutable as God himself, and consequently he is neither fallen nor degenerate, as I have shewn above. Nor moreover do we allow the Point in Question to be a Christian Principle ; so far from it, that we have prov’d it to be a Principle of the Law of Nature ; and that not from the degenerate fallen Light of Nature, as the *V.* loves to speak, but from self-evident Propositions, and Facts recorded in Holy Writ*.

BUT, which makes worse for him still, this is not the *V.*’s Meaning. By Christian Principles, for the Formation and Establishment of which, he says Arguments are not to be drawn from the degenerate, fallen Light of Nature, we are to understand the Principle he is pleading for, viz. the Unlawfulness of Defensive War ; that this is his Meaning appears from the Words immediately following ; • ‘ Neither are any from it of any Weight in Opposition thereto.’ Now this is a shameless begging the Question ; for we are so far from allowing him his Principle, or granting it to have any Foundation in the Christian Religion, that we deny it to have any Foundation in Nature ; and till he produces better Arguments in support of it, than any we have seen yet, we think we should wrong the Truth were we to do otherwise.

THE next Passage of this *V.* that seems to affect my general Doctrine, is Page 15. of his Answer ;
where,

• See first Part.

where, after having repeated these Words of his Adversary. ‘ War was lawful under the Old Testament Dispensation, and therefore it is lawful under the New,’ he says, ‘ Let us see how this extraordinary Inference will hold in other Cases ; Burnt-offerings, Sacrifices, and Circumcision, were lawful under the Old Testament Dispensation, are they therefore so now ?’

Answer. But the *F.* should consider these Cases are nowise parallel. Burnt-offerings, Sacrifices and Circumcision, were typical of the Gospel Dispensation, and were to cease of course when that was established. They were Parts of the Ceremonial Law, which was to continue only till the coming of Christ, who was to establish a new Law in its Room. This whole Dispensation was made up of Types and Shadows, whereof Christ was the Substance ; but when Christ came, these all necessarily vanished : ‘ The Picture being finished, there was no farther Need of the rough Draught.’ But with relation to a necessary Self-defence, the Case is very different ; if this was lawful under the Old Testament, by virtue of the Law of Nature (as I have proved it was) it must likewise be lawful under the New ; not only because there is no Precept there prohibiting it, but because the Grounds and Reasons thereof are the very same now they were then. Sacrifices and Circumcision are not to be used now, because there is no Occasion for them ; but there is as great Occasion for Defensive War as ever there was ; so that ’tis evident the Cases are not parallel. The *V.* adds, ‘ But we are farther told, it is certain that God approved of, and appointed his People to make War under the Law of *Moses*, and by the moral Law. The sixth Commandment doth undoubtedly imply a lawful War ; for if we must not kill others, much less ourselves ; and if we must have no Hand in our own Death, we must defend our

‘ Life against unjust Violence, which sometimes cannot be done without War. Now the blessed Jesus never came to destroy the moral Law of Nature, but to fulfil it.’ To which he replies, ‘ A positive Precept is made to imply its direct Reverse ; A Command not to kill, is implied to authorize killing.’ Here we have another Specimen of his Learning and Candour. In the first Place he speaks Nonsense in Grammar ; and in the second he grossly misrepresents his Adversary, and abuses his Reader, by putting such a Construction on his Words, as they will by no Means admit of. He has nowhere said, that a Command not to kill, is implied to authorize Killing ; nor can any Thing like it be fairly inferred from his Words. This is a forced and false Construction, of the *V*’s own framing ; and if it is an Absurdity, he must answer for it.

His Adversary, I dare say, never imagined that the sixth Commandment forbids all Killing, but only all Killing that is Murder. And if he thinks so, what Opinion must he have of Magistrates, especially those of his own Friends, who make no more Scruple to kill in their Way than others do ? In order therefore to do Justice to his Adversary, he ought to have put his Words in their true Light, and then they would have run thus ; As the Sixth Commandment forbids Murder, it necessarily implies an Authority or Right to kill in a lawful War. And this is so far from being an Absurdity, that I hope it will appear to be an evident Truth. That the Sixth Commandment implies a Defensive War (and the Author of the Sermon meant no other) I prove thus ;

If by Virtue of this Command it be a Sin to destroy myself, it must by the Terms be a Duty to preserve myself ; and if it be my Duty to preserve myself, it must likewise be my Duty to defend myself against lawless Violence, when I cannot secure
my

my own Preservation otherwise ; and if it be my Duty to defend myself against lawless Violence, when I cannot secure my own Preservation otherwise, it must be my Duty to do it by such Means, and in such a Manner, as without which I cannot possibly effect it ; and if I cannot possibly effect it without Defensive War, it cannot be unlawful to engage in it. But to bring the Argument closer still ; If by Virtue of this Command, it be a Sin for the Magistrate to destroy his Subjects, it must by the Terms, as well as by Virtue of his Office, be his Duty to protect them ; and if it be his Duty to protect them, it must be his Duty to defend them against all Injustice and Wrong ; and if it be his Duty to defend them against all Injustice and Wrong, it must be his Duty to do it by such Means, and in such a Manner, as without which it cannot possibly be done ; and if it cannot possibly be done without opposing Force to Force, in the Use of carnal Weapons, it cannot be unlawful in him to use these Means. Nay so far is it from being unlawful, that by Virtue of this Command, it must be his indispensable Duty to use such Means, when the Preservation of his innocent Subjects cannot be secured without them. Every Magistrate then being bound by virtue of this Command, not only to abstain from murdering his Subjects, but to use all possible Means for preserving their Lives, Liberties, and Properties ; he is likewise bound by virtue of this Command to engage in a Defensive War, when this is the only Mean left in his Power for effecting these valuable Purposes ; unless it can be made appear that such a War is expressly prohibited by a Gospel Precept ; which, as I have shewn above, cannot be done. From all which we conclude that the Sixth Commandment doth undoubtedly imply Defensive War.

THE *V.* further adds, ‘ I would now ask, is the
 ‘ moral Command, *Thou shalt not kill*, best fulfill’d
 ‘ or kept by understanding the Gospel to forbid
 ‘ War, or to allow of it ?’ To which I answer, by
 asking another Question, Is the moral Command,
Thou shalt not kill, best fulfill’d or kept by under-
 standing the Gospel to forbid all capital Punishments,
 or to allow of them ? to forbid Magistracy, or to al-
 low of it ? Is the moral Command, *Thou shalt not*
covet, best fulfill’d or kept by those who under-
 stand the Gospel to forbid Christians to labour for
 the Meat that perisheth, to take no Thought for
 Food and Raiment, not to lay up Treasures upon
 Earth, &c. or to allow of these Things ? But the
V. before we can give a direct Answer to his Ques-
 tion, must explain his Terms, and tell us what he
 means by *War* ; if he means by this Term, a law-
 less Attack upon innocent Men, we answer, The
 moral Precept, *Thou shalt not kill*, is best fulfilled
 by understanding the Gospel to forbid it ; but if by
 this Term he means a necessary Self-defence against
 lawless Violence, we answer, It is best fulfilled by
 understanding the Gospel to allow it. Nay, to un-
 derstand the Gospel to forbid War in the latter Sense,
 and act accordingly, when there is a Necessity for
 such a War, is so far from being the best Way to
 fulfil this Command, that in the Magistrate it must
 be a gross Violation of it. The best Way to fulfil
 the moral Command, *Thou shalt not kill*, would be
 for all Men to understand the Gospel to forbid all
 Kinds of Injustice and Wrong, and to act accord-
 ingly ; and yet it doth not follow that the Magistrate
 acts contrary to the Gospel in punishing Evil-doers,
 who do not conform to Gospel Rules ; so far from
 it, that he is bound by virtue of the Gospel so to
 do, this being one main End of his Office : So that
 were he to refuse or neglect it, he would act contra-

ry to this moral Law, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil.

As to the *V*'s following Words, ' Where there
' is one of those who take it in its first Sense slain,
' are there not many Thousands of the latter kill'd
' in the Practice of Fighting ?' I reply by asking
another Question, Where one of those that look'd
upon Christianity as a cunningly devis'd Fable have
suffer'd, have not many Thousands been slain in
maintaining it to be the Power of God unto Salvati-
on ? Where there is one of those who take it in its
first Sense, suffers, are there not many Thousands
of the latter martyr'd in the Profession of the Gos-
pel ? Is it therefore wrong to take Christianity in the
latter Sense ? And besides, that so few of those who
take it in the first Sense, are slain, may easily be ac-
counted for ; they are like *Solomon's* prudent Man,
who foreseeing the Evil, hides himself. Let the
Publick sink or swim, they take Care to keep them-
selves out of Harm's Way ; they have learnt so
much of the Wisdom of the Serpent, as not to ex-
pose themselves to Violence and Slaughter, so long
as there are other brave Men enough to screen them
from the Danger ; who, like some among the pri-
mitive Christians, seem to invite Danger as boldly as
others sneakingly shun it ; being as zealous for their
Country, as they were for their Religion : So that
a Man must have a good Command of his Tem-
per, that can keep his Countenance in reading
these Words, instead of being convinc'd by them,
that the Sixth Commandment is best fulfill'd by
those who understand the Gospel to forbid Defen-
sive War.

' MORAL Precepts (saith the Author of the Ser-
' mon) are grounded upon invariable Equity, upon
' the Nature and Reason of Things, and therefore
' cannot be altered.' To which the *V*. replies,
' Can any Man possibly think that War is Part of
' the

‘ the moral Law ?’ Upon which I remark : I know Nobody that ever said so, viz. that War is a Part of the moral Law. I have prov’d in the first Part of this Treatise, that a necessary Self-defence against lawless Violence is a Dictate of the Law of Nature, of which the moral Law is a Transcript ; but neither I nor the *A.* of the *S.* have so much as insinuated that it was a Part of that Law, but only a Duty resulting from it, and imply’d in the Precept, *Thou shalt not kill.* I have prov’d likewise, that as a necessary Self-defence against a foreign Enemy, was undoubtedly lawful under the Old Testament, it must be equally so under the New, because the Grounds and Reasons are the same, unless it can be made appear, that Christ hath by an express Law prohibited it. And I affirm, in answer to the Question, that tho’ it be no Part of the moral Law, yet it is a Dictate of it, and a necessary Duty resulting from it, and therefore will ever be lawful while there is a Necessity for it, unless we can suppose that God will reverse the Law of Nature, which is as immutable as his own Being.

The *V.* farther adds, ‘ Now (saith the Sermon) if the Almighty has approved of War formerly, and there is still the same Necessity of it under the Gospel Dispensation as before, it will follow that it is equally lawful now. It is absurd to suppose that the blessed God, who is infinite in Wisdom, and unalterable in his Nature, would determine contrarily at different Periods of Time, concerning a Case that is substantially the same.’

