

# **A Christian Anarchist Critique of Violence: From Turning the Other Cheek to a Rejection of the State**

***Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos***

*University of Kent and Canterbury Christ Church University  
a [dot] christoyannopoulos [at] gmail [dot] com  
<http://www.christoyannopoulos.com>*

*Paper presented at the 60<sup>th</sup> Political Studies Association Annual Conference  
("Sixty Years of Political Studies: Achievements and Futures")  
held in Edinburgh (UK) on 29 March – 1 April 2010*

***Please do not circulate without author's consent \****

## **Abstract**

*Jesus' Sermon on the Mount is seen by many Christians as a moving summary of his message to the community of Christian disciples. For Christian anarchist thinkers like Leo Tolstoy, Jacques Ellul, Michael Elliott, Dave Andrews and quite a few others, it also contains Jesus' most poignant statement on violence – his call not to resist evil but to turn the other cheek – a statement which, they argue, cannot but ultimately imply a condemnation of the state for its theoretical and practical monopoly over the allegedly legitimate use of violence. This paper offers an overview of this radical political exegesis. It begins by underlining the political significance of Jesus' illustrations of that saying and by showing that what Jesus demands is not unresponsive passivity but a very purposeful reaction. It then explains why for Christian anarchists, Jesus is calling his disciples to rise above the law of retaliation, how based on this Christian anarchists elaborate a set of detailed reflections on the cycle of violence which they see humanity as caught in for far too long, and why they hear Jesus to be thus proposing a radical method to overcome it. The paper then concludes by clarifying why this is taken by Christian anarchists to logically imply a rejection of the modern state. In short, this paper shows why for Christian anarchists, the very core of Christianity cannot but imply a form of (non-violent) anarchism.*

## Introduction

Jesus' Sermon on the Mount is seen by many Christians – anarchist or not – as a moving summary of his message to the community of Christian disciples. Augustine describes it as “a perfect standard of Christian life,” Hans Küng as “the core of Christian ethics.”<sup>1</sup> Christian anarchists concur.<sup>2</sup> Dave Andrews, for instance, sees the Sermon as a “summary of Christ's rules” in which the “teaching of Christ [is] epitomized.”<sup>3</sup> For Leo Tolstoy as well, the Sermon on the Mount stands out as the most pertinent summary of this teaching: “In no other place does Jesus speak with such solemnity; nowhere else does he enunciate so many moral, clear, and comprehensible rules, appealing so straight to the heart of every man; nowhere else does he speak to a greater or more various mass of simple folk.”<sup>4</sup>

At the same time, as Archie Penner puts it, the Sermon on the Mount is also “one of the most acute exegetical battlegrounds of the New Testament,” in particular over the section in which Jesus speaks of love and non-resistance.<sup>5</sup> It is therefore not surprising to find many Christian anarchists commenting, sometimes at length, on the pronouncements of Jesus in the Sermon. The purpose of this paper is to combine these scattered comments into one aggregate commentary, one generic Christian anarchist exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount.

Scholars often emphasise the parallels between Jesus' long Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Gospel and the much shorter Sermon in the Plain in Luke's.<sup>6</sup> A discussion of whether these two Sermons are narratives of the same event, however, falls outside the scope of this paper. Their content is very similar. Matthew's longer version covers the content of Luke's, and since it is this content that matters for Christian anarchism, this paper follows Christian anarchist thinkers in focusing almost exclusively on the Sermon on the Mount.

It will become obvious to the reader coming from a traditional Christian background that the Christian anarchist interpretation can frequently be quite different to more conventional exegeses of these passages. Christian anarchists however attribute this discrepancy to, at best, innocent misreading, and at worst, deliberate deceit on the part of established commentators. Christian anarchists therefore consciously bypass these traditional interpretations and try to base their exegeses solely on scripture. Tolstoy, for example, openly admits that he found himself “in the strange position of having to search for the meaning of [Jesus'] teaching as for something new.”<sup>7</sup> This paper follows Christian anarchists in ignoring the tradition in order to present the pure Christian anarchist reading of the text. Traditional commentaries, as well as the Christian anarchist reasons for bypassing them, are discussed elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

