US Foreign Policy in the Middle East - Is it Biblical?

- I. The stated and commonly believed pillars of US foreign policy in the Middle East.
 - 1. We are fighting terrorists on their own soil so they don't come here.
 - 2. We are a righteous nation and we need rid the world of evil.
 - 3. We are spreading freedom and democracy to the oppressed peoples abroad.
 - 4. We must stand for and defend Israel.
- II. Why US foreign policy in the Middle East is largely flawed and wrong from a biblical perspective.
 - 1. Christians have a faulty understanding of who the real Israel is.
 - 2. Therefore there is a false burden imposed on us to support the nation of Israel.
 - 3. We have discarded and forgotten the biblical position of nonintervention and nonaggression.
 - 4. We are not obeying our own laws concerning war.
 - 5. We have adopted the unbiblical concept of debt and paper money which our wars are fueled by.
 - 6. We are not a righteous nation. What business do we then have to try to force our immorality on others?
 - 7. We are likely modern day Assyria and Babylon and are the rod in God's hand to destroy wicked nations, but will most likely be destroyed by God after he is done with us.
- III. The biblical justification for this study.
 - 1. War and any important decisions should be made with wise and much counsel.
 - A. We are supposed to make war with good advice and by counsel (**Pro 20:18**).
 - B. We should only make war with wise counsel, and safety is found in the multitude of counselors (**Pro 24:6**).
 - C. Without good counsel purposes are disappointed, but they are established in the multitude of counselors (**Pro 15:22**).
 - D. Where there is no counsel, the people fall (**Pro 11:14**).
 - 2. So what business do I have in scrutinizing our war-making interventionist policies in the Middle East from a biblical perspective to see if they are right?
 - A. The scriptures are our counselors (Psa 119:24).
 - B. They should be our guide in every area of life (**Psa 119:105**).
 - C. We should take heed to its instruction and reproofs (Psa 119:9; Pro 6:23).
- IV. Christians have a faulty understanding of who the real Israel is.
 - 1. Many Christians, especially those who subscribe to dispensationalism, believe that the Jews living in modern day Israel are the chosen peculiar people of God.
 - 2. This belief is based on Old Testament passages such as these:
 - A. God is called *the God of Israel* 201 times in the O.T. ex: (Exo 5:1;Isa 45:15), but interestingly only twice in the N.T., and both times before the death of Christ (Mat 15:31; Luk 1:68).
 - B. God called Israel His chosen and his servant (Isa 41:8-9).
 - C. God said that he redeemed Israel and they were His (Isa 43:1).
 - D. Israel were God's elect (Isa 45:4).
 - E. God said He would not forget them and that he had blotted out their sins (Isa 44:21-22).

- F. God said that he would save Israel with an everlasting salvation (Isa 45:17).3. A fundament rule of bible study is that the O.T. is to be understood in light of the N.T. and the N.T. is used to interpret the O.T.
 - A. The New Testament, the word of the apostles, is a more sure word of prophecy (**2Pe 1:19**).
 - i. It is as a light that shines in the dark places of the Old Testament.
 - ii. We would do well if we take heed to this.
 - B. The New Testament is a *better testament* (Heb 7:22).
 - C. The New Testament is characterized by *great plainness of speech* in contradistinction to the Old Testament which was *vailed* (**2Co 3:12-13**).
 - D. If we would read the N.T., and specifically the epistles of Paul, we would understand the mystery that was made know to him: that the Gentiles have been made fellow-heirs, of the same body, and partakers of God's promises with Israel (Eph 3:3-6).
- 4. When we apply these scriptural principles, we will find out who the real Israel is.
 - A. The New Testament makes it very clear that there are two Israels (Rom 9:6).
 - i. Not all of the natural posterity of Abraham are God's Israel (**Rom** 9:7-8; Gal 4:28-30).
 - ii. Not all the natural posterity of Isaac are God's Israel (Rom 9:10-13).
 - iii. Not even all of the natural posterity of Israel (Jacob) are God's Israel (Rom 9:27-29).
 - B. It matters not if one is a natural child of Abraham, but rather if one is a child of the promise to Abraham (**Rom 9:8**).
 - i. The promises to Abraham were made to two people: Abraham and his seed which is Christ (Gal 3:16).
 - ii. Those who belong to Christ (Jew and Gentile) are therefore Abraham's and heir according to the promise (Gal 3:28-29).
 - iii. It is they which are of faith which are the children of Abraham, not they which are of blood only (Gal 3:7).
 - C. With the coming of Christ and the writing of the New Testament in His blood and the abolishing of the Old Testament, the Gentiles who used to be aliens from the commonwealth of Israel are now part of it (**Eph 2:11-22**).
 - i. This is why Paul says *we are the circumcision* to a Gentile church (**Phi 3:3**)
 - ii. This is why Paul could go as far as to say he is NOT a Jew, which is one outwardly...but he IS a Jew, which is one inwardly (Rom 2:28-29).
 - D. Being a natural Jew means absolutely nothing in the eyes of God on this side of the cross (**1Co 7:19; Gal 6:15; Col 3:11**).
 - E. The true *Israel of God* are those Jews and Gentiles which are in Christ (Gal 6:15-16).
- V. The false burden which is placed on us to support the nation of Israel.
 - 1. Misguided people who don't understand who the real Israel is misuse Old Testament verses to convince people that we must support and defend the modern-day nation of Israel.