To which he replies, ‘ If this Manner of Arguing proves any Thing, it proves Offensive War as lawful as Defensive. God approv’d of the *Israelites* taking away the Possessions of many Nations, he commanded them to destroy some utterly ; is it therefore equally lawful to do so now, whether we have his Command or not ? The
: War

‘ War that he approv’d of formerly, was undertaken by his Counsel and Direction.’ Upon which I remark, That the *V.* misrepresents his Adversary here again, when he says, ‘ He commanded them to destroy some utterly ;’ whereas his Adversary doth not so much as insinuate, thro’ the whole Paragraph, that God commanded War, but only that he approv’d of it : So that the War the *V.* instanceth in, is not a similar Case. God’s approving of some War formerly, which he did not command, is the Author’s Argument, and is all that was necessary to infer his Conclusion, *viz.* that Defensive War is lawful under the Gospel. But to gain the Assent of his ignorant Readers, the *V.* puts such Words in his Adversary’s Mouth, as will best suit his own Turn, and then exults as if he had the better of the Argument. ‘ God commanded the *Israelites*, says he, to destroy some utterly, is it therefore equally lawful to do so now ?’ Which Question is quite impertinent, as being grounded on a false Supposition, as if his Adversary had said, ‘ If the Almighty has commanded War formerly, &c.’ whereas he says no such Thing : His Words are, ‘ If the Almighty has approv’d of War formerly, &c.’ He likewise represents him as arguing in Defence of War without Distinction, which is another Specimen of his Candour : Whereas he is arguing only for the Lawfulness of Defensive War, as is evident from the Title and whole Tenor of the Sermon, and which this *V.* could not be ignorant of. How then he could say, ‘ That his Manner of arguing, if it prov’d any Thing, would prove Offensive War as lawful as Defensive,’ can never be accounted for to his Credit : For ’tis evident to every Body that can discover a true Syllogism from a bare-fac’d Sophism, that it is otherwise.

THE Author’s Words reduc’d into Form (the best Way to detect false Reasoning) will stand thus,
If

If the Almighty has approved of Defensive War formerly, because it was a necessary Means under Divine Providence to protect innocent Men from the lawless Attacks of foreign Enemies; Defensive War was undoubtedly lawful, because he can approve of nothing that is not so : But Defensive War is as necessary, in the Hand of Divine Providence, to protect innocent Men from the lawless Attacks of foreign Enemies, under the Gospel Dispensation, as it was formerly, *ergo* Defensive War is lawful under the Gospel. But if what the *V.* says be true, *viz.* ‘ That the *A*’s Manner of arguing proves Offensive War as lawful as Defensive,’ his Argument reduc’d into Form, will stand thus ; If the Almighty has approv’d of Defensive War formerly, because it was necessary, &c. Defensive War was then lawful ; but Defensive War is as necessary under the Gospel as formerly, therefore Offensive War is lawful under the Gospel. Here is a Conclusion inferr’d that is not to be found in the Premises. The Subject of the Premises is, *War Defensive*, the Subject of the Conclusion is, *War Offensive*.

Suppose the Vindicator were to argue in Defence of Divine Revelation, thus ; If God Almighty approv’d of Revelation formerly, and there is still the same Necessity of it now, it will follow, that it is equally lawful now. And suppose some one should reply, this Manner of arguing proves *Judaism* as lawful as Christianity : God commanded the *Jews* to keep Fasts, and observe Holy-days, to offer Sacrifices, and worship in the Temple ; is it therefore equally lawful to do so now, whether we have God’s Command or not ? How would the *V.* like this Manner of arguing ? Would he allow that the Argument (proving Divine Revelation to be lawful now, from the Divine Approbation of it formerly) proves *Judaism* as lawful as Christianity ? Or the Temple Service, as the spiritual Worship of the *Qua-*
ker.

ker Meetings? Would he not think it his Duty to wipe off so foul an Aspersion, by detecting and exposing the Sophistry and Falshood of his Adversary's Reasoning, and proving his own to be right, if not misrepresented? which he might do, thus; If the Almighty has approv'd of Revelation formerly because it was necessary to teach Men their Duty more clearly, &c. it follows, that it was lawful; but there is the same Necessity now for Revelation there was formerly; *ergo* Revelation is now lawful. This would be a fair Conclusion from the Premises, and the only one which in Truth could be inferr'd from them. How would he then like to be told; No, this is not the true Inference from your Argument; the true Inference from your Argument is, *Ergo* *Judaism*, and the whole *Jewish* Ritual is now lawful. Now this would be just such Measure as he metes to his Adversary on this Point. The native Inference from his Adversary's Premises, as I have shewn, is this; *Ergo* Defensive War is lawful under the Gospel. But the *V.* tells him no, the Inference from his Argument is this; *Ergo* not only Offensive War, but such as was that against the Seven Nations, is now lawful. For your Manner of arguing, says he, not only proves Offensive War, but such a War as that which the *Israelites* made upon the Seven Nations at God's Command, as lawful as Defensive.

THE Author's Argument being thus clear'd from the *V.*'s false Representation, the insulting Question, *Is it therefore equally lawful to do so now, whether we have his Command or not?* which he proposes with such an Air of Victory, shamefully recoils upon himself, as being no ways inferrable from the Argument of his Adversary, but is the meer Creature of his own Invention.

' THE War, says the *V.* that he approved of formerly, was undertaken by his Counsel and
Di-

‘ Direction.’ Here we have another Specimen of his Sophistry. What doth he mean by *the War*? This Proposition, tho’ literally true, yet is nothing to his Purpose; which is to prove that God never approv’d of any War but what was undertaken by his Counsel and Direction. *The War*, if it can mean any Thing, must mean the War with the Seven Nations; and this no doubt God approv’d of, because he commanded it; but what is this to the Purpose of confuting his Adversary, or proving that his Manner of arguing proves Offensive War as lawful as Defensive? Doth it follow, that because God approv’d of this particular War which was undertaken by his Command, that he never approv’d of any that was undertaken without his Command? By no Means. If the *V.* had intended to prove by these Words, that his Adversary’s Manner of arguing prov’d such a War as that against the Seven Nations as lawful as a Defensive (which he would fain do if possible) he should have form’d them thus; Whatever War God approv’d of formerly, was undertaken by his Command, or in his own equivocating Words, *by his Counsel and Direction*. Then he would have said something to his Purpose; could he have prov’d it, and might have told the World with a much better Grace, that his Adversary’s Manner of arguing proves Offensive War as lawful as Defensive. But if he cannot do this, the least Attonement he can make, for abusing his Author, and imposing upon the World evident Falshoods instead of Truths, is to beg God’s Pardon, and confess his Ignorance; or else frankly own the true Reason of such wretched Quibbling and Prevarication.

BUT to clear this Matter further still, I will now prove, for this *V.*’s Conviction, or Confutation, from two Instances, that the Almighty approv’d of some Wars formerly, which were not undertaken by his Com-

Command, or, as the *J.* himself expresses it, by his Council and Direction.

1. The Patriarch *Abraham*, as we read, *Gen.* xiv. 15. made War upon the four Kings for recovering his beloved Friend and Kinsman *Lot* ; which tho' not directly in his own Defence, yet it was *Tantamount*, as being grounded on the same Principles of Reason and Equity ; which I prove thus ; ' If a Man has ' a Right to defend himself, and what is his, against ' the Violence of a lawless Invader, he may certainly ' by endeavour to recover what has been by any ' kind of Violence or Villainy taken from him ; for ' as the Power to take any thing from another, ' gives no Right to it, it follows, that the Right ' to that which has been taken from its Owner, against his Will, remains still where it was ; he ' may still truly call it his, and if it be his, he may ' use it as his, which if he who took it away, or any ' other, shall hinder him from doing, that Man is ' even here the Aggressor, and the Owner does but ' defend himself, and what is his.' Which Reasoning being apply'd to the Case of *Abraham*, who made War upon those Kings with no other View but to recover a Part of his own Family, it will show that this was in Effect a Defensive War. And St. *Augustine* saith, ' That Nation may justly by ' Arms be assaulted, which shall neglect either to ' punish their own Subjects for Injuries by them ' done, or to restore that which by Force was taken away.' And this was just *Abraham's* Case. Now *Abraham* had no special Commission from God to undertake this War : Here was no Divine Counsel nor Direction out of the ordinary Course of Providence ; and yet it was approv'd of by God, as appears from Verse 19. *Melchisedeck*, who was Priest of the most High God, blessed God for the Victory ; which, had the Undertaking been unlawful, he certainly would not have done.

2. ANOTHER Instance of the like Nature we have in *Exodus* xvii. 9. There we find how *Moses* commanded the *Israelites* to fight the *Amalekites* in their own Defence, who with armed Violence oppos'd their Passage into the Land of *Canaan*; and it doth not appear that in this he consulted God at all. Now here is another Instance of a War that was not undertaken by God's Counsel and Direction, and yet was approved of by him, as we learn from Verse 14. *And the Lord said unto Moses, write this for a Memorial in a Book, and rehearse it in the Ears of Joshua.* That these Wars were agreeable to the Law of Nature, is evident from hence, that God approved of them, tho' undertaken without his special Command; for he can no more approve of any thing contrary to this, than he can change his own Being, or take away all Distinction between moral Good and Evil. Things which are morally Evil (and such are all Things contrary to the Law of Nature) can never be an Object of Divine Approbation, but must necessarily be condemned by him; the eternal and necessary Rectitude of his Nature requires it. These Wars were Defensive, or *Tantamount*, as I observed above; the latter was undertaken by the *Israelites* to defend themselves from the Violence of an Enemy, that by Force of Arms oppos'd their Passage into their own Land; the former was undertaken by *Abraham*, to recover his distress'd Friend and Kinsman, and his miserable Family, from a lawless Enemy, that had taken them Captives. Now if such a War was lawful then (as appears it was) there being the same Necessity still for Self-defence, it will follow, that Self-defence is equally lawful now, unless a Law of the Gospel can be produc'd which expressly forbids it.

