

The Kingdom of God is Justice and Peace: Lessons for Post-Soviet Evangelicals from Glen H. Stassen

Joshua T. Searle

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Artikel stellt den amerikanischen Wissenschaftler Glen H. Stassen vor, einen seriösen Exegeten, und seine Auffassung der Bergpredigt als ein Aufruf an alle Christen, aktiv nach Frieden zu trachten. Er vertritt die Auffassung, dass weder passive Unterordnung noch gewalttätige Konfrontation wünschenswerte Optionen sind, weil Jesus seine Nachfolger in einen aktiven, gewaltfreien Widerstand ruft, der tatsächlich rückhaltlos von Martin

Luther King praktiziert wurde. Kings Gewaltlosigkeit sowie seine Betonung von Versöhnung decken sich mit Stassens Modell einer gerechten Friedenstiftung und mit den Lehren des Neuen Testaments. Ebenso zeigt auch Nikolai Berdyaev auf, wie eine Vergötterung des Staates, Militarismus und Imperialismus im Widerspruch zum Evangelium stehen. Christen sollten sich nicht aus der Gesellschaft zurückziehen, sondern Leuchtturm der Versöhnung und der Liebe sein.

* * * *

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article présente l'exégète Glen H. Stassen et son interprétation du Sermon sur la montagne comme un appel pour tous les chrétiens à rechercher activement la paix. Il plaide que ni la soumission passive, ni la confrontation violente ne sont des options viables, parce que Jésus appelle ses disciples à une résistance active mais non violente, comme Martin Luther King en a donné l'exemple.

La non violence de Luther King et son insistance sur la réconciliation sont conformes à la pensée de Stassen sur la manière juste d'œuvrer à la paix, ainsi qu'à l'enseignement du Nouveau Testament. De même, Nicolas Berdiaev montre comment la divinisation de l'État, le militarisme et l'impérialisme sont contraires à l'Évangile. Les chrétiens ne doivent pas se retirer de la société, mais y être des porteurs de réconciliation et d'amour.

* * * *

SUMMARY

This article introduces the American scholar Glen H. Stassen, a respectable exegete, and his reading of the Sermon on the Mount as a call on all Christians to actively seek peace. It argues that neither passive submission nor violent confrontation is a viable option, because Jesus calls his followers to active, non-violent resistance, which

was indeed practised by Martin Luther King. King's non-violence and emphasis on reconciliation are consistent with Stassen's model of just peace-making and with the teaching of the New Testament. Likewise Nikolai Berdyaev shows how deification of the State, militarism and imperialism are contrary to the gospel. Christians should not withdraw from society but be beacons of reconciliation and love.

* * * *

1. Introduction

Never in the history of post-Soviet Eurasia has the need for justice and peace been as pressing as it is today. Thanks to the unprecedented technological progress of our age, we have become much better

at hurting and killing our fellow human beings than at any other time in history. Our clever scientists have developed sophisticated technology that enables a few people operating a missile system on the ground to push a button that releases a deadly

missile which blasts an airliner out of the sky from a height of 10,000 meters, causing the instant death of hundreds of innocent people. Furthermore, we are all living under the threat of nuclear weapons, which could annihilate all humankind within a few hours of infernal destruction. In a nuclear age, the principle of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) makes it impossible for there to be any winners, for everyone and everything would be obliterated.

Faced with the devastating loss of life caused by the recent war between Ukraine and Russia and the risk of major further escalation involving other nuclear-armed Western powers, many Christian leaders throughout post-Soviet Eurasia have been confronted with urgent and difficult questions concerning the ethical and spiritual responsibilities of Christians in a situation of war. In an age of renewed hostilities, it is high time that evangelical Christians not only discuss or think about peace theories, but actively engage in the creative development of imaginative alternatives towards the resolution of violent conflict.