- 2. They cite verses that say that God will bless them that bless Israel and curse them that curse Israel such as (Gen 12:3; 27:29; Num 24:9).
 - A. This promise was made to Abraham and *his seed* (Gen 12:3 c/w Gen 22:17-18 c/w Gen 26:4 c/w Gen 28:14).
 - B. Jesus Christ was the seed to whom the promise was made (Gal 3:16).
 - C. All that are in Christ, both Jews and Gentiles, are Abraham's seed and heirs of that promise (Gal 3:29).
 - D. Therefore those who bless the Israel of God (Gal 6:16) (God's elect Jews and Gentiles (Gal 6:15)) will be blessed and those who curse them will be cursed.
- 3. They cite verses that say that God has a special interest in Israel, such as: (Psa 105:10; Psa 114:2; Psa 125:5; Psa 130:8; Psa 135:4).
 - A. As has already been plainly proved from the New Testament, there are two Israels (**Rom 9:6**).
 - B. The natural-only Israel are not the children of God, nor are they the children of the promise (**Rom 9:7-8**).
 - C. God has cast off this reprobate portion of Israel and has no interest in them at all (**Rom 9:27-29; Rom 11:2, 7-10**).
 - D. The Israel that God has a special interest in are those who are in Christ who are Abraham's seed (Gal 3:29).
 - E. The Israel that God has a special interest in are those who are spiritual Israelites (Jews and Gentiles), not natural Israelites (**Rom 2:28-29; Phi 3:3**).
- 4. They cite verses that say that we should pray for the peace of Jerusalem and that God loves Jerusalem, such as: (Psa 122:6; Psa 125:2; Psa 135:21; Psa 137:6).
 - A. There are two Jerusalems: one that's below on the earth that now is and which is in bondage (Gal 4:25), and one that is above in heaven which is free (Gal 4:26).
 - B. The heavenly Jerusalem is the church (Heb 12:22-23; Rev 21:2,9-10), which is the Jerusalem that God loves and is concerned for the peace of (Eph 5:23,25).
 - C. God calls earthly Jerusalem Sodom and Egypt (Rev 11:8).
- 5. They cite verses that say that God has a special interest in Zion, such as: (Psa 48:2; Psa 69:35; Psa 76:2; Psa 129:5; Psa 132:13).
 - A. The Sion (Zion) that God has a special interest in is the heavenly mount Sion, which is the heavenly Jerusalem, the church (**Heb 12:22-23; Rev 14:1**).
 - B. This point was thoroughly proved in the previous section.
- 6. The unbelieving Jews who largely make up the population of the modern nation of Israel are antichrists. Why should Christians support them?
 - A. They deny that Jesus is the Christ which makes them antichrists by definition (1Jo 2:22-23).
 - i. They have the spirit of antichrist which is not of God (**1Jo 4:3**).
 - ii. They are deceivers and antichrists (2Jo 1:7).
 - iii. They don't abide in the doctrine of Christ and therefore they have not God (**2Jo 1:9**).
 - B. They hate Jesus Christ and therefore hate God (Joh 15:23; Luk 10:16).
 - i. They are *the world* that hate Jesus, God the Father, and Christians (Joh 15:18-24 c/w 15:25).