THERE is a manifest Difference between God's approving those Wars that were undertaken by good Men, having no other Warrant for so doing than
the

the bare Law of Nature ; and those that were undertaken by his special Command. The first were undertaken because they were agreeable to the Law of Nature, antecedent to all positive Precepts whatsoever, and therefore were approved of by God ; but the latter were only lawful because God commanded them. He being the absolute Sovereign of the Universe, and the rightful Proprietor of all his Creatures, may justly dispose of them to whom, and in what Manner, he pleases. 'Tis true God cannot dissolve the Obligation of the preceptive Law of Nature, or change the Natures of Good and Evil. For altho' he be omnipotent, yet we must always suppose his infinite Power to be conjoin'd with infinite Goodness, else it is no Divine Power ; and therefore, *Posse malum, non est posse ; i. e.* It is no Power but Weakness to do Evil*. Nevertheless, God may alter the Properties of those Things from whence the Respects of Good and Evil do result, as in the *Israelites* destroying some Nations utterly, and taking away their Possessions, which God may justly do, by virtue of his absolute Dominion ; but the Change here is not in the Obligation of the Law, but in the Things themselves. Murder would be an intrinsical Evil still, but that which was done by an immediate and explicit Command from God, was no Murder. Robbery had been a Sin still, but taking Things alienated from their Properties by God himself, was not Robbery. And moreover, the Nations upon whom he commanded the *Israelites* to make War, and destroy some of them utterly, and spoil them of their Possessions, had by their Wickedness forfeited all to the Sovereign Proprietor of the whole World ; who might therefore justly take them away by whatever Instruments he pleased ; and as he thought proper to make Use of the *Israelites* for that Purpose, they did no Wrong in taking away their Possessions, and destroying many of them

utterly,

* See Preface, Page 7.

utterly, because they did only what God commanded them, which, to have refused, would have been Rebellion; whereas had they undertaken such a War without God's Command, it would never have been approved of by him, because it would have been a manifest Violation of the Law of Nature. In this Case they would have been guilty of Robbery and Murder, and therefore God could never have approved of it. The Reasons of the first-mentioned Instances, were founded in the Law of Nature, which is the eternal Rule of Righteousness, which Reasons will continue the same, so long as it is reasonable that the Innocent should not suffer Injury by the violent Hands of the Guilty; or, in other Words, so long as there subsists any Difference between moral Good and Evil: But the last-mentioned Instances were in Consequence of an express Command of God, founded upon Reasons peculiar to the Circumstances of those Times in which it was given. The *Israelites* were under a *Theocracy*; God himself was their King and Sovereign in a more peculiar Manner than to any other People. He not only undertook their Tutelage thro' a Desert Country, in which he protected and supported them in a miraculous Manner many Years, but promis'd to settle them in a fertile Land, and bestow upon them great Possessions.

And as the Inhabitants of the Seven Nations had by their Rebellion against God forfeited all, he was pleas'd to give a special Commission to his own peculiar People to drive them out, and take Possession. But that extraordinary Dispensation being long since expired, and all Nations being now under an ordinary Providence, as to their civil Policy, there are not the same Grounds and Reasons for such a Practice, and therefore it ceases of Course. But the same Grounds and Reasons subsist now, as did then, we may suppose God would act in the same Manner; but

but they ceasing, the Practice ceased with them. The *Israelites* were commanded to destroy some Nations utterly, and to take Possession of their Inheritance, and this no doubt God approved of, because he commanded it; and in such Circumstances in which this Command was given, it was not repugnant to the Law of Nature: for 'tis not a command nothing repugnant to that, as I observed above; yet, in other Circumstances, when the Grounds and Reasons of such a Command cease, we may be sure God will not approve of such a Practice.

Let this Distinction therefore be remembered, that those Wars which were undertaken by good Men, without any special Command from God, and afterwards approved of by him, were agreeable to the Law of Nature, and consequently lawful; and when the Grounds and Reasons of them continue, will ever be so; but those Wars that were undertaken by the *Israelites*, at the special Command of God, being founded upon Reasons that could last no longer than the *Tribes* lasted, tho' they were lawful then, while the Reasons of them continue, yet they could not be so, when the Reasons ceased. Let this Distinction, I say, be remembered, and it will be an easy Matter to answer the *1st* Question; 'Is it therefore lawful to do so now, whenever we have any Command or not? No, it is not lawful now to take away Mens Possessions and Lives, tho' it was then; because Circumstances being altered, and the Reasons of such a Practice being ceased, God Almighty does not give Men such a Command, and that because he can do nothing without Reason. But then it doth not follow from hence, that it is not equally lawful now to make such a War as good Men under the Old Testament did, for the undertaking whereof they had no other Direction but the Law of Nature, which Law is still common to us with them, and that for this Reason; Because

the same Grounds and Reasons subsist now as did then. Having the same Law to direct us, and being under the same Obligations to defend ourselves from unjust Violence, to which we are equally liable, it must consequently be as lawful for us to defend ourselves, by opposing Force to Force, as it was for them; unless, as I said before, Christ by an express Precept in the Gospel has prohibited it.

He further adds, ‘ The latter Part of the Paragraph does not belong to the Argument, unless it is first prov’d, either that People Now-a-days have the express Command of God to go to War :--- Or that he hath determined Man to be a sufficient Judge when it is suitable, and when not.’

To which I reply : The first Part of this Remark is false, as sufficiently appears from what I have said above ; and the latter Part is already answered. For I have prov’d, to the Conviction of every unprejudic’d Reader, that Defensive War is agreeable to the Law of Nature, and not contrary to the Gospel, notwithstanding the want of an express Command of God. From whence it will follow, that while Man, by the Exercise of his rational Faculties, can distinguish between Right and Wrong, Happiness and Misery, he will be a sufficient Judge when such a War is suitable, and when not.

The Author of the Sermon says farther ; ‘ Can we think that God would approve of any Practice formerly, that was contrary to the moral Law ? Well, if a just War was not contrary to the moral Law under the *Jewish* Dispensation, and before it, why should it be so now in the like Circumstances of Necessity ?’ To which the *V.* replies, ‘ I have already observed, that the Almighty’s enjoining and approving of some Wars formerly, does not authorize any Wars begun and carried on at the meer Will and Pleasure of Men. The like Circumstances of Necessity must be when we have the di-

vine

‘vine Command and Direction, and no otherwise.’ Which Objection having been already proved to be groundless and impertinent, it will not follow, that the like Circumstances of Necessity must be when we have the divine Command and Direction : The like Circumstances of Necessity must be, the human Impossibility of protecting and preserving an innocent People from the Violence of a lawless Invader. This was the Ground of those Wars which were formerly carried on by good Men, without any express Command from God, and yet approv’d of by him, which is an indisputable Testimony that they were lawful ; and the same Grounds and Reasons subsisting still, the same Practice must be lawful still, unless an express Law of God can be produc’d prohibiting it. That the Gospel prohibits all unlawful Wars, as it does all other unlawful Actions, we readily grant ; but it no more follows from hence, that all Manner of War is unlawful under the Gospel, than that all Manner of Actions are so ; for as some Actions are lawful, notwithstanding there are a great many unlawful ; so some Wars may be just, notwithstanding the many unjust Wars that are carried on in the World ; and tho’ these be prohibited by the Gospel, as all other unjust Actions are, yet it does not appear that those are prohibited any farther, than as they exceed the Bounds of Justice and Humanity ; and then ’tis only the Abuse that is prohibited, but not the Use. ‘ The blessed Jesus (saith the *K.*) hath taught some Christians, both by the
‘ immediate Dictates of his Spirit, and Expression
‘ of his Will, when personally upon Earth, that the
‘ best Way to keep the Commandments, *Thou shalt*
‘ *not kill*, and, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour*, is
‘ not to harbour any Ill-will or Revenge against
‘ any, but to love Enemies.” I will add, by way of Remark, That the blessed Jesus hath taught, not some, but all Christians, I shall not say, by the im-

mediate Dictates of his Spirit (because they who say so, assert more than they can prove, unless by the immediate Dictates of his Spirit they mean the holy Scriptures) but by the Expression of his Will in the Gospel, that the best Way to keep these Commandments, is not to harbour any Ill-will or Revenge against any, but to love Enemies. And, without Doubt, all who deserve the Name of Christians, will acknowledge this, as well as this *V.* and, I doubt not, are as ready to practise it in its true and proper Sense. But how does this Argument prove the Unlawfulness of Self-defence against the lawless Violence of a foreign Enemy? Because it is every Christian's Duty to harbour no Ill-will or Revenge against any, doth it therefore follow, that it is the Duty of the Magistrate to suffer a foreign Invader to destroy himself and his Subjects, without any Resistance? Or, in other Words, That 'tis unlawful for the Magistrate to defend himself, and his Subjects, against the lawless Violence of a foreign Enemy? By the same Argument, he ought to bear with the most villainous Outrages of Cut-throats and Rebels among his own Subjects, because this will be the best Way to keep the Commandments, *Thou shalt not kill*, and, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour*, by not harbouring any Ill-will or Revenge against any, but loving of Enemies. But may not the Christian Magistrate defend himself and his Subjects against a foreign Enemy, without harbouring Ill-will and Revenge against any, as well as put to Death a notorious Criminal, who cannot be preserv'd without manifest Danger to the Community? And if so, why such a mighty Out cry against a Defensive War, as if it could not be undertaken without the manifest Violation of the Sixth Commandment, and the Precept of Christ, to harbour no Ill-will or Revenge against any, but to love Enemies, when 'tis evident the Case is quite other-
wise?

wife ? For if the Magistrate may put to Death a notorious Malefactor, who cannot be preserv'd without manifest Danger to the Publick, and yet not be chargeable with any Violation of these Commandments, he may likewise, without being guilty of any Violation of these Commandments, strenuously defend himself and his innocent Subjects against the lawless Violence of a foreign Invader, when the Ruin of the Publick cannot be prevented without it. This *V.* should distinguish between War Offensive and Defensive (but this would have serv'd his Purpose) and even between the Use and the Abuse of the latter. I acknowledge that even a Defensive War may be abus'd, when Men, in the Management of it, exceed the Bounds of Justice and Humanity ; but this is no Argument against the Lawfulness of it, but only of the Perverseness of Mankind, who are too apt to abuse the best Things of Providence. Christianity has been abus'd by bad Men to very ill Purposes, and yet I hope Nobody will say, that therefore the Profession of Christianity is unlawful. Christianity forbids Injury and Revenge, and enjoins the Love of Enemies (says the *V.*) and therefore 'tis unlawful for Christians to defend themselves against a foreign Enemy. Now the same Argument will prove it unlawful for the Christian Magistrate to resist a domestick Traitor, or the most outrageous Villain whatsoever ; for if Resistance to them can be managed wholly without these Crimes, and consistent with Christ's Precept of loving Enemies, so may likewise Resistance to a foreign Enemy. If it cannot, and yet Resistance to them be acknowledged lawful, so likewise may Resistance to foreign Invaders, notwithstanding the same Unhappiness. Let them look to it who are guilty of these Crimes. This can no more hinder honest Men from defending themselves, or from making their Advantages of the Crimes of others in their own

own Self-defence in one Case, than it is allowed to do in another.