Although this article is written against the backdrop of the current hostilities between Ukraine and Russia, the aim is not to address this conflict directly by arguing which side is ‘wrong’ and which is ‘right’, but to consider the issue of just peace-making from biblical, historical and theological perspectives. This article is thus directed towards the elucidation of a biblically-rooted vision for just peace-making, which takes the teachings of Jesus as both its object and point of departure.¹ I proceed from the assumption that the call to be peace-makers is not a secondary or derivative issue that we can think about after we have sorted out all our other beliefs concerning sin and salvation. Rather, if someone claims to follow Christ, that person is called to strive actively to promote peace and to uphold justice.² As followers of the Risen Christ, Christians are called to ‘live peaceably in a violent world’.³ In other words, peace and justice are not just ‘noble ideals’, but urgent gospel imperatives that are ‘constitutive of Christian existence’.⁴ Moreover, justice and peace are not passive states of being, but, rather, they are active and dynamic manifestations of the kingdom of God. Since the focus is on active prevention, rather than passive responses to violent hostilities, it will be necessary to address briefly the issue of what causes wars and how these causes can be counteracted by gospel-informed practices of just peace-making.

Recognising that this article does not necessarily represent a broad evangelical point of view,

my aim is to present the issue of justice and peace from a Radical Reformation perspective.⁵ As such, this article is written as a challenge to mainline European evangelical thinking on these issues, which has tended to follow the so-called ‘just war’ ideas of North American evangelical theologians.⁶

2. Transforming initiatives of grace: resisting evil non-violently

Glen H. Stassen (1936-2014), who served as Professor of Christian Ethics at Fuller Theological Seminary, was one of the pioneers of the ‘just peace-making’ initiative. As a Distinguished Visiting Professor of the International Baptist Theological Seminary in Prague, he was one of my teachers during my time there as a masters student in 2008. Unfortunately, during his lifetime Stassen never achieved widespread recognition as a serious biblical exegete among evangelical theologians. In an article on Stassen’s contributions to Christian ethics, Michael Willett Newhart laments that, ‘most New Testament scholars writing on the Sermon [of the Mount] are not saying anything about Stassen’s work’.⁷ One of the reasons why biblical scholars have tended to ignore Stassen’s contributions is that he is regarded as a Christian ethicist, rather than a biblical exegete. However, Stassen displayed a wide erudition in biblical scholarship and a deep knowledge of the biblical languages. Moreover, his work was published in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, which is arguably the leading journal in biblical studies.⁸ It is unfortunate, therefore, that he is still seen as an outsider by the biblical studies establishment.

A persistent thesis that recurs throughout Stassen’s writings is that for Christians, peace and justice are not primarily issues of social ethics, but rather they are gospel issues.⁹ Just peace-making is not simply a moral obligation, but a gospel imperative.¹⁰ Anyone who claims to follow the way of Christ is called actively to promote conditions that lead to justice and peace. Passive avoidance of conflict is not enough for anyone who wants to be faithful to the Way of Jesus.¹¹ Stassen used to insist that the first question Christians ask about issues of war and peace should not be ‘can such and such a war be justified on biblical or social-ethical grounds?’, but, ‘what do the teachings of Jesus teach us about how to prevent war and which practices make for peace?’¹² Stassen asserted that, ‘The gospel is about God’s initiatives of grace, not merely about what we are not supposed to do.’¹³

Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom is concerned with the way that God's reign of peace and justice has become a new reality. The main concern of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:38-42) is not the issue of whether or not we have permission to retaliate violently. Stassen argues from a solidly biblical perspective, claiming that the Scriptures – in particular the teachings of Jesus – contain practical and realistic measures that Christians can take in order to overcome the conditions that lead to violent conflicts. Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount is not confined to a private sphere of personal morality, but constitutes 'a public ethic that gives important guidance for preventing wars'.¹⁴

Stassen rightly recognises the futility of traditional evangelical approaches to the issue of war and peace, which look for individual biblical verses in order to substantiate certain arguments concerning whether Christians can engage in armed conflict. It is senseless, Stassen notes, to attempt to argue either for or against Christian participation in armed conflict through a propositional analysis of New Testament texts isolated from their narrative setting.¹⁵ Writing with a careful appreciation of the historical context of Jesus' time and a nuanced understanding of the original Greek text, Stassen has argued that Jesus' teachings in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7) are arranged into 'fourteen triads', each of which contains a teaching on (1) traditional righteousness; (2) a vicious cycle; and (3) a transforming initiative.