- ii. We should not love *the world* (**1Jo 2:15-16**).
- iii. We should not be friends with *the world* (Jam 4:4).
- iv. Jesus would not even pray for *the world* (Joh 17:9).
- C. Should we as Christians help the ungodly and love them that hate the LORD (2Ch 19:2)?
- 7. This doesn't mean that we should not preach the gospel to them and tell them to repent just like we would to any other sinner.
- VI. We have discarded and forgotten the biblical position of nonintervention and nonaggression.
 - 1. Proponents of an interventionist and imperialist foreign policy will cite O.T. examples of where God commanded Israel to utterly destroy wicked nations and possess them (Jos 6:17-21; 1Sa 15:2-3).
 - A. They will say that God hasn't changed (Mal 3:6; Heb 13:8) and therefore a Christian nation such as the USA still has such a mandate.
 - B. While God hasn't changed, His law has (Heb 7:12; Heb 8:13; 2Co 3:6-13).
 - C. Jesus showed that O.T. precedents of this type have no *natural* application in the N.T. (Luk 9:51-56).
 - D. As was before proved, God's Israel under the New Testament is the church, not the USA, the UK, or even the modern nation of Israel.
 - i. Therefore, the USA is not the new Israel and has no Manifest Destiny to conquer other nations and create an imperial empire.
 - ii. Since we are now under the New Testament, where in the N.T. does any country have a commandment from God to start aggressive wars with its neighbors?
 - iii. For example: what if our government wanted to wage war on Mexico when they had not attacked us, and they gave as justification for it that they were a bunch of drug-running, pagan, catholic savages who were polluting the land with their sin and needed to be eliminated based on principles God gave to Israel in the O.T.?
 - iv. Where is there a commandment in the N.T. for us to do that?
 - v. What justification could a neocon Christian give from the New Testament to wage such a war of aggression?
 - The New Testament counterpart of the these Old Testament commandments would be for Christians to mortify (kill) the sins of their flesh and spare none of them (Col 3:5-9).
 - A. The weapons of the church's (spiritual Israel) warfare are not carnal, but rather spiritual (**2Co 10:3-5**).
 - B. We cast down *imaginations*, not walls.
 - C. We bring *thoughts* into captivity, not nations.
 - D. We mortify our own sins, not dictators.
 - 3. Nonintervention is not pacifism.
 - A. <u>Nonintervention</u> 1. Absence of intervention; in international politics, systematic non-interference by a nation in the affairs of other nations except where its own interests are directly involved.

- B. <u>Pacifism</u> 1. The policy or doctrine of rejecting war and every form of violent action as means of solving disputes, esp. in international affairs; the belief in and advocacy of peaceful methods as feasible and desirable alternatives to war.
- C. The Bible doesn't condemn soldiering or war in all circumstances.
 - i. When soldiers came to John the Baptist to be baptized, he told them to be just, honest, and content, but not to forsake their profession as soldiers (Luk 3:14).
 - ii. Centurions were blessed on different occasions in the N.T.
 - a. <u>Centurion</u> 1. The commander of a century in the Roman army.
 - b. <u>Century</u> 1. a. Rom. Hist. A division of the Roman army, constituting half of a maniple, and probably consisting originally of 100 men; but in historical times the number appears to have varied according to the size and subdivision of the legion.
 - c. When a centurion came to Jesus and told him he was a centurion who was in authority over soldiers who obeyed his commands, Jesus didn't rebuke him for being in the military, but rather commended him for his faith (Luk 7:1-9).
 - d. Cornelius was a centurion who feared and pleased God (Act 10:1-4) whom God blessed with conversion without changing his job (Act 10:48).
 - iii. Ministers are referred to as soldiers (Phi 2:25).
 - a. Paul even describes ministers as soldiers warring (2Ti 2:3-4).
 - b. If it was sinful to be a soldier and go to war, then God certainly wouldn't use that terminology to describe his ministers.
 - iv. The Bible uses the principle of war-making for illustrations.
 - a. Jesus used the principle of war-making to illustrate the importance of counting the cost of discipleship (Luk 14:31-33).
 - b. Paul uses the principle of war-making to illustrate the fact that a minister ought to be paid for his labor (**1Co 9:7**).
 - c. If war-making was sinful, then the Bible would not use it to illustrate godly principles.
- D. The Bible allows for and promotes self-defense.
 - i. Most wars, though, are not in self-defense, but rather are a product of the lust of men (power, control, resources) (Jam 4:1-2).
 - ii. Jesus commanded His disciples to be armed with a sword and even to sell their garments to buy one if they didn't have one (Luk 22:36).
 - a. Jesus was not talking about a spiritual sword.