BUT it is a very unaccountable Thing, in my Opinion, to suppose that a People cannot join together, with the Consent, and by the Authority of the supreme Magistrate, in defending themselves against a foreign Enemy, without any such Crimes. For there is nothing necessary to this, that I know of, that requires either Revenge, Hatred, or Injury, in the true Sense of these Terms, or any Thing but an inoffensive and justifiable Way of proceeding. If any other Methods have been used in carrying on such Wars, this will only reflect upon the Persons who have made Use of them, not upon the Justice of the Wars themselves. Hence will appear the Impertinency of this *V*'s elaborate Harangue, Page 39. where he says, ' If every particular Member of the Church be forbidden Revenge, it is because allowing of it would manifest a want of Patience and Fortitude to endure, and encourage Envy, &c. surely then this Reason is much stronger for forbidding national and publick Revenge.' All which is *gratis dictum* still, because the Practice, for the Lawfulness of which we are contending, implies no such Idea. We grant that the Gospel forbids Revenge, both private and publick ; Doth it therefore follow, that it forbids Self-defence ? Or, in other Words, doth it therefore follow, that a necessary Self-defence is unlawful, when this can be done without Revenge ? Let this *V*. prove, that an affectionate Father cannot defend himself against an unnatural Child attempting to cut his Throat, without Revenge ; or that a pious Prince cannot defend his innocent Subjects from a foreign Invader, without a malicious Intention of Revenge and Injury in the proper Sense of these Terms ; and then his Argument will signify something, otherwise 'tis quite impertinent, and wholly
foreign

foreign to the Point in debate. But then he tells us further : ‘ A Prohibition of Injuries, and a Command to endure them, must be consider’d as relative to the Consequence if allow’d : A small Injury is attended with a Degree of Injustice, and the enduring it rather than returning it, shews, in some Degree, a Christian Disposition. Now consider that Consequence with respect to greater, the enduring of them, rather than returning Evil for Evil, doth certainly shew a greater Degree of that Meekness and Lowliness of Heart, which Christ taught his Disciples to learn of him.’ Upon which I must remark, in the first Place, That this sophistical Argument reflects a most egregious Calumny on the Christian Religion, representing it as necessarily laying Christians open to all the villainous Outrages the vilest Part of Mankind think fit to offer them. For by the same Argument it may be prov’d unlawful to resist a Robber or a Cut-throat, because the enduring of their injurious Treatment, rather than returning Evil for Evil, shews a Christian Disposition, and a very great Degree of that Meekness and Lowliness of Heart, which Christ taught his Disciples to learn of him. By the same Argument it may be prov’d unlawful for a Christian Prince to quell a dangerous Conspiracy, or to resist a Cabal of rebellious Subjects, who have sworn Destruction to him and the Commonwealth, because the enduring such Injury and Injustice, rather than returning Evil for Evil, shews a Christian Disposition in him, and a great Degree of that Meekness and Lowliness of Heart, which Christ taught his Disciples to learn of him. And if it be said that the Christian Religion allows the Magistrate to regard the publick Good, then it must consequently be allowed lawful for him to defend the Publick from lawless Violence ; unless a Regard for the publick Good can be consistent with the Destruction

struction of the Publick. But the true State of this Case, in short, can amount to no more than this, that Christianity obliges Men to suffer patiently, when they cannot by any lawful Means prevent it. The Point therefore this *V.* must prove, is this; That Self-defence against a foreign Invader, when other Methods fail, is an unlawful Method for People to take in order to prevent their own Ruin. Or, that tho' the Christian Religion hath allowed the Christian Magistrate to defend himself and his innocent Subjects from Robbers and Cut-throats in private Cases, it hath absolutely condemned it in all Cases against a foreign Invader, tho' this be much more necessary for the same good End. To prove this, would do Service to a Cause which I hope the *V.* hath not much at Heart, but would by no Means be for the Honour of the Christian Religion. But to tell us that Christianity obliges us to bear Injuries, can be no Argument at all against our Doctrine; we are as ready to acknowledge this as this *V.* The Question is, how far it obliges us to do so? And that every Man, who hath not renounced his Reason, or mask'd it with a Vizard of Hypocrisy, will own, is no farther than they cannot prevent it by lawful and honourable Means. And if it can be shewn, that Self-defence in all Cases is condemn'd in the Gospel, this must be the Argument against it taken from Christianity, and not that it obliges us to bear Injuries; for this it may do, and yet allow of Self-defence, in Cases of publick Concern, as well as in some Cases of private Concern.

As to the Passages of Scripture from whence the *V.* infers his Argument, I have sufficiently examined them in the first Part of this Treatise, and shewn, that they necessarily require a Limitation, and that it can be no more shewn from those Expressions, that no Cases are to be excepted in the interpreting these Texts, than it can be from the like general
Ex-

Expressions us'd in other Places, that other Texts can admit of no Restrictions, which yet are allowed on all Hands to require a limited Interpretation.

We are forbid in unlimited Terms to resist Evil, but no where forbid to defend ourselves ; we are enjoined in unlimited Terms to love our Enemies, but this cannot imply a total Neglect of ourselves ; we are required likewise in unlimited Terms to pray for our Enemies, but this doth not imply that we are to pray in an unlimited Manner for them, any more than our Obligation to return them Blessing for Cursing implies in it a Necessity of praying for their worldly Prosperity to our own Destruction. We are required in general Terms to pray for all Men, but we are left to common Sense to inform us that Charity begins at Home, and that we are not obliged to pray for their Success or Life, if it be inconsistent with our own, or to prefer the temporal Good of any Person, before the Happiness of others in whom we are more nearly concerned.

THE *V.* further observes ; ‘ That according to
 ‘ the Reason given by Christ himself, immediately
 ‘ after these Precepts, they must certainly intend
 ‘ a Prohibition of all Injury and Revenge, or else
 ‘ the Comparison is not very proper ; *That ye may*
 ‘ *be the Children of your Father in Heaven, &c.*’
 Which Observation is equally impertinent with his former ; because the Practice we plead for, implies neither Injury nor Revenge, strictly so called. And further ; If it be unlawful for a Christian Community to defend themselves against a foreign Enemy, because we are to imitate our heavenly Father, who dispenses his temporal Blessings upon the most publicly prophane* ; by the same Argument, it will be

* I pray the *V.* to put these Words into the Mouth of a Criminal, and then consider the Consequence of them. Sir,
faith

be unlawful to defend ourselves against any villainous Assault whatsoever ; it will be unlawful for the Magistrate to inflict Punishment upon Criminals ; it will be unlawful for the most virtuous Woman to resist a Ravisher, &c. because God dispenses his temporal Blessings upon the vilest of the human Race : This Passage of Scripture is an excellent Argument against Revenge and Injury, arising from Mens Passions and corrupt Inclinations, which are entirely inconsistent with the publick Good ; and likewise for the most patient suffering of those Evils which they cannot lawfully and honourably avoid. But it is a sad Thing to find Men endeavouring to represent the Christian Religion, as throwing off all Care for the Happiness of human Society, and to look upon themselves, because Christians, as unconcern'd for their Families, Neighbours, and Posterity, at a Time when there is the greatest Call for such a Concern : This must make Strangers to it, apt to believe it an Enemy, and not a Friend, to human Society.

BUT further, the Argument against Self-defence taken from these Words, *That ye may be the Children of your Father which is in Heaven*, is not only inconclusive, but ill grounded ; and is so far from being in favour of the *V.* that it makes directly against him. We are commanded to love our Enemies by the Example of God himself, who maketh his Sun to rise on the Evil, and on the Good, and sendeth Rain on the Just, and on the Unjust, and yet the same God puts a manifest Difference between them ; some he pu-

saith the Malefactor to his Judge, Why are you so unkind and severe to me ? Tho' I be a Criminal, yet you ought to be as kind to me as the best of your Subjects ; because you are to follow God's Example, who makes the Sun to shine, and the Rain to fall on the Just and Unjust. Private Persons are hereby encouraged to love their Enemies, but it lays no Obligation on the Christian Magistrate not to defend the People from lawless Violence.

punishes with heavy Judgments in this Life, and hath in Store much heavier Judgments in the next. Tho' God be full of Patience and Long-suffering, yet the Scripture every where declares his Indignation and Wrath against obstinate Sinners, of which the Magistrate is declared by St. *Paul* to be the Minister, *Rom. xiii. 4.* And Christ himself being provok'd by the Obstinacy of the *Jews*, is said by a Parable, to send out his Army, and to burn up their City, which was accordingly fulfilled in Fact. So that tho' it be the Duty of Christians not to retaliate Injury and Revenge, that they may be the Children of their heavenly Father, who is good to the Unthankful and the Wicked, it will not follow that 'tis unlawful for the Magistrate (who is God's Minister to execute Vengeance, or inflict Punishment on them that do Evil) to defend with the Sword of Justice his Innocent Subjects against the lawless Violence of wicked Men; because at the same Time that he doth this, he may imitate his heavenly Father, who tho' he be kind to the Unthankful and Wicked, yet declares his Indignation and Wrath against obstinate Sinners, both in this Life and the next. Now from what hath been said on these Remarks, let any reasonable Man judge, whether our Saviour can be suppos'd in these Passages, wherein he prohibits all Injury and Revenge, to put the Case of a foreign Invasion, or that we should love Russians and Cut-throats in such a Manner, as not to defend the Publick from their Violence, lest in this Attempt they should chance to lose their Lives. And I must likewise submit it to the Judgment of every intelligent Reader, whether what the *V.* says in the latter Part of his Paragraph, Page 40. be not partly impertinent, and partly false. The Words are these: ' Will my putting up with
' small and tolerable Injuries, not indulging private
' Revenge, but resisting with Violence great Inju-
' ries,

' ries, and returning with the utmost Force all the
 ' Evil in my Power, in revenge for national Grie-
 ' vances, be coming up to this Comparison of the
 ' Almighty's universal Beneficence and Kindness to
 ' those that do their utmost to affront and oppose
 ' him ?' All this, I say, is impertinent ; because
 the Practice we plead for, doth not necessarily re-
 quire the returning with our utmost Force all the
 Evil in our Power in revenge for national Grievan-
 ces*. The *V.* is much mistaken if he thinks so.
 We are pleading for nothing but a necessary self-
 defence, which if we can do by Arguments or Per-
 suasives, thereby bringing the Enemy to reasonable
 Terms without shedding of blood, we shall neither
 be guilty of Violence nor Injury, if we require no-
 thing of him repugnant to Justice, which, if he
 complies with, there will be an End of all Hostili-
 ties on our Part ; but if, instead of complying with
 any reasonable Terms, he attacks us in an hostile
 Manner, we, in opposing Force to Force, purely
 in our own Defence, cannot, with any Colour of
 Reason, be said to commit Violence ; *i. e.* forcibly
 infringe upon any Man's Right, which is the pro-
 per Idea of Violence, and return all the Evil in our
 Power in revenge for national Grievances ; because
 this may be done, not from any Principle of Re-
 venge, but from the sole Principle of Self-preservation.
 And as for the Evils that may accidentally
 happen to the Aggressor, we cannot properly be
 said to be the Authors of them ; because he who
 begins the Violence, is the true Cause of all that fol-
 lows ; and whatever falls upon him, by the Oppo-
 sition

* He that defends himself in a lawful Manner, doth not act
 directly for the Hurt of another, but for his own Preservation :
 And he who repels a Wrong is not injurious, but he who offers
 it. 'Tis one Thing to exercise an unblameable Defence, and
 another Thing to prosecute an unmerciful Revenge. The lat-
 ' may be as great a Sin, as the first Offer an Injury ; but
 the former can never fall under so hard a Censure. *Passend.* 190.

sition made by the defending Party, is but the Effect of his own Act ; or, as I said above, it is that Violence, of which he is the Author, reflected back upon himself.