Taking the example of Jesus' teaching on anger and violence (Mt 5:21-26),¹⁶ Stassen notes that in verse 21 Jesus first explains the traditional understanding on this issue: (1) 'You have heard that it was said to those of ancient times, "You shall not murder; and whoever murders shall be liable to judgement."' Jesus then explains in verse 22 the vicious cycle of violence that results from destructive attitudes of the heart: (2) 'But I say to you that if you are being angry with a brother or sister, you will be liable to judgement; and if you insult a brother or sister, you will be liable to the council, and if you say, "You fool", you will be liable to the fire of hell.' Through his analysis of the Greek text, Stassen notes that these first two pronouncements of Jesus contain no imperatives. By contrast, the third part of Jesus' teaching (vss 23-26), which Stassen calls the 'transforming initiative', contains several imperatives (underlined): (3) 'So when you are offering your gift at the altar, if you remember that your brother or sister has something against

you, *leave* your gift there ... and *go*; first *be reconciled* to your brother or sister, and then come and *offer* your gift. *Come to terms* quickly with your accuser.' Far from preaching 'impossible ideals', Jesus was offering a grace-based, practical way of real deliverance.¹⁷

On the issue of Jesus' teaching concerning how evil ought to be resisted, Stassen offers a helpful perspective. He claims that the Greek in Matthew 5:39 ('do not resist evil') should be translated as 'not to retaliate by revengeful or evil means'. Clearly Jesus was not commanding his followers not to resist evil at all. Jesus himself frequently resisted evil, whether this evil was expressed by the Pharisees and the political and religious authorities of his day, or by Satan himself (Mt 4:1-11; 23:1-36; Lk 13:32).¹⁸ Rather, Jesus' transforming initiatives mandate his followers not to submit passively to evil practices or commands, but to perform a non-violent transforming initiative that shames the one who makes the unjust command.¹⁹ For instance, if someone asks for their tunic (Mt 5:40), Jesus instructs his disciples to hand over not only their tunic but also their cloak, which would leave them literally naked, thus exposing the greed of the one who made the demand and shaming him publicly.²⁰ Therefore, when confronted with violence, war and monstrous injustice, Jesus teaches his followers not to acquiesce meekly to evil demands, but to resist through creative acts of love and obedience to the gospel of grace and forgiveness.

It is alarming that in the 1930s the vast majority of German clergy (whether Protestant, Catholic or Baptist) tacitly supported Hitler, partly as a result of their misinterpretation of Jesus' words about not resisting evil. As detailed historical studies have shown, eighty percent of German pastors and most theologians in the 1920s and early 1930s opposed the democratic Weimar Republic and favoured the authoritarian German National People's Party, which helped to bring Hitler to power in 1933.²¹ The history of Germany in the early 20th century, as well as the more recent history of post-Soviet Russia, teaches us the tragic lesson that an authoritarian regime, nourished on hatred and the constant need to search for and identify 'harmers', can enjoy astonishing levels of popular support, as the mass of people enter a state of collective psychosis. Therefore, Scripture, tradition and historical experience all testify to the gospel imperative of non-violent resistance to the forces of evil, and the tragic consequences that

ensue when Christians opt for passive non-resistance instead of active, non-violent resistance. Such resistance can involve performing a transforming initiative with the intention to shame one's persecutor into recognising their guilt. Such resistance can also employ what John Caputo calls 'the weak force of forgiveness' as a means of overcoming enmity.²² In order to end vicious cycles of violence, such acts of forgiveness may need to be unilateral – in the sense that forgiveness is offered even when it is not sought by the persecutor. Alternatively, active, non-violent resistance can be demonstrated through acts of creative love. The life and teachings of Martin Luther King bear eloquent testimony to the efficacy of such acts.