- b. When the disciples presented two swords, He said *It is enough*, not *I meant a SPIRITUAL sword* (Luk 22:38).
- c. It is enough to carry two guns.
- iii. Jesus said that a strong man *armed* keeps his house in peace (Luk 11:21).
- iv. Jesus said that a goodman (*the master or male head of a household*) would not suffer (*tolerate or allow*) his house to be *broken* up by a thief (Mat 24:43 c/w Exo 22:2).
- v. Retaliation is not self-defense and must not be done.
 - a. It is God's place to recompense, not ours (**Rom 12:17-21**; **Pro 24:29**).
 - b. We ought not render evil for evil (1Pe 3:9; Pro 20:22).
- E. There is a time to not defend oneself.
 - i. If we are being persecuted for the gospel's sake, like Jesus, we should not resist with violence (**1Pe 2:19-23**).
 - ii. We should not resist minor offences with violence (Mat 5:39-41).
 - a. If someone slaps you on the cheek, let me slap the other one; if someone takes your coat, give him your cloke also; if someone makes you walk a mile with him, go two.
 - b. This is far different than if someone tries to chop your head off or rape your wife.
 - c. If you don't provide for the preservation of your family's life, you have denied the faith (**1Ti 5:8**).
 - iii. A man with discretion will defer his anger (Pro 19:11).
- 4. Nonintervention is not isolationism.
 - A. <u>Isolationism</u> 1. The policy of seeking (political or national) isolation: with special reference to the U.S.A.
 - B. <u>Isolation</u> 1. a. The action of isolating; the fact or condition of being isolated or standing alone; separation from other things or persons; solitariness.
 - C. <u>Isolate</u> *v*. 1. trans. To place or set apart or alone; to cause to stand alone, detached, separate, or unconnected with other things or persons; to insulate.
- 5. Inter-national conduct should (at least sometimes) be governed by the same principles in the N.T. as inter-personal conduct.
 - A. Biblical laws regulating the actions of a government toward its citizens are not always the same as the laws regulating the actions of an individual toward another individual.
 - i. The government is in authority over the citizenry.
 - ii. This is distinctly different from the relationship two individuals have with each other.
 - iii. The civil authority has the power of the sword to execute vengeance on them that do evil (**Rom 13:1-4**).
 - iv. An individual does not have the power to avenge themselves when they are wronged (**Rom 12:17-19**).
 - B. In the case of inter-national conduct, the nations are peers of each other, not authorities and subordinates.
 - i. Nations are comprised of individuals.

- Nations are even referred to as individuals, such as the nations of Israel and Edom who were referred to as their "founding fathers", Jacob and Esau (Gen 25:23 c/w Num 20:17-22).
- iii. Jesus used an example of how a nation would count the cost when deciding to go to war with another nation to illustrate how an individual should count the cost when deciding to follow Him (Luk 14:31-33).
- iv. Therefore some of the same laws and principles in scripture should apply to inter-national conduct as apply to inter-personal conduct.
- 6. The principles of nonintervention.
 - A. The following points apply to individuals, and also apply to nations as well (as will be shown based on what God said to Babylon).
 - B. Mind your own business.
 - i. Stay in your own lane; don't meddle with strife not belonging to you (**Pro 26:17**).
 - ii. Don't be a busybody in other men's matters (**1Pe 4:15**).
 - iii. People resent you when you get in the middle of their fights (Exo 2:13-14).
 - C. Obey the Golden Rule.
 - i. "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise" (Luk 6:31).
 - ii. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mat 22:39).
 - iii. In other words, treat others as you would want them to treat you.
 - iv. Don't murder people who have not attacked you.
 - v. Ron Paul got booed in South Carolina (the "bible belt") for saying that we ought to adopt a Golden Rule in foreign policy.
 - D. Act only in self-defense; don't initiate violence.
 - i. "Strive not with a man without cause, if he have done thee no harm" (**Pro 3:30**).
 - ii. Peter had a right to self-defense (Luk 22:36-38).
 - a. Jesus had told Peter that He would be killed by the Jewish leaders and even rebuked him for refusing to believe it (Mat 16:21-23).
 - b. Jesus had prayed for God's will to be done (Mat 26:42).
 - c. Peter therefore stepped over the line when he initiated violence (Joh 18:10-11).
 - d. Jesus rebuked him for it (Mat 26:51-52).
 - iii. Babylon was judged for her imperialism (Hab 2:5-13). Notice the following:
 - a. Babylon (the Chaldeans (Hab 1:6)) was referred to as *a* man (Hab 2:5).
 - b. They didn't *keep at home* (Hab 2:5 c/w Pro 27:8).
 - c. They could not be satisfied and had to continue conquering nations and people (Hab 2:5 c/w Pro 27:20).
 - d. They took what was not theirs (Hab 2:6 c/w Exo 20:15 c/w Eph 4:28).