THE Practice therefore we plead for, being the Act of the supreme Magistrate, comes up to the Almighty's universal Beneficence as a Comparison ; who, notwithstanding this, doth by no Means clear the Guilty : And thus it appears that the *V*'s Conclusion is as false, as his Premises are impertinent.

Again : The Author of the Sermon endeavours to prove, that the Office of the Magistrate necessarily evinces the Lawfulness of Defensive War ; upon which the *V*. makes this Remark ; ‘ Whenever
‘ the Magistrate is convinced that the Doctrines of
‘ Christianity forbid War, it will be as much his
‘ Duty, as any other Man's, to render Obedience
‘ to those Doctrines ;’ *i. e.* in other Words, to act according to his Convictions. To which I reply : It seems very unaccountable how any Man can be convinced that 'tis lawful to be a Magistrate, who is the same time convinced of the Unlawfulness of Defensive War. For if it be the indispensable Duty of the Magistrate to protect the Lives and Liberties of the Subjects, and if this cannot, at some times, be done, without opposing Force to Force, I would ask this *V*. How that Man can be said to do his Duty, or act a consistent Part, who, undertaking the Office of a Magistrate, is bound in Conscience to deny that to the Publick, which at Times is the most valuable and necessary End of his Office ? He must either allow, that it is not the Magistrate's Duty to protect the Lives and Liberties of Subjects from unjust Violence, which I believe he will hardly venture to do ; or else, that every Man, principled against Self-defence, undertaking the Office of a Magistrate, acts such a Part as no honest Man can justify. The *V*. should have said, which would

have been much more for his Credit, Whenever a Man is convinced that the Doctrines of Christ forbid Defensive War, it will be his indispensable Duty to refuse the Office of a Magistrate (at least to act in the legislative Part of Government, whose Province it is to concert proper Measures for the Defence of the Publick) leaving this Office to those, who can comply with all the Ends of it with a safe Conscience.

But further: * I look upon it to be a preposterous Way of arguing, that because a Man is not convinced of the Lawfulness of any Practice evidently requisite for the Good of human Society, that therefore it is his Duty to omit it; this is making a Man's Faith or Persuasion the Rule of moral Duties. 'Tis true the Apostle saith, *Whatever is not of Faith is Sin*; but he doth not mean those moral Duties which are discoverable by the meanest Mortal, that has the Exercise of Reason; but such as arise from doubtful Speculations, the Practice or Omission whereof, hath no other Evil in them, than as they give Scandal or offence to weak Brethren. But to maintain, that every Man's Persuasion or Opinion is to be the Rule of his moral Duty, as this *V.* doth, both here, and where he says, 'If any sincere Christian understands it to be his Duty not to make any Defence at all, his refusing to use any, will never incur Guilt,' is, in my Opinion, of dangerous Consequence. One of the great Ends of Society is mutual Defence against Injuries; every Member therefore is obliged by the Law of Nature, whereby he is bound to observe Compacts, and fulfil Promises, to contribute his Share in Defence of the Publick; this is as indispensable a Duty on every Member of civil Society, as Obedience to Parents, or Subjection to Magistrates. 'Tis a Duty, the Obligation to which no Law can dispense with, nor can any Pre-
tence

* See Preface, Page 11.

tence whatsoever excuse the Neglect of it. Let a Man pretend to what Spirit he will, his understanding it to be his Duty to omit what both Reason and Revelation demonstrate to be Sin for him to omit, viz. Protection, if he be a Magistrate, and Obedience, if a Subject (besides the Obligation he is under, by the Law of Nature, to keep lawful Compacts, and fulfil lawful Promises) will undoubtedly incur Guilt, whatever this *V.* may fondly imagine to the contrary. By this Manner of arguing, Men may plead for the greatest Villainies. *Ravillac* understood it to be his Duty, and a very meritorious Act, to kill *Henry* the Fourth, because he favoured Hereticks; Did he therefore by this villainous Assassination incur no Guilt? The Enthusiasts and Fanaticks of *Munster* understood it to be their Duty to destroy their Magistrates, in order to make way for Christ's Kingdom, the Establishment whereof, they imagin'd, would be obstructed by these earthly Powers; Did therefore their actual rising in Arms against their lawful Magistrates incur no Guilt? And even as to Cases of Omission, if a Subject understands it to be his Duty not to obey the lawful Commands of the supream or sovereign Power of the Commonwealth, will he therefore incur no Guilt, when the Apostle says, *That he shall thereby receive to himself Damnation*? If a Christian understands it to be his Duty, from some mistaken Passages of Scripture, not to labour for the Meat that perisheth, and thereby starve himself and his Family, will he therefore incur no Guilt? If a Man should understand it to be his Duty to betake himself to a monastick Life, and thereupon abandon his Family, and retire to a Convent, will he therefore incur no Guilt?

If the Magistrate, the very End of whose Office it is to preserve and protect Mens Lives and Properties, understands it to be his Duty not to inflict Punishment on Evil-doers, notwithstanding this be in-

dispensibly necessary for the publick Security, will he therefore incur no Guilt? And finally, If all the Subjects of a Commonwealth, who are bound, by the Laws of God and Nature, to do every Thing that is lawful, and in their Power, for preserving and promoting the Good of the Community, understand it to be their Duty to omit a Practice, which at a certain Time is the only Means under God to preserve the Community from Ruin, will they therefore incur no Guilt? Whence I think it plainly appears, that this Way of arguing is not only groundless and absurd, as destroying the true Foundation of all moral Duties, but a most dangerous Error, and would infer most dreadful, yet necessary, Consequences*.

THE next Passage in this Vindicator's Answer to the Sermon, which seems to affect the general Doctrine I have established, is, Page 33. where he remarks on that Prophecy of *Isaiah* ii. 4. which says, *And he shall judge among the Nations, and shall rebuke many People, and they shall beat their Swords into Plowshares, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks, &c.* Which Prophecy can no more prove the Unlawfulness of Defensive War, so long as there shall be Occasion for it, than it will prove the Non-obligation of keeping a sucking Child from playing with a Viper, or the Non-necessity of keeping a Lamb from a Lion, because the same Prophecy tells us, that at the very Time when Men shall beat their Swords into Plowshares, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks, *The Lamb and the Lion shall lie down together, and the sucking Child shall play with the Basilisk.* It can prove nothing but this, That whenever that Prophecy shall be fulfilled, which we believe will be at the Conversion of the *Jews*, then all War will cease, an universal Peace being spread over the Nations. This the Prophet intimates by a symbolical Expression, of turning their Weapons

* This farther explained, Preface, Pages 11, 12, &c.

pons of War into Implements of Husbandry. Then there will be no Violence, and consequently no Need of Defence. But it can by no Rules of Reasoning be inferr'd from this Prophecy, that 'tis unlawful to make Use of such Weapons in our own Defence, so long as there is Necessity for it. This is not a Prophecy of the Gospel-Dispensation in general, but only of something that shall come to pass in a certain Period of that Dispensation. It only tells us what the State of Christians will be, as to this Point, when it shall be fulfilled; but not what their Duty is, with regard to it before; Only what shall be done in a certain Period of the Gospel Œconomy, but not what must be done before that Period comes. What the *V.* says with relation to the Cause and the Effect; 'That the Cause is the judging of Christ internally in Individuals, and the Effect, that wherever this judging is experienced, there is a Cessation from all War;' is either a bare-fac'd Sophism, or a meer Dream of his own; and is as opposite to the plain Import of the whole of this Prophecy, as Light is to Darkness. And if Men will take such Liberties as this in interpreting Scripture, they may bring Scripture Proofs for all the devout Dreams of *Jacob Bekmen*. Whenever this Prophet speaks of Christ's Kingdom, that he signifies an external glorious State, and not any hidden Kingdom in the Hearts of a Few, is evident from every Text that makes mention thereof. But that this glorious State, or at least that Period of it alluded to in the Text under Consideration, hath never been yet, but is still future, is as evident to all rational Men, who are well acquainted with Church-History. The Time hath never yet been when the Lion and the Lamb could lie safely together (taking these Words even in a figurative Sense) and the sucking Child play with the Basilisk without Danger of being hurt; and when there was none to

hurt in all God's Holy Mountain ; when Nation hath ceas'd to lift up Sword against Nation, and wholly left off to learn the Discipline of War. And if the *V.* can prove the present Age to be the Time prophesied of in these Words, I will give up the Point I contend for ; but if he cannot, I must beg Leave to insist upon it, that his Argument drawn from hence to the contrary, proves nothing. When Nation shall cease to lift up Sword against Nation, and not learn War any more ; then I own Christians may convert their Weapons of War into Implements of Husbandry ; but till then it doth not appear, from any thing in this Prophecy, that they may not lawfully keep them, and use them too, provided it be purely in their own Defence. Nothing from thence can be concluded against the Lawfulness of a necessary Self-defence, so long as they that heartily endeavour to live in Peace, are not suffered to enjoy it. What the *V.* quotes from the learned *Poet*, is so far from making it appear that this Prophecy makes in favour of his Argument, that it is a strong Confirmation of what I have advanced, *viz.* That the Completion of this Prophecy is yet to come. The Animosities and Hostilities between the *Jews* and Gentiles have never yet been rooted out ; this will never be till the *Jews* are converted ; nor have Mens Pride, and Passions, and Lusts, which are the Causes of all Wars, been subdued, as this learned Commentator says they shall be, when this Prophecy shall be fulfilled. And when he says, that the working Humility, Meekness, Self-denial, and true and fervent Love to all Men, from whence Peace necessarily follows, was the Design of the Gospel in all, and the Effect of it in those that rightly received it ; this no more proves that he thought this Prophecy makes Defensive War unlawful under the Gospel, than that he thought it makes capital Punishments by the Magistrate so. For if it be unlawful for the

Ma-

Magistrate to use the temporal Sword in Defence of his innocent Subjects, because it was the Design of the Gospel to work Humility, Meekness, Self-denial, and true and fervent Love to all Men, and the Effect of it in those who rightly received it; it must by the same Argument be unlawful for the Magistrate to defend himself and his peaceable Subjects from the villainous Attempts of Murderers and Cut-throats in his own Dominions; which Doctrine this learned Man was very far from believing. It is evident, that all have not yet complied with the Design of the Gospel, and it cannot be inferred from any thing in *Poole's* Words, that he thought it unlawful for those, who have comply'd so far with the Design of it, as to follow after the Things that make for Peace, to defend themselves against those who will not suffer them to enjoy it, when they cannot, in any human Probability, escape their unjust Violence otherwise.