3. Martin Luther King and non-violence

Glen Stassen has convincingly argued that in order to resist evil in a way that is faithful to the teachings of Jesus, neither passive submission nor violent confrontation is a viable option. Rather non-violent, creative acts of loving disobedience are the means that Jesus commands to bring transformation. There are several and well-documented precedents for this approach. The black Baptist leader and civil rights campaigner, Dr Martin Luther King (1929–1968), learned from Lev Tolstoy and Mahatma Gandhi – and, most of all, from Jesus – that love as romantic sentiment or affection was useless in the struggle against racism.²³ Too often Christians have spoken about love as an abstract, disembodied sentiment that generates warm, glowing feelings of happiness and well-being. But this notion of love is at variance with the biblical conception of agape. Agape-love is a transformative and subversive power that incurs pain, suffering and even death. Love that simply submits passively to racial injustice cannot solve the evil of racism; neither can violent confrontation. King recognised that it was impossible for oppressed people to love their enemies in an affectionate sense. But he maintained that they could still love their oppressors if love was defined as 'understanding, redeeming good will for all men [*sic*]'.²⁴ King believed that the white community needed the love of the black minority because the evil of racism had harmed not only the blacks who were being oppressed, but had also blemished the souls of the white majority community.

King argued that, far from being an expression of weakness, non-violence was a weapon of the strong, claiming that those who resorted to

passive non-violence out of fear were not truly non-violent.²⁵ The aim of active non-violent resistance, based on Jesus' teachings in the Sermon on the Mount, was to convince the opponent that he was wrong by inducing in him a sense of shame, which would lead to a change of heart and a deep reconciliation between the persecutor and the persecuted. As King put it, 'We never get rid of an enemy by meeting hate with hate; we get rid of an enemy by getting rid of enmity.'²⁶ In keeping with his de-personalised approach to evil, King made a clear distinction between the forces of evil, on the one hand, and the persons who committed the evil, on the other. King's non-violent approach to just peace-making was directed against systems of evil rather than against the individuals who participated in these systems.²⁷ The aim was to achieve reconciliation, rather than the defeat and humiliation of one's opponent.²⁸

King's teachings on non-violence and emphasis on reconciliation with, rather than defeat of, one's opponents is fully consistent with Stassen's model of just peace-making, and, even more importantly, with the teaching of the New Testament. The Gospels and the Epistles consistently witness to God's utter renunciation of the principle that violence can be employed toward the resolution of violent conflict.²⁹ Through the cross of Christ, God rejected the 'myth of redemptive violence'³⁰ once and for all. Instead of waging war against those who had murdered his Son, God demonstrated his gracious forgiveness and active compassion for his human creatures by exposing and defeating the dark powers that had kept them in slavery to sin. As Colossians put it: 'And having disarmed the powers and authorities, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross' (Col 2:15). King maintained that God deals with violence not by responding in kind, but by active and compassionate non-violent confrontation, which leads to justice and deliverance. The aim of the cross was not the defeat and humiliation of sinful humanity, but the defeat and public humiliation of the evil 'powers and principalities' that held people in slavery to sin. Similarly, the Letter to the Ephesians is adamant that 'we are not fighting against flesh-and-blood enemies, but against evil rulers and authorities of the unseen world, against mighty powers in this dark world, and against evil spirits in the heavenly places' (Eph 6:12).

4. Engaging the powers and principalities in the service of just peace-making

The teaching of Ephesians 6:12 can be taken as a point of departure for thinking about how to actively, yet non-violently, confront the powerful, violent forces of injustice and hatred that operate in our contemporary, media-driven society. War and violence can only thrive in a context of moral and spiritual nihilism and in a society which lacks human compassion and demonstrates a thoughtless indifference to people's suffering. The resort to violence is an instinctive human response that signifies a lack, not only of compassion, but also of imagination. In fact, violence is one of the many baneful manifestations of the poverty of imagination in a world ruled by technological gadgetry, celebrity culture, junk TV and various forms of mind-numbing propaganda. As a result, people live under the illusion that the violent feelings and extreme views that they have adopted by watching and listening to the media are their own.