- e. They did violence to others (Hab 2:8 c/w Luk 3:14).
- f. They coveted (**Hab 2:9 c/w Col 3:5**).
- g. They killed people which was a sin (Hab 2:10 c/w Mar 10:19).
- E. No government has the right to make its citizens kill other people who didn't attack them.
 - i. We are supposed to obey our government (Rom 13:1-7; 1Pe 2:13-17).
 - ii. We only are obliged to obey as far as they are exercising their legal and legitimate authority.
 - iii. We must not obey when they have demanded that we do something that is forbidden by God (Act 4:19; Act 5:29).
 - iv. A government therefore cannot compel a person to kill another person (**Rom 13:9**).
 - a. No Christian would kill their next door neighbor who did nothing to him if government told him to do so.
 - b. Therefore, a Christian can and should resist any order by a government to kill a person in a different country who has not first attacked him.
 - c. If your government has put you in such a position either against your will, or by lying to you and convincing you by propaganda, then they have the greater sin (Joh 19:11).
 - d. God has mercy on us when we do things in ignorance (Act 3:17).
 - e. If you were put in that position by your government, you were acting in self-defense to preserve your own life.
- 7. The Just War Theory. (This is not Bible, but is a theory which has it roots in Christian philosophy). The following was taken from Wikipedia.
 - A. Jus ad bellum (the right to go to war).
 - i. **Just cause -** The reason for going to war needs to be just and cannot therefore be solely for recapturing things taken or punishing people who have done wrong; innocent life must be in imminent danger and intervention must be to protect life. A contemporary view of just cause was expressed in 1993 when the US Catholic Conference said: *"Force may be used only to correct a grave, public evil, i.e., aggression or massive violation of the basic human rights of whole populations."*
 - ii. **Comparative justice -** While there may be rights and wrongs on all sides of a conflict, to overcome the presumption against the use of force, the injustice suffered by one party must significantly outweigh that suffered by the other. Some theorists such as Brian Orend omit this term, seeing it as fertile ground for exploitation by bellicose regimes.
 - iii. **Competent authority -** Only duly constituted public authorities may wage war. "A just war must be initiated by a political authority within a political system that allows distinctions

of justice. Dictatorships (e.g. Hitler's Regime) or deceptive military actions (e.g. the 1968 US bombing of Cambodia) are typically considered as violations of this criterion. The importance of this condition is key. Plainly, we cannot have a genuine process of judging a just war within a system that represses the process of genuine justice. A just war must be initiated by a political authority within a political system that allows distinctions of justice".

- iv. **Right intention -** Force may be used only in a truly just cause and solely for that purpose—correcting a suffered wrong is considered a right intention, while material gain or maintaining economies is not.
- v. **Probability of success -** Arms may not be used in a futile cause or in a case where disproportionate measures are required to achieve success;
- vi. **Last resort -** Force may be used only after all peaceful and viable alternatives have been seriously tried and exhausted or are clearly not practical. It may be clear that the other side is using negotiations as a delaying tactic and will not make meaningful concessions.
- vii. **Proportionality** The anticipated benefits of waging a war must be proportionate to its expected evils or harms. This principle is also known as the principle of macro-proportionality, so as to distinguish it from the *jus in bello* principle of proportionality.
- B. Jus in bello (right conduct within war)
 - Distinction Just war conduct should be governed by the principle of distinction. The acts of war should be directed towards enemy combatants, and not towards non-combatants caught in circumstances they did not create. The prohibited acts include bombing civilian residential areas that include no military targets and committing acts of terrorism or reprisal against civilians. Moreover, combatants are not permitted to target with violence enemy combatants who have surrendered or who have been captured or who are injured and not presenting an immediate lethal threat.
 - ii. **Proportionality** Just war conduct should be governed by the principle of proportionality. An attack cannot be launched on a military objective in the knowledge that the incidental civilian injuries would be clearly excessive in relation to the anticipated military advantage (principle of proportionality).
 - iii. **Military necessity** Just war conduct should be governed by the principle of minimum force. An attack or action must be intended to help in the military defeat of the enemy, it must be an attack on a military objective, and the harm caused to civilians or civilian property must be proportional and not excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. This principle is meant to limit excessive and unnecessary death and destruction.