' The *Jews*, says the *V.* understood this Prophecy to relate solely to the times of the Messiah, and alledge it as a strong Argument that the Messiah is not come.' Upon which I observe, that this *V.* is every where the same subtle Arguer. The *Jews* understood, by this Prophecy, that the Messiah would come in the Form of a great temporal Monarch, to restore them to their own Land, that *Jerusalem* should be the Seat of Government, and that all Nations should bow under his Scepter: In this Sense, I say, they understood this Prophecy to relate solely to the times of the Messiah, and alledge it as a strong Argument that the Messiah is not come; I leave the intelligent Reader to make the Application. The *Jews*, I grant, use this Prophecy by Way of *Argumentum ad hominem* against such Christians as this *V.* in order to prove that Christ cannot be the Messiah prophesied of by *Isaiab*, who, supposing that they understood this Prophecy in the same Sense

with themselves (as indeed such as the *V.* does in one Sense) urge them with this Question ; Why is not War and Fighting ceased among the Nations, if your Christ be the Messiah there prophesied of ? So that the *V.*'s Argument might pass well enough, if advanc'd by a Jew ; but as it comes from the Mouth of the *V.* of a Christian Doctrine, it is most intolerable ; and argues either the greatest Ignorance, or the most shameful Prevarication imaginable. And if the antient Fathers did affirm this Prophecy to be fulfilled in the Christians in their Times, as the *V.* asserts, I must beg Leave to desire him to consider, that these antient Fathers he speaks of, being some of that Man-made hireling Ministry he complains of, Page 3. of his Vindication, are to be understood, *Cum grano salis*. This, I dare say, he will readily grant me, as to many other Points these Fathers have most strenuously maintained ; and why their Authority should be of so great Weight with the Vindicator in this one Point, and no other, is not easy to be accounted for to his Credit. I should be glad to know of the *V.* whether he believes that those Fathers, upon whose Authority he depends so much for proving his Point, were among the Number of those ' Primitive Believers who were faithful to the ' Appearance of the divine Spirit, and obey'd the ' Teachings and Directions thereof,' or in the Apostacy he speaks of, Page 2 ? If he owns the first, he must renounce *Quakerism*, or else stand self-condemned ; if the second, what Reason have either we or he to believe that those apostate antient Fathers understood the true Meaning of this Prophecy ?

BUT further, if these antient Fathers did any where affirm this Prophecy to be fulfilled in the Christians in their Times, they could mean no more, than that it was fulfilled so far as that Christians liv'd more peaceably than the Heathens ; no more, than that it was fulfilled in some Sense, as we say ;
this

this was evident to every one from Matter of Fact. For tho' they who in times past killed one another, upon every little Provocation (as was common among the Heathens) did not then war and fight with their Enemies, as *Justin Martyr* speaks; yet Nation did then fight against Nation, and Kingdom against Kingdom, as much as ever, and Men learned War then as much as before. So that 'tis impossible any Man in his Senses could think, that this Prophecy was at that Time fully accomplished. Could *Justin Martyr* possibly imagine, that a Prophecy concerning the Peace and Tranquility of all Nations, was fulfilled in the passive Obedience of a very insignificant Number, in Comparison with all Nations? If he did, we may venture to say, without Breach of Charity, that he was as much mistaken in this Point, as the *V.* cannot but think he was in some others, which we look upon to be of far greater Importance. But granting the *V.* that the Fathers universally allow the Reign of Christ to be describ'd by the Prophet *Isaiah*, Chap. xi. where he says, *They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy Mountain, for the Earth it shall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea.* Will it therefore follow, that Defensive War is unlawful in every Period of this Reign? By no means. Nothing can be inferr'd from it against the Unlawfulness thereof, but only in that Period of it, when there shall be none to hurt nor destroy in all God's holy Mountain; and when the Earth shall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea. And if *Justin Martyr* took the holy Mountain in this Prophecy to be spoken of the Church of Christ, as the *V.* asserts, and if he tho't that this would be the State of the Church in every Period of it, we must beg Leave to think he was mistaken; for 'tis evident from Fact, that the Case is otherwise. The Time has never yet been when

it could be truly said, there was none to hurt nor destroy in the visible Church of Christ, tho' we have good Ground to believe there will be such a Time; and then we acknowledge that no Kind of War will be lawful, no, not a Defensive War; and the Reason is, because there will be no Violence to defend ourselves against. But so long as lawless Violence is offered, so long will Defensive War be lawful, and no longer, provided always it be managed with Justice and Humanity.

AND here I cannot but observe, that that Cause must be built on a very poor Foundation, which stands in Need of such wretched Props to support it, as some broken and imperfect Sentences of the ancient Fathers, made Use of for this Purpose, by those very Men who despise their Authority in other Cases, which the whole Christian World, but themselves, allow to be of much greater Importance; and raking into some obscure Prophecies of the Old Testament, which, as is evident in Fact, have never yet been literally fulfilled; and which the *Jews* make Use of to prove that Christ cannot be the true Messiah, and *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and a great many more of the *V's* Authorities, to prove the millenary Reign of Christ, when all the Just should rise from the Dead with the same Bodies that they liv'd in formerly, that they should fare deliciously, and enjoy corporeal Delights, and beget Children as before; and all this with an equal Degree of Claim to Truth with this Vindicator; they are equally qualified to support each of the latter Doctrines as the former, and each of the Vindicators seems to be intitled to an equal Degree of Merit, for such valuable Discoveries to the rest of mankind. What Truth therefore is in the latter Clause of the following Paragraph, which was the Point this Vindicator undertook to prove, I submit to the intelligent Reader to judge, viz. 'These
Pre-

' Predictions, says he, and some others of the like
 ' Tendency, together with the Examples and Testi-
 ' monies of the Apostles and primitive Christians,
 ' that Obedience to the Gospel and that Peace, not
 ' only to give them inward Peace, but to take a-
 ' way the Use of carnal Weapons, are very strong
 ' and cogent Proofs, that War cannot be consistent
 ' with the Purity and Perfection of the Christian Re-
 ' ligion.' Where we may see more of his Sophistry
 still, as if the Author of the Sermon had been plead-
 ing for War without any Distinction; and as if there
 were a Difference between the Christian Religion as
 contain'd in the New Testament, and the Purity and
 Perfection of that Religion, which he imagines is to
 be found no where but among them who have that
 Light which hath delivered them from all Sin; and
 that infallible Spirit, by which alone Men can come
 to a right Understanding of the Scriptures.

THAT neither these Predictions, nor the Example
 and Testimony of Christ and his Apostles, do in the
 least take away the Use of carnal Weapons, so as to
 make it unlawful for the Christian Magistrate to de-
 fend his Subjects against a foreign Enemy, I have
 fully prov'd already. And as for the primitive
 Christians, I will shew presently, that neither does
 their Example, or Testimony, do so. And there-
 fore what the *V.* thinks strong and cogent Proofs,
 that a Defensive War (for we contend for no other)
 cannot be consistent with the Purity and Perfection
 of the Christian Religion, as delivered by our Savi-
 our, and written by the Apostles in the New Testa-
 ment, will be no Proofs at all, but the meer Crea-
 ture of his own Imagination, which, instead of pro-
 ving the Truth of his Doctrine, will expose it to
 the just Indignation of every unprejudic'd reasonable
 Man.

Now as to the Example and Testimony of the
 primitive Christians, nothing can reasonably be in-
 ferr'd

terr'd from hence against the Lawfulness of Defensive War, for several Reasons. First, it must be considered that they being Subjects under their Magistrates, which their Religion taught them to regard as an Ordinance of God, had no Right to resist any Violence offered by them, as they were but private Subjects ; because in so doing, they would have been Rebels, and so would have incurr'd the Penalty of Damnation. A particular Party of Men may be barbarously us'd by their Superiors, and yet it may neither be expedient nor lawful for them to defend themselves by Force of Arms, because the Laws of the Community are against them ; and as they cannot in Conscience comply with these Laws, whatever Reason they may have to lament their Misfortune, they can have none to complain of being obliged to suffer the Penalty, in Case of Transgression. For every Person that submits to a Government, and becomes a Subject to any Prince, either explicitly or implicitly, stipulates and consents, that he will pay due Obedience to all the Laws of the Commonwealth to which he belongs ; which Obedience is justly due from him to the Government, for the Protection it affords him, and the Privileges he enjoys under it. Now if any Subject, under such Obligations, should find himself oblig'd in Conscience to alter his Conduct, whereby he transgresses some standing Law of the Community ; if in this Case, I say, he is made to suffer the Penalty in Case of such Transgression, it is no more than he had Reason to expect, because he is supposed to have promis'd Obedience to whatever Laws should be made by the Legislature of that Government to which he hath submitted ; and to attempt to defend himself by Force of Arms against the Execution of the Laws of this Government, would be no less than Rebellion. Wherefore the only lawful Remedy left him in this Case, is Patience, and Meekness,
under

under his Sufferings. Now this was the Case of the primitive Christians. They were a Party of Men barbarously used, and they had, no doubt, a Right to better Treatment ; but no one can shew, either that they could justly complain of the Execution of the Laws, unless it can be made appear, that their Superiors were convinc'd that they had a divine Commission for what they did contrary to those Laws ; or (which is a Consideration of great Weight in this Debate) that it would have been for the Interest and good of the Publick, or whole Community, that they should have risen up in Arms, and not only for their own particular Self-defence against their Superiors and Fellow Subjects, have put whole Nations in Combustion, and so have been the Occasion of great and universal Calamities. Every Body can see at once the infinite Difference between the Case of the primitive Christians, who were punished by their own Magistrates, because they could not in Conscience obey the Laws of their Country, and that of one Nation's invading another. Besides, it was very much for the Honour and Propagation of their Religion, whilst they were but a Party of Subjects, not concerned in the Management of State-Affairs, that they should engage the Favour of their Princes, and attract the Hearts of all Men to their Profession, by their signal Patience, and Submission to the greatest Torments imaginable. But it must be extremely to the Disgrace and Hindrance of their Religion, if it obliged them, when they became the whole of a Community, govern'd by their own Laws, to submit themselves to be ruined and made miserable by every lawless, foreign Invader. By the former they demonstrated to all the World the Power of their Faith, in Cases in which it was lawful and honourable for them to suffer, and to prefer their Duty to God and their Country, before their own private Interest.