In this paper, Christian anarchist thought is defined rather broadly to include all the writings that advance the Christian anarchist thesis. The most famous producer of such writings is undoubtedly Leo Tolstoy – he is often the *only* example of Christian anarchism cited in the academic literature on anarchism. Among the *aficionados*, however, Jacques Ellul is also very famous, and people usually also know about Vernard Eller and Dave Andrews. Also well known are some of the figures associated with the *Catholic Worker* movement (especially popular in the United States), in particular Dorothy Day, Peter Maurin, and Ammon Hennacy. The Christian anarchist literature is also enriched by short articles in fringe publications such as *A Pinch of Salt* (published in the U. K. in late 1980s) and by contributions from thinkers at its margins, who are perhaps not the most vociferous fanatics of pure Christian anarchism, or perhaps not Christian anarchists consistently (perhaps writing anarchist texts for only a brief period of their life), or perhaps better categorised as pacifists or Christian subversives than strict anarchists but whose writings complement Christian anarchist ones. These include Peter Chelčický, Nicholas Berdyaev, William Lloyd Garrison, Hugh Pentecost, Adin Ballou, Ched Myers, Michael Elliott, William T. Cavanaugh and

Jonathan Bartley among others.<sup>9</sup> Finally, Christian anarchism also has its anarcho-capitalists, like James Redford and James Kevin Craig. This paper does not draw on every one of these thinkers and writers, but extracts from them the main arguments they put forward which are of most direct relevance to the focus of this paper.<sup>10</sup>

For Tolstoy – the classic exemplar of a Christian anarchist thinker – the Sermon on the Mount held a very special place. Tolstoy had struggled with a deep existential crisis for years when, while pondering a specific verse of this Sermon, suddenly came “a clear comprehension of all the teaching of Jesus,” and “all that before had seemed obscure became intelligible.”<sup>11</sup> This understanding brought his existential torment to a close, it unlocked for him the essence of Jesus’ teaching, and it was based on this understanding of Christianity that he began launching his bitter attacks on the state and on the church.<sup>12</sup> That crucial verse which Tolstoy saw as the key to Christianity is the famous verse where Jesus invites his disciples not to resist evil, but to turn the other cheek instead.

Not all Christian anarchists follow Tolstoy in elevating that single verse as high as he does, but all see in it and in the Sermon on the Mount a moving articulation of Jesus’ central teaching of love and forgiveness. Most would agree that the Sermon on the Mount forms an ideal blueprint, a manifesto, as it were, for any truly authentic Christian community. And even if they do not all see the passage on not resisting evil as the absolute essence of Christianity, most Christian anarchists share the analysis of human society which Tolstoy develops from his exegesis of that passage. Moreover, just as with Tolstoy, the starting point for most Christian anarchists is not so much a critique of the state as an understanding of Jesus’ radical teaching on love and forgiveness which, when *then* contrasted to the state, leads them to their anarchist conclusion.<sup>13</sup>

The most important passage to examine from the Sermon on the Mount is therefore the one where Jesus calls for his disciples not to resist evil. This instruction not to resist evil comes in verses thirty-eight to forty-two of the fifth chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, where Jesus tells his disciples:

38. Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:
39. But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil<sup>14</sup>: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.
40. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.
41. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.
42. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.<sup>15</sup>

The sections of this paper elaborate the main clusters of interpretation Christian anarchists (and selected pacifists) make about these verses, beginning with a closer look at Jesus’ three illustrations of non-resistance to show why these are politically significant. The second section introduces the view that what Jesus demands is not unresponsive passivity but a very purposeful reaction. The third shows that Jesus is calling for his disciples to rise above the law of retaliation, and thus prepares the ground for the fourth section, which discusses Christian anarchist reflections on the cycle of violence, and the fifth, which explains why Christian anarchists believe Jesus to be proposing a method to overcome it. The sixth and final section then clarifies why the preceding exegesis drives Christian anarchists to their anarchism, to their criticism of the state. For Christian anarchist interpretations of other passages (including Romans 13 and “render unto Caesar”) as well as more in depth exposition and further discussion of Christian anarchist themes, see *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel*.<sup>16</sup>

# 1. Jesus' three illustrations

Michael Elliott and Walter Wink interpret Jesus' three brief illustrations one by one in order to show that in Jesus' historical context, these had immediate political connotations which can often be missed by exegetes who are foreign to that context.