- iv. **Fair treatment of prisoners of war** Enemy soldiers who surrendered or who are captured no longer pose a threat. It is therefore wrong to torture them or otherwise mistreat them.
- v. No means malum in se Soldiers may not use weapons or other methods of warfare which are considered evil, such as mass rape, forcing soldiers to fight against their own side or using weapons whose effects cannot be controlled (e.g. nuclear/biological weapons).
- C. Jus post bellum (justice after war)
 - i. **Just cause for termination -** A state may terminate a war if there has been a reasonable vindication of the rights that were violated in the first place, and if the aggressor is willing to negotiate the terms of surrender. These terms of surrender include a formal apology, compensations, war crimes trials and perhaps rehabilitation. Alternatively, a state may end a war if it becomes clear that any just goals of the war cannot be reached at all or cannot be reached without using excessive force.
 - ii. **Right intention -** A state must only terminate a war under the conditions agreed upon in the above criteria. Revenge is not permitted. The victor state must also be willing to apply the same level of objectivity and investigation into any war crimes its armed forces may have committed.
 - iii. **Public declaration and authority -** The terms of peace must be made by a legitimate authority, and the terms must be accepted by a legitimate authority.
 - iv. Discrimination The victor state is to differentiate between political and military leaders, and combatants and civilians.
 Punitive measures are to be limited to those directly responsible for the conflict. Truth and reconciliation may sometimes be more important than punishing war crimes.
 - v. **Proportionality -** Any terms of surrender must be proportional to the rights that were initially violated. Draconian measures, absolutionist crusades and any attempt at denying the surrendered country the right to participate in the world community are not permitted.
- VII. The USA is not obeying its own laws and traditions concerning war.
 - 1. The Constitution on war.
 - A. "Congress shall have power to declare War" US Constitution, Article 1, Section 8
 - B. Congress has not declared war since WWII.
 - 2. The founding fathers on war and nonintervention.
 - A. George Washington.
 - i. "Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly

hostile to republican liberty;" - George Washington's Farewell Address, September 17, 1796.

- ii. "Observe good faith and justice toward all Nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and Morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it?" - Ibid.
- "In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential, than iii. that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of Nations has been the victim." - Ibid.
- iv. "So likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite Nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification." Ibid.
- v. "The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop." Ibid.
- B. Thomas Jefferson.
 - "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none;" -Thomas Jefferson's First Inaugural Address, 1801.
 - ii. "Having seen the people of all other nations bowed down to the earth under the wars and prodigalities of their rulers, I have cherished their opposites, peace, economy, and riddance of public

debt, believing that these were the high road to public as well as private prosperity and happiness." - Thomas Jefferson.

- iii. "Believing that the happiness of mankind is best promoted by the useful pursuits of peace, that on these alone a stable prosperity can be founded, that the evils of war are great in their endurance, and have a long reckoning for ages to come, I have used my best endeavors to keep our country uncommitted in the troubles which afflict Europe, and which assail us on every side." - Thomas Jefferson.
- C. John Quincy Adams.
 - i. America, in the assembly of nations, since her admission among them, has invariably, though often fruitlessly, held forth to them the hand of honest friendship, of equal freedom, of generous reciprocity. She has uniformly spoken among them, though often to heedless and often to disdainful ears, the language of equal liberty, of equal justice, and of equal rights. She has, in the lapse of nearly half a century, without a single exception, respected the independence of other nations while asserting and maintaining her own. She has abstained from interference in the concerns of others, even when conflict has been for principles to which she clings, as to the last vital drop that visits the heart. She has seen that probably for centuries to come, all the contests of that Aceldama the European world, will be contests of inveterate power, and emerging right. Wherever the standard of freedom and Independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will her heart, her benedictions and her prayers be. But she goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will commend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standard of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. The frontlet on her brows would no longer beam with the ineffable splendor of freedom and independence; but in its stead would soon be substituted an imperial diadem, flashing in false and tarnished lustre the murky radiance of dominion and power. She might become the dictatress of the world; she would be no longer the ruler of her own spirit.... Her glory is not dominion, but liberty. Her march is the march of the mind." - JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, address to U.S. House of Representatives, Jul. 4, 1821
- D. The Monroe Doctrine.