In a world where living in socially-constructed illusions of violence and falsehood is the 'default position', the struggle for peace and truth is hard work and requires great moral strength and spiritual engagement. The problem is that many people have become either wilfully distracted or have degenerated into a state of collective insanity, induced by the constant propagandistic assaults by state-monopolised media outlets on the values of truth, respect, dignity and humanity. Under a constant barrage, these values are gradually eroded; ideology, power, militarism and national pride triumph over truth, freedom, peace and solidarity. The erosion of these values paves the way for war. As the Ukrainian-born philosopher, Nikolai Berdyaev, noted, wars occur in 'an atmosphere of the mass subconscious in which personality, personal consciousness and the personal conscience are paralysed'. He thinks that human beings can only be induced to wage war 'by paralysing their consciousness through a system of hypnosis, of psychological and physical poisoning'.³¹

Such a condition leads to a distortion of people's moral conscience and induces them to call good that which is evil and to name as evil that which is good (Isa 5:20; cf. Mk 3:22-30). For example, the personal sins of egoism, self-seeking, violence, slavish acquiescence to authority, hatred of others, when transferred to the level of the state, are regarded as 'patriotic virtues' or even 'duties'. Thus, when national pride causes people to regard

the might of the state as of greater worth than the life of human beings, war has in principle already broken out. The Holy Spirit has been quenched and the powers and principalities are unleashed in all their destructive fury. By contrast, war can never break out in societies that are pervaded by the gospel values of dignity, respect, truth, freedom, solidarity and compassion.

One of the lessons of the Soviet tragedy is that the de-Christianisation of society leads inexorably to the dehumanisation of society. The erosion of spiritual values causes a descent into a hostile social context in which life becomes 'nasty, brutish and short' – to quote the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes.³² In order to promote a society in which justice and peace can thrive, Christians are called to embody and inculcate the humane virtues in society, so that degenerate forces of militarism and nationalistic hatred would not be able to flourish. As Berdyaev remarked, 'The new Christianity must re-humanise humankind and society, culture and the world.'³³ The flourishing of this kind of Christianity is expressed not in the triumph of Christianity over society, but in compassion for and involvement in society.³⁴

This kind of Christianity subverts the fake patriotic religion that deifies the State and gives divine sanction to a nation's imperialism. Sometimes national churches even invoke the name of 'God' as an idol who has bestowed a special blessing and favour on a particular nation, which then allegedly gives this special nation the right to invade and conquer neighbouring territories and subdue their peoples. Such a sham Christianity, which is a denial of Christ and the gospel, will ruthlessly destroy any forms of genuine Christian faith that go beyond cultural or national identity. This kind of idolatrous, nationalistic official Christianity, which encourages war and hatred towards other nations, is a distortion of the gospel and is under the control not of Christ, but of the dark 'powers and principalities' to which Ephesians alludes.

Christians are called to confront these powers and principalities not only through private prayer and intercession, but by prophetic acts of non-violent resistance in the public sphere. Such demonstrations of prophetic resistance offer a witness to the watching world that there are genuine alternatives to violent retaliation. Withdrawal into the shelter of church walls through a narrow, pietistic spirituality that is disconnected from social and political realities is not an option for followers of Christ who want to be salt and light in their com-

munities (Mt 5:13-16). Sin and evil are not merely personal issues, but also structural phenomena. Therefore, those Christians who advocate withdrawal from society should ask whether it is even possible to live the Christian life if the entire structure of society requires people to compromise their Christian principles of honesty, openness, integrity and compassion. Walter Wink writes that, 'Personal redemption cannot take place apart from the redemption of our social structures.'³⁵ So, as Richard Foster remarks, it is true that God cares about whether we lie or tell the truth as individuals, but he also cares about institutions in government and the media that disseminate lies and misinformation to entire populations.³⁶ Foster further states that, 'we cannot speak of love and at the same time be part of institutional structures that perpetuate injustice'.³⁷ Therefore, Christians cannot speak with integrity about loving their neighbour (whether that neighbour is a 'friend' or an 'enemy') unless they are prepared to confront the social structures of corruption and oppression that create wealth and power for a privileged few, while the vast majority are deprived of dignity and freedom.

The withdrawal of the church from society impoverishes both society and the church. All too often in the Soviet and post-Soviet eras the task of creating a more just and humane social order has been usurped by authoritarian and anti-Christian autocrats, rather than by Spirit-filled Christians. The default position of too many post-Soviet evangelical Christians has been to withdraw from society and to focus on the individual soul's relationship to God, rather than engage with concrete matters of justice, peace and compassion to one's neighbour.³⁸ However, Jesus himself – and Scripture in general – has much more to say about justice and peace than about the 'soul'.³⁹ Furthermore, the gospel is not only the source of personal salvation, but also a dynamic vision of comprehensive social transformation in which the kingdoms of this world are transfigured into the kingdom of God and his Christ (Rev 11:15).