On the first illustration, Wink begins by asking: "Why the right cheek?" He then explains that, in those times, "the left hand was used only for unclean hands," which means the attacker must have used the right hand – but, in that case, "the only way one could strike the right cheek with the right hand would be with the back of the hand."<sup>17</sup> In that context, he suggests this would be "unmistakably an insult," a humiliation.<sup>18</sup> Elliott reaches the same conclusion albeit from a slightly different angle: he notes that "Hitting someone in the face, particularly in front of witnesses, was in those times, just as it is today, a humiliation and a loss of dignity for the victim in Middle-East society."<sup>19</sup> Jesus, both Wink and Elliott suggest, is depicting a situation which his followers would immediately recognise as humiliating, and which, in that society, would consequently call for an appropriate, equally forceful and humiliating response to uphold one's dignity and honour.<sup>20</sup>

The response Jesus recommends, however, goes against these local expectations. For Elliott, what Jesus is saying is: "Don't retaliate. Don't behave in the way your enemy expects you to behave. Do what your attacker least expects: behave in the opposite way."<sup>21</sup> In effect, by turning the other cheek, "the cycle of violence is unexpectedly interrupted."<sup>22</sup> This, Elliott contends, confuses the attacker, who now "is no longer in control of the process he initiated. He is, in a very real sense, disarmed!"<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Wink claims that turning the other cheek "robs the oppressor of the power to humiliate," which forces the attacker to regard the victim "as an equal human being."<sup>24</sup> Both Elliott and Wink therefore agree that Jesus' surprising response in this first illustration disempowers the attacker and forces him to regard the victim in a different light.

Elliott and Wink bring a similar perspective on the other two responses illustrated by Jesus. In the second one, they note that by pointedly handing over his cloak in response to being sued for his coat, the victim would end up naked. Yet Elliott argues that nakedness in that context would be offensive, and that the community would blame the person who brought this about more than the actual victim.<sup>25</sup> Along the same lines, Wink contends that this nakedness would register "a stunning protest" against the social and legal system that brought this about; that the "entire system" would thus be "publicly unmasked," but that this unmasking "offers the creditor a chance to see, perhaps for the first time in his life, what his practice causes, and to repent."<sup>26</sup> So, again, Jesus' recommendation in this illustration would be "a practical, strategic measure for empowering the oppressed" against, in this case, such unfair use of the legal system.<sup>27</sup>

Regarding the third illustration, both Elliott and Wink agree that Jesus is here making a reference to a then established military practice, whereby a soldier could force a civilian to carry his pack, but for one mile only.<sup>28</sup> Once again, here, Jesus' proposed response throws the soldier "off-balance," by depriving him "of the predictability of your response."<sup>29</sup> Doing twice as much as what is usually allowed, Elliott argues, is "a way of subverting authority" in that "the victim is claiming the power to determine for himself the lengths to which he is prepared to go."<sup>30</sup> So yet again, Jesus' illustration of non-resistance implies a critique of the expectations of his contemporary society and seeks to empower the victim through a counter-intuitive response.

Elliott further argues that the three illustrations cover the three "strategies which the enemy is most likely to employ" against followers of Jesus: "physical intimidation, manipulation of the legal system, and military co-option," each of which "involves a form of violence."<sup>31</sup> According to Elliott, therefore, Jesus' examples have immediate political

significance: they illustrate three typical kinds of violence within that political context and three unexpected, subversive yet non-violent responses to it.