- i. "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense." - The Monroe Doctrine, December 2, 1823.
- ii. "Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none." - Ibid.
- VIII. We have adopted the unbiblical concept of debt and paper money which our wars are fueled by.
 - 1. Wars are costly, both in terms of lives and money.
 - A. Wars used to be financed either by borrowing or taxing the people.
 - B. Over the years, governments got wise to this and decided it would be easier print currency to pay for the war rather than tax people or borrow it.
 - C. This ultimately ends up creating inflation and sometime hyperinflation which destroys the currency.
 - i. This is what happened in the Revolutionary War in the 1700s in which the colonies printed Continentals to pay for the war to the point they became worthless, which is where the saying originated, "Not worth a Continental".
 - ii. The same thing happened to the Greenback dollar during the Civil War.
 - iii. The same thing happened to Germany after WWI in the 1920s.
 - 2. The Bible discourages borrowing and debt.
 - A. The scripture says to "owe no man anything" (Rom 13:8).
 - B. The borrower is servant to the lender (Pro 22:7 c/w 1Co 7:23).
 - C. The USA is now the largest debtor nation on earth.
 - D. Who is going to be ruling who in the future?
 - 3. Saving and investing are encouraged in the scriptures.
 - A. Fools spend everything and save nothing (Pro 21:20; Pro 21:17).
 - B. China has been saving, investing, and buying up natural resources while the USA has been building bombs and making war.
 - C. Who are the wise ones?
 - 4. Paper (fiat) currency, which finances wars, is unbiblical.
 - A. Money should be defined by weight (Gen 23:16; Gen 43:21; Jer 32:9).
 - B. The law of Moses required just weights and measures (Lev 19:35-36).
 - C. God hates falsifying balances and robbing people by deceit (Amo 8:5 c/w Pro 20:10).
 - D. This is what inflation does to the savers in society; it robs them by deceit.
 - E. Wars would be fought far less frequently on a gold standard.

- IX. We are not a righteous nation. What business do we then have to try to force our immorality on others?
 - 1. Wicked nations are characterized by:
 - A. Pride (Eze 16:49).
 - i. America is a proud nation; just look at the "American Pride" bumper stickers.
 - ii. God hates pride (Pro 8:13; Pro 16:5).
 - B. Fullness of bread (affluence) and an abundance of idleness (Eze 16:49).
 - i. America is an affluent bread and circus society.
 - ii. The chickens are beginning to come home of roost and we are losing our high standard of living.
 - iii. We have lost our work ethic that made this country great and prosperous (**Rom 12:11; 2Th 3:10; Ecc 9:10**).
 - C. Lack of charitable giving (Eze 16:49).
 - i. This is a form of giving to God (**Pro 19:17**).
 - ii. Being slack in charitable giving, including giving to the ministry, is robbing God (**Mal 3:8-9**).
 - iii. God sends poverty to those who take care of themselves, but give little to Him (Hag 1:4-11).
 - iv. Do you suppose this has anything to do with why we are in the economic condition we are?
 - v. On the other hand, God abundantly blesses them that give liberally to Him (**Pro 3:9-10; Mal 3:10**).
 - D. Covetousness (Rom 1:29).
 - i. Americans' lives consist in the abundance of things they possess (Luk 12:15).
 - ii. We are like the rich man who wasn't rich toward God (Luk 12:16-21).
 - iii. This is idolatry (Col 3:5).
 - E. Fornication (**Rom 1:24,29**).
 - i. Fornication is a sin (**1Co 6:18; 1Th 4:3; Heb 13:4**).
 - ii. We are a nation of fornicators.
 - iii. "Today, according to a May 10-14 Gallup poll, only 38% of U.S. adults say it is wrong for a man and a woman to have sexual relations before marriage, while 60% disagree." <u>Gallop Poll, May 2001</u>
 - F. Sodomy (Rom 1:26-27).
 - i. Sodomy is the result of a depraved society who has rejected God (Rom 1:20-27).
 - ii. God destroyed cities that were infamous for this perversion and from which it gets its name (**Jud 1:7**).
 - iii. We are a nation of sodomites and sodomite supporters.
 - iv. "Just three years ago, support for gay marriage was 44%. The current 53% level of support is essentially double the 27% in Gallup's initial measurement on gay marriage, in 1996." <u>Gallop Poll, May 2013</u>

- v. It's not just those that do such things who are under God's judgment, but those who *have pleasure in them that do them* (**Rom 1:32**).
- vi. We are an immoral nation in every area of morality.

vii. Gallop Poll, June 2013

viii. Americans' Views on the Morality of Major Societal Issues

Next, I'm going to read you'n list of issues. Regardless of whether or not you think it should be legal, for each one, please tell me whether you personally believe that in general it is morally acceptable or morally wrong.

% Morally acceptable.