For too long Christians have sought to fulfil the commandment to love God without sufficient attention to the equally important commandment to love their neighbour. Scripture teaches that if we claim to love the God that we have not seen, while at the same time we do not love the people we meet regularly in our churches and on the street, we are, in fact, liars and hypocrites (1 Jn 4:20). The church, accordingly, should exhort people to

love God through demonstrating compassion to people in our society. The Sermon on the Mount calls for self-denial not in the sense of self-renunciation, but, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer said, as a call 'to love one's neighbour, and thus to reject everything that hinders fulfilling this task'.⁴⁰ These are the conditions that lead to durable peace.

5. Conclusion

We are living in violent times and in an age of wars and rumours of wars. Aspects of our culture are saturated in violence. Like many things in our world today, violence has been turned into a commodity that can be consumed by the masses; it has been made into something pleasurable, fascinating, appealing and entertaining, particularly to young people. For some, violence has become a substitute for compassion, friendship and meaningful relationship. Violence is not only a personal sin, but a social pathology that is one of the unmistakable signs of the dark powers and principalities at work in the world. These dark powers are driven by a nihilistic impulse 'to rob, to kill and to destroy' (John 10:10a), as well as to distort and fabricate in order to generate violence and hatred that hinders the work of the Holy Spirit in establishing a community of compassionate solidarity among diverse peoples and nations.

The non-violent ethic of Martin Luther King, together with the careful biblical exegesis of Glen Stassen, demonstrates that the task of the church is not simply to protest against violence once war has broken out, but to proactively create a more just and humane social order in which war becomes essentially unthinkable. Escape from murderous cycles of violence is possible only by creative and proactive initiatives that lead to peace and justice. These kingdom principles will never be able to flourish in the nations of the former Soviet Union until the Christian values of honesty, dignity, freedom, justice and compassion are expressed not only in explicit church activities, but also in the mundane realities that govern social and personal relations in the region as a whole. Dignity, respect and compassion are the prerequisites for sustainable peace. Without these social virtues, war and hostility will perpetuate a vicious circle of injustice, resentment and violence.

Therefore, post-Soviet Christians should be asking questions not merely about when, where and to what extent it is permissible to use violent means to defend one's country, town or commu-

nity, but also about what proactive measures they can take collectively in order to witness to viable peaceful alternatives to the violence and destruction that determine the ways of the world. For those of us who care about the values of peace, justice, honesty, truth, dignity and compassion in the nations of the former Soviet Union, the lived-out testimony of Martin Luther King and the biblical teaching of Glen Stassen have much to teach us as we look towards the future with hope.

Joshua T. Searle is Tutor in Theology and Public Thought at Spurgeon's College, London. His address is Spurgeon's College, South Norwood Hill, London SE25 6DJ, England.