## 2. A purposeful reaction

Moreover, a point which Christian anarchists (and pacifists) are keen to emphasise is that Jesus' non-resistance is not just some completely inactive, uncaring acceptance of evil, but a very specific, strategic response – a response which Jesus illustrates clearly with his three examples. Here, however, views diverge among Christian anarchists as to exactly what kind of action is allowed and what kind of resistance is forbidden: resistance to certain *types* of evil, resistance *by evil*, or *any* resistance at all. These very important disagreements are discussed in detail elsewhere.<sup>32</sup> Here, what should be noted is that non-resistance as it is illustrated by Jesus is a purposeful and determined type of response.

Wink, for instance, who is not a Christian anarchist but more of a militant pacifist, maintains that an accurate translation of the Greek does not suggest “the passive, doormat quality” which many Christians “cowardly” adopt, but that Jesus’ statement “is arguably one of the most revolutionary political statements ever uttered.”<sup>33</sup> He thinks that “court translators” turned “nonviolent resistance into docility,” and that a “proper translation” of the Greek word for “resist” would be: “violent rebellion, armed revolt, sharp dissention.” Thus according to Wink, Jesus was saying: “Do not strike back at evil (or, one who has done you evil) in kind. Do not give blow for blow. Do not retaliate against violence with violence.” Jesus, Wink continues, “was no less committed to opposing evil than the anti-Roman resistance fighters. The only difference was over the means to be used: *how* one should fight evil.” There are three possible responses to evil: passive “flight,” violent “fight,” or “militant nonviolence.”<sup>34</sup> For Wink, a correct translation of the Greek verb shows that Jesus was rejecting the first two options and recommending the third. He was not preaching inaction, but a very radical type of reaction.<sup>35</sup>

Adin Ballou, whose position is perhaps best described as on the cusp between Christian anarchism and pacifism, is of a similar opinion as Wink. Based on Jesus’ examples, he argues that the precise type of resistance Jesus forbids is: “resistance of personal injury by means of injury inflicted.”<sup>36</sup> He therefore believes the word resistance should not “be taken in its widest meaning” but “in the strict sense of the Saviour’s injunction,” which would consequently mean that “Evil is to be resisted by all just means, but never with evil.”<sup>37</sup> Both Wink and Ballou therefore seem to interpret Jesus’ instruction as forbidding violent or evil responses to evil, but not necessarily political resistance as such.

However, Tolstoy, who after all is the conventional exemplar of classic Christian anarchism, sometimes appears to disagree. In his version of the Gospel, Jesus says: “Do not fight evil by evil, and not only do not exact at law an ox for an ox, a slave for a slave, a life for a life, but do not resist evil *at all*.”<sup>38</sup> He seems to be interpreting the word resistance in the widest possible sense. When read this way, Jesus’ recommended reply does not admit any form of resistance at all. And yet somewhere else, Tolstoy writes that “Jesus says, ‘You wish to destroy evil *by evil*, but that is unreasonable. That there may be no evil, do none yourselves.’”<sup>39</sup> This time, Tolstoy seems to imply that there is a form of response, perhaps even of resistance, which might not be tainted by evil. Tolstoy thus does not appear fully consistent in his interpretation of Jesus’ teaching. Sometimes he interprets Jesus’ command to forbid all forms of resistance; sometimes he interprets it to forbid only violent resistance. These important issues are discussed elsewhere.<sup>40</sup>

The point to note here is that although there may be disagreement among Christian anarchists and pacifists about exactly what form of reaction is allowed by these verses, they all (Tolstoy included) insist that the Christian response is a very real and very radical

*reaction*. In Bartley's words, "nonviolence does not mean inaction, but rather means not being violent in the actions we *do* take."<sup>41</sup> Thus, as Elliott appreciates, what Jesus offers is a genuine strategy, which consist in both not resisting and doing more than is demanded.<sup>42</sup> This is a form of action, a genuine, purposeful, tactical reaction.

### 3. Beyond *lex talionis*

In these verses, therefore, Jesus is prescribing and describing a radical type of reaction. This radical response, coupled with Jesus' introductory words ("Ye have heard that hath been said [...] But I say unto you"), implies a disapproval of something about his political context. That something, for Christian anarchists, relates to the cycle of violence inherent in a non-Christian society's administration of justice, and more specifically in *lex* (or *jus*) *talionis*, the law of retaliation enshrined in the Old Testament.