	18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 and older	Net support among 18-34 vs. 55÷
	26	26	3%	
Pornography	49	28	19	+30
Sex belween teenagers	48	30	22	+26
Gay or leshian relations	24	15d	54	+23
Sex between an unmarried man and woman	$\overline{2}^{2}$	63	5^{6}	+16
Having a baby outside of marriage	71	67	57	+1.0
Polygamy	19	45	Б	÷11
Abortion	48	40	38	+10
Cloning humans	19	11	9	± 10
Cloning animals	37	35	32	+5
Gambling	66	65	62	#d
Doctor-assisted suicide	46	477	43	+3
Suicide	17	45	16	+1
Married men and women having an affair	385	6	6	+1
Divorea	68	66	69	·=1.
Buying and wearing clothes made of animal fur	58	61	59	्य
Medical research using stem cells from human embryos	58	59	63	-5
The death penalty	57	66	63	-6
Medical testing on animals	47	60	61	-13

Ranked by net support among 18- to 34-year-olds vs. those aged 55 and older Gallup 2013 Values and Beijefs poll, conducted May 2-7, 2013

GALLUP'

G. Women in authority (Isa 3:12).

- i. Women are supposed to be keepers at home and obedient to their own husbands (**Tit 2:3-5**).
- ii. We have a nation where women are increasingly in control of their husbands, homes, their churches, and their governments at every level.
- iii. This ought not to be.
- H. Children are disobedient to parents (**Rom 1:30**).
 - i. It is a wicked nation whose children are their oppressors (Isa 3:12).
 - ii. Our nation is being oppressed by children whose parents will not discipline them.
 - iii. Foolishness needs driven out of children with a rod (**Pro 22:15**).

- iv. They need the hell beat out of them (**Pro 23:13-14**).
- v. When this is done, they will give you rest instead of being your oppressor (**Pro 29:17**).
- 2. With a track record of righteousness like this one, why in the world would we think we have a moral obligation to force our "righteousness" on other nations?
- X. We are likely modern day Assyria and Babylon and are the rod in God's hand to destroy wicked nations, but will most likely be destroyed by God after he is done with us.
 - 1. God punishes wicked nations at sundry times and in divers manners.
 - A. Sometimes God using the weather to accomplish His chastening of people (Job 37:11-13).
 - B. Sometimes God uses natural disasters (Nah 1:2-8).
 - 2. Sometimes God uses wicked men or nations to punish other wicked men or nations.
 - A. The wicked are God's hand and sword that He uses for His purposes (**Psa** 17:13-14).
 - B. This may be the only use that God has for some people (**Pro 16:4**).
 - i. This *evil* is not sin that God has made the wicked for.
 - ii. Neither is this saying that God made some men to damned.
 - iii. This *evil* is speaking of judgment that God uses the wicked to accomplish.
 - iv. It is in this sense that God *creates evil* (Isa 45:7).
 - a. God doesn't create evil in the sense of creating sin.
 - b. People that sin and say that they were predestined to do so are liars (Jer 7:8-10).
 - c. God has never commanded people to sin, nor has the thought of it ever come into His heart (Jer 7:31), nor has it come into His mind (Jer 19:5; Jer 32:35).
 - v. Consider the following verses that refer to evil as judgment:
 - a. God does judgment in a city (Amo 3:6).
 - b. God set His face against Jerusalem for evil (Jer 21:10).
 - c. God's planned destruction of Israel was called *evil* (Exo 32:10-14).
 - d. God's planned overthrow of Nineveh was called *evil* (Jon 3:4 c/w Jon 3:10).
 - e. The Lord smote Benjamin and it was *evil* that was come upon them (**Jdg 20:41**).
 - C. God used the kingdom of Assyria to destroy Israel (Isa 10:5).
 - i. The Assyrians were the rod of God's anger (Isa 10:5).
 - ii. God gave them a charge to take the spoil and to tread down the people (Isa 10:6).
 - iii. The Assyrians didn't know they were the rod in God's hand, they were just happy to destroy as many nations as possible (**Isa 10:7**).
 - iv. When God was done using the Assyrians to punish Israel, He would then destroy them for their pride (Isa 10:12).

- v. Assyria thought that is was by their own might that the were able to destroy other nations, but failed to realize they were the axe in the hand of the hewer (Isa 10:13-18).
- D. God would later use the Babylonians to destroy Jerusalem.
 - i. God would raise up the Chaldeans which were a wicked nation to destroy His nation Judah and Jerusalem (**Hab 1:6-11**).
 - ii. God has established them for correction (Hab 1:12).
 - iii. God not only destroyed Israel by Babylon, but also other nations (Jer 25:9).
 - iv. God used Babylon for a time to punish Israel (Jer 25:11).
 - v. But like Assyria, once God was done with them, He destroyed them too (**Jer 25:12**).
- E. Many years later, God would once again use the Roman empire, which He called *his armies* to destroy Jerusalem again (Mat 22:7 c/w Luk 21:20-24).
- F. Do you see any possible parallels between the USA and the ancient nations of Assyria and Babylon that were world superpowers that God used to destroy and punish other wicked nations and then destroyed them once he was done with them?