Endnotes

- 1 This Christocentric approach was arguably Stassen's most significant and enduring contribution to Christian ethics. See Michael Westmoreland-White, 'Glen Harold Stassen (1936-2014): Follower of a Thick Jesus', in Rick Axtell, Michelle Tooley and Michael L. Westmoreland-White (eds), *Ethics as if Jesus Mattered. Essays in Honor of Glen H. Stassen* (Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 2014) 7-20.
- 2 Glen H. Stassen and David P. Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics. Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2003) 149-150.
- 3 Stanley Hauerwas and John Berkman, 'Violence' in Paul A. B. Clarke and Andrew Linzey, *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society* (London: Routledge, 1996) 869; see also Stanley Hauerwas and Jean Vanier, *Living Gently in a Violent World. The Prophetic Witness of Weakness* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2008).
- 4 Bryan P. Stone, *Evangelism after Christendom. The Theology and Practice of Christian Witness* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007) 186.
- 5 The Radical Reformation, in particular the Anabaptist movement, was a formative influence on Stassen throughout his life. See for instance Glen H. Stassen, 'Anabaptist Influence in the origin of the Particular Baptists', *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36.4 (1962) 322-348, and Stassen, 'Concrete Christological Norms for Transformation' in G. H. Stassen, D. M. Yeager and J. H. Yoder (eds), *Authentic Transformation. A New Vision of Christ and Culture* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 127-190.
- 6 See for instance Thom Brooks (ed.), *Just War Theory* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Nigel Biggar, *In Defence of War* (Oxford: OUP, 2013); and Michael Haspel, *Friedensethik und humanitäre Intervention. Der Kosovo-Krieg als Herausforderung evangelischer Friedensethik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002).
- 7 Newhart, 'Stassen on the Mount' in Axtell c.s., *Ethics as if Jesus Mattered*.
- 8 Stassen, 'The fourteen triads of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:21-7:12)', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003) 267-308.
- 9 David Bosch makes a similar point in *Transforming Mission. Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991) 437.
- 10 Glen H. Stassen, Rodney L. Peterson and Timothy A. Norton (eds), *Formation for Life. Just Peacemaking and Twenty-First-Century Discipleship* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2013) 113; see also Andrew Purves, *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology. A Christological Foundation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004) 231.
- 11 Glen Harold Stassen, *Just Peacemaking. Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1989) 89.
- 12 Stassen and Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, 174.
- 13 Glen H. Stassen, *A Thicker Jesus. Incarnational Discipleship in a Secular Age* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012) 203.
- 14 Stassen, *Thicker Jesus*, 196-198.
- 15 Stassen, *Thicker Jesus*, 203.
- 16 Stassen, 'The fourteen triads', 270-274.
- 17 Stassen, 'The fourteen triads', 268-274.
- 18 Stassen, *Thicker Jesus*, 188.
- 19 For a fuller and authoritative survey of Christian approaches to non-violent resistance, see Michael G. Long (ed.), *Resist! Christian Dissent for the 21st Century* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2008).
- 20 On this particular issue see Walter Wink, 'Beyond Just War and Pacifism. Jesus' Non-violent Way', *Review and Expositor* 89 (1992) 197-214.
- 21 Stassen, *Thicker Jesus*, 190.
- 22 John D. Caputo, *The Weakness of God. A Theology of the Event* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006) 326.
- 23 Martin Luther King, *A Testament of Hope. The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991).
- 24 King, quoted in Keith D. Miller, *Voice of Deliverance. The Language of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Its Sources* (Macon: University of Georgia, 1998) 60.
- 25 William D. Watley, *Roots of Resistance. The Nonviolent Ethic of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Valley Forge: Judson, 1985) 111.
- 26 King, quoted in Bernard V. Brady, *Christian Love. How Christians Through the Ages Have Understood Love* (Washington, D.C.: University of Georgetown, 2003) 214.
- 27 Michael G. Long, *Against Us, But for Us. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the State* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2002) 104.
- 28 Watley, *Roots of Resistance*, 114-118.
- 29 For a controversial, yet compelling, statement of this argument from a Radical Reformation per-

- spective, see J. Denny Weaver, *The Nonviolent Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- 30 Walter Wink, *The Powers that Be* (London: Mowbray, 1998) 42-48.
- 31 Nikolai Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, trans. R.M. French (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1944) 156.
- 32 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Mineola: Dover, 2006) 70.
- 33 Nikolai Berdyaev, *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, trans. D.A. Lowrie (Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1961) 129.
- 34 Joshua T. Searle and Mykhailo N. Cherenkov, *A Future and a Hope. Mission, Theological Education and the Transformation of Post-Soviet Society* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2014) 116.
- 35 Walter Wink, *Unmasking the Powers. The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986) 98.
- 36 Richard J. Foster, *Streams of Living Water. Celebrating the Great Traditions of Christian Faith* (Trowbridge: Eagle, 1999) 152-153.
- 37 Foster, *Streams of Living Water*, 153.
- 38 Searle and Cherenkov, *A Future and a Hope*.
- 39 The *Poverty and Justice Bible*, produced by the Bible Society (Swindon: Bible Society, 2008), highlights all the references to justice and poverty in the Scriptures, including the Gospels, and helpfully draws attention to Jesus' copious references to these issues. For a scholarly account of Jesus' relation to the prophetic tradition that emphasised justice, see William R. Herzog, *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God. A Ministry of Liberation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000).
- 40 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, trans. R. Krauss (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005) 238-245.