First, however, it is necessary to note that *lex talionis* is not a licence for unlimited violence. Penner explains that in the Old Testament settings which Jesus is referring to, "the expression [...] amounts to a statement of principle based on literal exactions in some areas of civil and criminal justice," and it was therefore aiming at "the administration of justice" on the basis of reciprocity.<sup>43</sup> Penner makes clear that "redress for wrong was meant as much as the idea of retaliation," that the purpose of it "was to curb crime and sin and to maintain civil order among the Hebrews," and that therefore "the injunction was not a permission to exercise private and hateful revenge in the sense in which the word is often used currently."<sup>44</sup> The idea behind *lex talionis* is that of justified retaliation, "to mete out punishment on the basis and with the intent of justice."<sup>45</sup> Equally important, however, is how this "fair" and "just" level of retaliation can be used by the two parties as a basis for reaching an alternative solution: a "fair" and "just" level of compensation. *Lex talionis* therefore provides the basis for either retributive (punishment of the offender) or restorative (compensation by the offender) justice.<sup>46</sup> These principles, Penner remarks, were not used only in the times of Jesus, but are also "basic in civil and criminal law today."<sup>47</sup>

In the above verses, however, Jesus calls for his disciples, when wronged, not to "seek revenge or redress through legal or coercive means."<sup>48</sup> In order to "limit the level of retaliation taken in a world caught up in relentless cycles of revenge," argues Andrews, God once ordered human beings not to be excessive, to take only one eye for one eye, not more; but here Jesus is pushing the same intention further: "We were called to move from unlimited violence to limited violence by the command to only take an 'eye for an eye'. And we were called to move on from violence to nonviolence by the command to 'turn the other cheek'."<sup>49</sup>

Ammon Hennacy, Jonathan Bartley and John H. Yoder all agree. For Hennacy, "in the earlier Bible times, if a man knocked out an eye of another man, according to tradition, he'd be lucky to get off with being lynched at once. The Jews were trying to lessen the severity of this," and what Jesus is here proposing is "to go a bit farther."<sup>50</sup> For Bartley, Jesus "made it clear that [the *lex talionis*] was not enough" and instead urged "forgiveness and what many would see as the creation of an upward spiral of peace."<sup>51</sup> Hence, for Yoder, "What in the old covenant was a limit on vengeance [...] has now become a special measure of love demanded by concern for the redemption of the offender."<sup>52</sup>

Both commands are informed by the same intention, but non-resistance to evil goes further than the more rigid law of reciprocity. Indeed, this is one of the senses in which Jesus "fulfils" rather than "destroys" the law, by rearticulating it based on its original purpose (this theme is addressed in more detail elsewhere)<sup>53</sup>. Jesus is instructing his disciples to move beyond the *lex talionis* of the Old Testament, to push its original intentions even further. For Christian anarchists, the reason for which Jesus does this has to do with the way the law of

retaliation can – and usually tends to – spiral out of control and become an unrelenting cycle of violence and revenge.

## 4. The cycle of violence

Christian anarchists interpret Jesus' instruction as a comment not just on the Old Law, but also on human practice past and present. This section and the next therefore convey, in considerable detail, Christian anarchist reflections on the potential cycle of violence inherent in *lex talionis*, and their understanding of Jesus' non-resistance in light of that.

It will become obvious that Christian anarchists are quick to generalise Jesus' comments on *lex talionis* to the broader political question of how to deal with evil and achieve justice in society as a whole. They reflect on the use of violence as a method to achieve any kind of justice – from personal or collective retribution all the way to the much broader visions of social justice articulated by competing schools of political thought. They also thus broaden the notion of evil in a similar way to include not just personal evil but also social, political and economic evil and injustice.

This broadening of the apparently more immediate meaning of these verses may not appear fully justified at first it accords with Jesus' broader teaching and example.<sup>54</sup> Besides, it resonates with the long established debate in more conventional Christian theology on the theological and ontological relation between love and justice.<sup>55</sup> Jesus' three examples admittedly illustrate a narrower set of instances of evil, but they are merely illustrations of his reinterpretation of the much broader principle of *lex talionis*, itself a principle aiming at the achievement of justice in society.