Interest. But, upon the latter Supposition, nothing could be inclined, but that Christianity was an Enemy to the publick Good of human Society, and that it tended to conclude whole Nations under Slavery and Oppression ; unless, at the same time, it could be shewn, that Christians have good and rational Grounds to hope for a miraculous, or to trust in an ordinary Providence, without the Use of Means for their Protection.

BUT besides the Practice, we are urged with the Testimony of the primitive Christians (especially of the Fathers) against the Unlawfulness of War under the Gospel. To which I reply ; That tho' the universal Testimony of the primitive Fathers of the Christian Church, as to Matters of Fact, must of Necessity be received ; yet their Judgment, in any difficult Point, or any Part of their Practice depending upon their Judgment, ought not to be any farther regarded, than as it is founded either on the Reason of the Thing itself, or on the Declarations of Christ and his Apostles. As to the Point before us then, nothing can be concluded from the Sayings of the Fathers, but that it was the Opinion of some private Men. The first Testimony the *V.* quotes is that of St. *Ambrose*, a Man-made Minister, and an eminent Bishop, whose Testimony, if it be authentick in every Point he treats of, will be very little to the *V.*'s Credit. And besides, what he says in that Passage he hath quoted from him, relates intirely to his own Order, as will evidently appear to any One that can read his Offices, a Book wrote by him on purpose to teach Ecclesiasticks their Duty ; which rather implies, that others were not concluded by the same Rule, than the contrary. *Against Arms and Soldiers*, says he, in another Place *, *we have no other Weapons but Tears ; for these are the only Forts and Muniments of a Priest.*

So

* *Lib. 5. Orat. in A.*

So may the Passage quoted by him from *Origen* against *Celsus*, as appears from the following Words ; *To those who, being Unbelievers, says he, would oblige us to fight for the Commonwealth, and to destroy Men, we shall give this Answer, That even their own Idol Priests, and those that attend upon the Service of their reputed Gods, do keep themselves unstained with human Blood, that so they may offer up their Sacrifices for the whole Nation with clean and unpolluted Hands. Neither, in case there should arise a War, are these Men to be listed in their Armies ; and if this be not done without Reason, how much more may they be said after their Manner to fight, who, being Priests to the most high God, endeavour to preserve themselves free from Blood and Rapine ? That so whilst others are polluted with Spoil and Slaughter, they may wrestle with God himself by constant and incessant Prayers, for the Welfare of them who make War justly (mark this) and for the Safety of them that govern righteously **. It was an Opinion early introduced into the Church, that such as put themselves into holy Orders, ought not to be entangled with any other Care, nor diverted by any other daily Labour. The Clergy, among all Nations, were ever exempted from bearing Arms ; which Practice obtain'd likewise among the Christian Clergy very early, as appears by that Collection of Rules called *The Apostolical Canons* ; and thus we have stumbled upon the true Origin of the Quakers Non-resisting Principle, which, in the Opinion of some, looks much more like a Branch of Priestcraft, than a Doctrine of Christianity.

THAT St. *Ambrose* and *Origen* did not look upon all Sorts of War to be unlawful under the Gospel, is evident from hence : The same *Origen* brings in Bees, as a Proof that it was lawful for Christians to make a just and well order'd War, as often as Necessity required. And St. *Ambrose* expressly affirms †, That

* *Apocalyps*, i. 6.

† *Serm.* 7.

‘ That simply to go to War was no Sin, but only to
 ‘ fight for Spoil and Plunder.’ And likewise in his
 Offices he says, ‘ That Force, whereby either our
 ‘ Country is defended from our Enemies by War,
 ‘ or the Weak and Innocent defended at Home, or
 ‘ our Associates from Pirates and Robbers, is per-
 ‘ fect Justice.’ And in another Place he speaks
 thus †: ‘ The Emperor *Julian*, tho’ an Apostate,
 ‘ yet had many Christians that fought under his Ban-
 ‘ ner; to whom when Command was given to march
 ‘ against the Enemy in Defence of their Country,
 ‘ they readily obey’d; but being commanded to
 ‘ march against the Christians, then they acknow-
 ‘ ledged no Emperor but the King of Heaven.’
 Now, whether the Testimony of these two antient
 Fathers can be any Proof against the Lawfulness of
 Defensive War, I leave the impartial Reader to
 judge. The *V.* says, after he had quoted *Origen’s*
 Words: This is a full and plain Declaration of the
 Opinion and Practice of the Christians in *Origen’s*
 Time; which I beg Leave to deny: For tho’ in
 some Cases Christians did refuse to bear Arms, not
 because it was in itself unlawful, but in respect of
 some Circumstances they were in, which would not
 admit of the Exercises of War, without doing some
 Acts that the Christian Religion would not allow of,
 such as taking the military Oath by the Heathen
 Gods, or the Genius of the Emperor; fighting a-
 gainst their Christian Brethren; that is, being obli-
 ged to harass them in Times of Persecution, and
 the like: I say, tho’ in such Cases as these, Christians
 did sometimes refuse to bear Arms, yet that Numbers
 of them did bear Arms, both before and after *Origen’s*
 Time, and were not condemned by the Church for
 it, is evident from History. We have seen already,
 that the Emperor *Julian* had many Christians that
 fought under his Banner, who are commended by
 St.

† *De Offic. Lib. 1, Cap. 27.*

St. *Ambrose* for readily obeying the Command to fight in Defence of their Country, and for acknowledging no Emperor but the King of Heaven, when commanded to march against the Christians.

Clemens Alexandrinus expressly says*, ‘ That a Christian may be a Magistrate ;’ which implies that he did not think all War unlawful. And when describing the Habit of a Christian, he says, ‘ It would become him to be unshod, unless he be a Soldier.’ *Clemens Romanus* says†, ‘ Let the Soldier that desires Baptism be instructed to abstain from wrong doing, and from Oppression, and to content himself with his Pay : If he be willing to obey, let him be admitted.’ And I defy any Man to shew, from the whole History of the Church, where ever any were rejected from Baptism, or read out of the Meeting, because he was a Soldier ; which undoubtedly would have been done, had all War been inconsistent with the Purity and Perfection of the Christian Religion.

AND *Tertullian*, another of the *V*’s Authorities, expressly says, ‘ We, tho’ Strangers, do notwithstanding supply all your Places and Offices, we fill your Cities, Islands, Castles, Towns, Councils, yea, and your very Camps.’ And in another Place he says, ‘ We both sail and fight with you in the same Fleet||.’

AND he tells the same *Marcus Aurelius*, who, as the *V*. says, threatened the Christians in his Time for not bearing Arms, but could not prevail with them so to do (which, tho’ true, can be no Proof that Christians thought all War contrary to Christianity) ‘ That the Prayers of his Christian Soldiers had procured from God Rain in the Time of Drought.’

AND in another Place‡ he commends the Brave-
H ry

* *Pædag. Lib. 2. Cap. 11.* † *Const. Lib. 8. Cap. 32.*
 ‡ *Apol. Contr. Gentes. Cap. 37. Cap. 42.* † *De Coron. Militis.*

ry of that Soldier before all his Brethren, that had thrown away the Garland when he had won it ; intimating unto the said Emperor, that he had many other such Christian Soldiers.

AND we have Instances out of the same Author, of Soldiers that endured Torments even to Death, for the Christian Faith, and were therefore worthily admitted by the Church to the same Honour with other Martyrs.

AND St. *Cyprian*[†], the famous Bishop of *Carthage*, and another of the *V*'s Authorities against the Lawfulness of Defensive War, expressly says of two Men, both *African* Soldiers, ' That they were once ' Soldiers fighting under secular Princes, but they ' were at the same Time true Soldiers of God, ' when by the Confession of their Faith in Christ, ' they vanquished the Devil ; and by their invincible Patience under the Cross, were ennobled with ' the Crown of Martyrdom.' And here I cannot but remark, how groundless the *V*'s Suggestion is, Page 53. and how uncharitably he guesses, where, speaking of the Soldiers in *Dioctlesian*'s Army, he says, ' But what Sort of Christians those were in the Emperor's Army, whom *Dion* said could fight, we can ' only guess at. They might indeed bear the Name ' of Christians, as Multitudes do Now-a-days.' Answer ; It appears from what I have just now said, that there were many Soldiers among the primitive Christians, who did more than bear the Name of Christians ; for they suffered Martyrdom, not because they would not bear Arms, but because they would not renounce Christianity. And even those Soldiers in *Dioctlesian*'s Army, might be more than meer nominal Christians, tho' they were not so scrupulous as *Maximilian* was ; who by mistaking the true Meaning of some Passages in the Gospel (as some now-a-days do) might think they imply'd a Prohibition

[†] *Cypr. Ep. ad Cler. & Pleb.*

hibition of all Use of the Sword. But this *V.* I find, will allow none to be more than nominal Christians, who have not got an Understanding exactly of a Size with his own; in which Case, I can assure him, every Authority he hath here quoted, will be but a nominal Christian; for they and he differ very widely on every Point of the Christian Religion, however well he may think they agree in this. But further; that there were Soldiers in the primitive Times, that were more than meer nominal Christians, will appear from the noted Passage of the *Thebean* Legion. But before I proceed to give any Account of it, it will be proper to observe, that sometimes when the Persecution was heightened, all the Christian Soldiers and Officers, as well as others, were commanded to renounce Christianity, and embrace Paganism, by pouring Incense on the Altar to the Heathen Gods, or delivering up their Bibles, and the like, which, tho' some thro' Fear comply'd with, yet great Numbers absolutely refused it; and this drew upon them the Torments they suffered. Now this Legion having been converted unto Christianity some Time before by the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, when they lay in *Palestine*, as *Eucherius* saith, contentedly serv'd in the Army all that Time, but being suspected by the Emperor *Maximian* of having embrac'd Christianity, they were commanded to sacrifice to Idols; which they absolutely refusing, and confessing themselves to be Christians, were all put to Death at the Emperor's Command. Now this Legion, though very powerful (it consisting of 6666 brave Soldiers) did not attempt any Resistance; both because it would have been impossible for them to defend themselves against the Emperor's whole Army, and because they look'd upon it as inconsistent with the Duty of Subjects to oppose their Magistrates in the Execution of the Laws. But tho' they would not defend themselves against their own Magistrates (which indeed would

not have been agreeable to the Law of Nature) yet it appears from the noble Speech they made before their Execution, that they were not principled against bearing Arms in Defence of their Country. ‘ Against any foreign Power, say they, we freely offer our Hands, which yet we dare not imbrue in the Blood of Innocents. Our Arms which have been long practis’d in suppressing Vice, and in vanquishing Foes, never yet knew how to oppress the Righteous, or to cut the Throats of our Neighbours and Fellow Citizens. When first we engaged in War, we remember it was to protect, and not to destroy : We have hitherto fought for Justice, for Piety, for the Defence of Innocence ; for these Prizes we have slighted all Dangers ; we have fought for the Defence of our Faith, which should we have broke with God, how canst thou, O Emperor ! expect that we should keep with thee ?’