Christian anarchists therefore begin by noting that forceful resistance is almost universally accepted as the justified method for humanity to confront injustice. Ballou observes that “The almost universal opinion and practice of mankind is on the side of resistance of injury with injury.”<sup>56</sup> Hennacy remarks the same, adding that “It [is] plain that this system [does] not work.”<sup>57</sup> “The earth,” Ballou regrets, “has been rendered a vast slaughter-field – a theatre of reciprocal cruelty and vengeance.”<sup>58</sup> Why? Because “The wisdom of this world has relied on the efficacy of injury, terror, EVIL, to resist evil,” says Ballou.<sup>59</sup> Tolstoy is of the same opinion: the whole history of humankind for him betrays incessant and yet ultimately failed attempts to resist evil with evil, to deal violently with problems of violence, to wage wars in order to preclude other wars.<sup>60</sup>

This method, however, only multiplies evil. Because human beings often fail to see that another's violence was to him only fair retaliation for an original offence, they get caught in an unending cycle of vendettas. If the justice of the retaliation is not recognised by its victim, what to one party is only fair retaliation becomes unjustified aggression to the other. Reciprocating evil with evil may *sometimes* appear just, but more often than not, it is thereby multiplying evil. Intrinsic to *lex talionis*, therefore, is the risk of it sparking a cycle of violence. Tolstoy quotes Ballou's explanation:

He who attacks another and insults him, engenders in him the sentiment of hatred, the root of all evil. To offend another because he has offended us, on the specious pretext of removing an evil, is really to repeat an evil deed, both against him and against ourselves – to beget, or at least to free and to encourage, the very demon we wish to expel. Satan cannot be driven out by Satan, untruth cannot be cleansed by untruth, and evil cannot be vanquished by evil.<sup>61</sup>

Or as Tolstoy puts it, “One wrong added to another wrong does not make a right; it merely extends the area of wrong.”<sup>62</sup> An eye for eye eventually makes the whole world go blind.<sup>63</sup> It is hard to overestimate how important this realisation is for all Christian anarchists, and especially Tolstoy, Hennacy and Ballou. They believe Jesus exposed this cycle of violence

and showed humankind a way out of it. It is therefore worth looking in more detail at some of the reflections made by Christian anarchists on this vicious circle of violence.

Jacques Ellul, in his book devoted to the subject, asserts that there are five laws of violence.<sup>64</sup> One of these is that “Violence begets violence – *nothing else*.”<sup>65</sup> We think that laudable ends sometimes justify slightly unfortunate means. Christian anarchists passionately disagree. Violent means only produce further violence, and they fatally corrupt and destroy even the worthiest of aims.<sup>66</sup> The end simply does not, ever, justify the means. “When evil means are employed,” Nicholas Berdyaev insists, “these ends are never attained: the means take central place, and the ends are either forgotten, or become purely rhetorical.”<sup>67</sup> Countless human goals have been fatally compromised by the violent means which were adopted in an attempt to reach them, but which ended up taking centre stage while the original goal became more and more distant and elusive.

Nonetheless, moral aims are necessary preconditions for violent means to be adopted in the first place. As another of Ellul’s laws of violence highlights, proponents of violence always try to justify it both to others and to themselves by evoking venerable goals: “Violence is so unappealing that every user of it has produced lengthy apologies to demonstrate to the people that it is just and morally warranted.”<sup>68</sup> This is understandable, and proponents of violence can rarely be accused of evil intentions: they usually genuinely and wholeheartedly believe that the superior ends they long for can be achieved by the violent means they succumb to. Berdyaev remarks that “no one ever proposes evil ends: evil is always disguised as good, and detracts from the good.”<sup>69</sup> Yet the resort to violence is precisely where evil seeps in.