In short, in most of the antient Persecutions, we find Examples of Christian Soldiers, who were as content and ready to die Martyrs, as any other Christians. In *Tertullian’s* Time, it appears, they were as couragious in passive, as active Valour. And in the Persecution of *Decius*, we read of a File, or, as some render it, a Troop of Soldiers, who attending in the Court of Judicature, where Christians were try’d for their Religion, ran to the Bar, and cry’d out, We are Christians ; and made the Judges themselves tremble. *Eusebius* saith, ‘ Christian Soldiers went out in a Kind of Pomp and State to die, and rejoic’d at the Testimony they were to give for the Faith.’ I could bring many more Examples of this Nature among the Christian Soldiers, but this is enough to shew, that there were Numbers of Soldiers among the primitive Christians that were more than meer nominal Christians, as this *V.* uncharitably suggests. From
all

all which it appears, that nothing can be concluded from the Testimony or Practice of the primitive Christians against the Lawfulness of Defensive War against a foreign Invader.

BUT even supposing that some of the Christian Fathers were really of Opinion, that all War was unlawful under the Gospel ; what then ? Will this amount to a Proof that it really is so ? Every Father the *V.* hath quoted, taught Doctrines, and held Opinions more zealously than he can prove they did the Unlawfulness of Defensive War ; and yet I presume their Authority has no Weight with him in these Points. *St. Ambrose* maintain'd the Necessity of Episcopacy to the Being of a true Church, that Water Baptism, and the Belief of the Resurrection of the same Body, were necessary to Salvation (as did all the Fathers he hath mentioned.) *Athenagoras* maintain'd the Worship of Angels, and that they were created to take Care of Things here below. He recommends Virginity, condemns second Marriages, and calls them an honourable Adultery.

TERTULLIAN, who writes more like a Poet than an Historian, can hardly ever be literally interpreted, without making him to appear a Writer of no good Character. He asserts*, That a Christian cannot in Conscience perform the Function of a Judge, nor serve as an Executioner of Justice. He absolutely condemns second Marriages, as being Adultery†. He prohibits Christians to avoid Martyrdom ; and enjoin'd the most strict and frequent Fasts.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS held the absolute Necessity of Water Baptism, pleads that 'tis unlawful to fly from Persecution, contrary to our Saviour's Words ; that a true Christian is free from Passions, even the most innocent Ones, except such as regard the Preservation of the Body ; and that the Christian is the only rich Man||.

ORIGEN

* *De Idol. Cap. 17.* † *De Coron. Cap. 11.* || *Pedag.*

ORIGEN maintains, that all intelligent Beings ever did, and ever shall, exist ; that they have been always free to do Good and Evil, and that they have been precipitated into lower Places, and confin'd to Bodies for a Punishment of their Sins†.

As to *Maximilian*, who, as the *V.* says suffered Death for refusing to bear Arms, nothing can be interr'd from this obscure single Instance against the Lawfulness of the Practice ; since, as I have shewn, many Christians who suffered Death for the sake of their Religion did so. Either there might be some Circumstance attending his particular Case, which made it his Duty to refuse it ; or he may have been one of those Christians we read of, who were so intemperate in their Zeal, that they ran unnecessarily to Torments, and desir'd rather to be condemn'd than absolv'd ; and did several other Things in which we are under no Obligation to follow their Steps, nor to think that they were obliged by any Precept of the Gospel to act as they did. Now what I would observe, from what I have said upon these Opinions of the Fathers, is this ; That if this *V.* will not allow the Authority of these Fathers in one Case, as I am pretty confident he will not, why should he urge it so strenuously in another ? If the universal Example of the primitive Christians is not to be followed in one Case, it cannot, if we consider it by itself, be justly accounted of greater Force in any other.

It may justly be expected, that they who argue so strongly from their Example, according to the Account given of it by these Antients, should imitate it in all other Instances recorded by the same Writers, or, at least, argue for the Necessity of so doing. But whilst they acknowledge no such Necessity in many other Cases, we cannot think their bare Example to be, in this Case only, of great Importance, even could it be proved. But in Truth none of the Fathers say any thing from whence it can be concluded, that Defensive War, against a foreign Enemy, was reckoned unlawful by the primitive Christians. *Tertullian*, 'tis true, seems, in some Cases, to speak doubtfully of it, not because it was in itself unlawful, as I observed above, but because Christian Soldiers were apt to be exposed to some Actions which were not consistent with their Christian Profession. Hence we find he objects in one Place, ' That Christian Soldiers were sometimes commanded to swear ' by the Heathen Gods : ' Whereupon in another Place he argues thus ; ' Shall, says he, a Christian watch to guard the ' Temples of those Gods whom he hath renounced ? Shall he sup ' there where he is forbidden to eat ? Shall he defend those ' Spirits by Night, which he exorciseth by Day ? ' And then he adds ; ' How many other great Offences may be ' seen in military Duties, which cannot be otherwise interpreted, ' ed, but as Breaches of our Christian Laws ? ' But tho' in
some

some Places he thus speaks doubtfully, yet in other Places he speaks more favourably, so as to make it appear, that he did not understand it to be inconsistent with the Purity and Perfection of the Christian Religion. He speaks of it as dangerous, but not as unlawful; and that it is so, I know no body that will deny. Besides, the Places I have quoted already, wherein this Father speaks favourably of a just War, in his *Idololatria*, he says; ‘It is much questioned whether Christians may take Arms, or whether Soldiers may be admitted to Christianity.’ And in his *Corona Militis*, after he had disputed a while against the Lawfulness of War, he at length distinguishes between him that entered into Arms before he was baptized, and him that lifted himself after Baptism. ‘For, says he, their Condition is plainly otherwise, who being first Soldiers, were afterwards converted to the Faith, as theirs whom St. *Jobn* admitted to his Baptism; or that faithful Centurion’s whom Christ approved of, and whom St. *Peter* instructed; provided that having once embraced the Christian Faith, and being sealed up thereunto by Baptism; they either renounce the War presently, as some have done, or take special Care that they do nothing therein that may offend God.’ Whence it is evident, that *Tertullian* look’d upon the military Office only as dangerous, but not as unlawful; because Christians might continue in Arms after Baptism, which certainly would not have been permitted by him, if he had thought that all War was contrary to the Gospel, no more than Magicians and Soothsayers were permitted after Baptism to retain their unlawful Professions. ‘They who profess such Arts as the Christian Discipline do not allow, says he†, are not to be admitted into the Church of Christ.’ And of the same Opinion were St. *Augustine* and St. *Cyprian*. I have shewn above, that both St. *Ambrose* and St. *Cyprian* approv’d of a just War, and so did St. *Augustine* and St. *Basil*. ‘Good Men, saith the First*, make War their Refuge; but wicked Men make it their Delight.’ And the Last gives this Testimony of the primitive Christians; ‘That their Ancestors never accounted that Execution which was done in a just War as Murder; but always held them excus’d, that fought for the Defence of Chastity, and of Piety.

NEITHER was there any one Bishop, that we read of, among so many that were great Sufferers for Religion, that ever reprov’d *Constantine* (who was turn’d Christian) for making War, or that ever endeavoured to make his Soldiers decline it; tho’ many of them were very severe Disciplinarians, sparing neither Prince nor People, that were defective in their Duties. Now let the impartial Reader but consider what this *V.* hath alledged from the Example and Testimony of the primitive Christians to prove the Unlawfulness of Defensive War, and what I have

advanced

advanced in Answer thereto, and then let him judge with what Assurance he could say, ' That the Examples and Testimonies of the primitive Christians, that Obedience to the Gospel had that Effect, not only to give Christians inward Peace, but to take away the Use of carnal Weapons, are very strong and cogent Proofs, that War cannot be consistent with the Purity and Perfection of the Christian Religion ' And even tho' it may appear doubtful, whether these Antients look'd upon all War to be unlawful, which, to me, it does not, yet we ought not from thence to make any Doubt, whether it be lawful for us to enter into a necessary War for defending our Country against a foreign Enemy. Many of the primitive Fathers disallow'd of second Marriages, and several other lawful Practices, as I have shewn above ; yet no wise Man will conclude, that they are in themselves unlawful. For tho' the Omission of such Practices might be expedient then, and, in some Circumstances, Ornaments of the Christian Profession, and acceptable to God ; such as Celibacy in times of Persecution, &c. yet they are not impos'd upon as by the Necessity of any Law.

NAY further ; Admit there are some Texts of Scripture, which seemingly forbid all Sorts of War ; yet since it hath been reckoned by all good Men a Means sufficient for avoiding personal Inconveniencies (as cutting off a Right hand, or plucking out a Right-eye) to admit of any Sense rather than the literal ; much rather should those Places of Scripture that are urg'd against the Use of carnal Weapons in Defence of Mens Lives and Liberties admit of any Sense, than that Christianity should be made to destroy that which is one of the main Pillars of Human Society. For if it be granted that the World cannot subsist without Government, nor any Government without Protection and Defence, which every Body but a wild Visionary, or bare fac'd Hypocrite, will readily grant ; then it is as certain, that that Religion cannot be Good, which teaches such Doctrines, which, if followed, thro' their native Consequences, will destroy all Government, and turn human Society into a Field of Blood. And therefore I conclude, that every such Doctrine, let its Pretences to Sanctity be ever so specious, and the Abettors of it ever so precise, ought not only to be held in the utmost Abhorrence and Detestation, by every true Friend to his Country, but to be suppress'd with all possible Care and Prudence, as a Nuisance and Pest to the Government where it is maintain'd, and an egregious Reprobach to the Christian Religion.

E R R A T A.

Page 26. Line 36. for *lie* read *live*. p. 31. l. 34. dele *the*. p. 32. l. 9. for *the* read *the*. p. 34. l. 16. dele *of*. p. 52. l. 11. dele *be*. p. 85. l. 38. for *understood* read *understand*. p. 87. l. 23. dele *it*. p. 92. l. 2. for *included* read *concluded*.

F I N I S.