Besides, using violence or coercion to impose a social vision upon rebellious minorities is bound to fail. Tolstoy argues that since “there is in human society an endless variety of opinions as to what constitutes wrong and oppression,” authorising violence for any one cause inevitably guarantees a vicious cycle of evil tit-for-tat, “a universal reign of violence.”<sup>70</sup> Those who are coerced will only obey while they are weaker than the tyrants, under fear of threats. However “As soon as they grow stronger they naturally not only cease to do what they do not want to do, but, embittered by the struggle against their oppressors and everything they have had to suffer from them, they [...], in their turn, force their opponents to do what *they* regard as good and necessary.”<sup>71</sup> Revolutionary violence promises counter-revolutionary violence.

One of the fundamental problems with violent methods, Christian anarchists argue, is that “once we consent to use violence ourselves, we have to consent to our adversary’s using it, too.”<sup>72</sup> This is because, Ellul continues, “We cannot demand to receive treatment different from that we mete out. We must understand that our own violence necessarily justifies the enemy’s, and we cannot object to his violence.”<sup>73</sup> Adopting violence as a method to attain one’s goals implies the recognition of violence as an acceptable method in the first place. Thus in responding to violence with violence, says Yoder, “We agree with the other party that his weapons are right and thereby really lose our right to tell him that what he is doing is wrong.”<sup>74</sup> According to Tolstoy, that is precisely “where the danger of employing violence lies: all the arguments put forward by those who employ it can with equal or even greater justification be used against them.”<sup>75</sup> By smiting back when smitten on the right cheek, one is conceding that smiting is an acceptable type of action. One side’s violence will always be seen by the other side as legitimising its own choice of violent methods.

Worse, the use of violence creates justifications for further violence. On top of implicitly conceding that violence is an acceptable method, the use of violence actually becomes a justification, almost an invitation, as it were, for a violent reply. This is another of Ellul’s laws of violence, that “violence creates violence.”<sup>76</sup> That is, “every act of violence can explain and seek to justify itself as a response to an earlier act of violence” – hence the

inherent danger of *lex talionis*.<sup>77</sup> Violent acts aggrieve those who are targeted, as well as their families and friends.<sup>78</sup> These people will typically seek justice in violent retaliation. Hence using violence gives the opponent good reasons for more violence in return. Conversely, this violent retaliation “makes the attacker feel he is right, that all humans are just the same, they must always use weapons to defend themselves,” says pacifist Richard Gregg.<sup>79</sup> In short, violence obscures its initial aim, validates itself as a method, and justifies more violence in return.

Moreover, Ellul’s first law declares that “Violence becomes a habit of simplification of situations, political, social, or human. And a habit cannot quickly be broken.”<sup>80</sup> Evil overcomes us, and we are “led to play evil’s game – to respond by using evil’s means, to do evil.”<sup>81</sup> The world is accustomed to this game, caught in the delusional habit of the efficacy of violence.<sup>82</sup> Yoder puts it succinctly: “Violence is always, apparently, the shortest and surest way,” but he immediately adds: “And in the long run that appearance always deceives.”<sup>83</sup> We have a habit of thinking that violence can help us achieve our aims, but in the long run, all it does is add momentum to the destructive cycle of violence.

“As fire will not put out fire,” Tolstoy therefore believes, “so evil will not destroy evil.”<sup>84</sup> Even if we think we are right, we must resist the temptation to force others to obey our will.<sup>85</sup> As William Lloyd Garrison explains, “physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration;” evil means do not teach moral virtues.<sup>86</sup> Besides, according to Tolstoy’s Jesus, “every man is full of faults and incapable of guiding others. By taking revenge, we only teach others to do the same.”<sup>87</sup> The very fact that violence sometimes appears to work in the short run only teaches exactly that – that violence appears to work, not that the user of violence was correct.<sup>88</sup>

Christian anarchists urge every human being to decide where they stand on this. The question of how to respond to evil cannot be avoided.<sup>89</sup> *Lex talionis* appears to offer a solution, but inherent in it is a tendency for reciprocal violence to spiral out of control. Jesus indirectly exposed this logic by advising to go beyond it. On the face of it, however, humanity has so far declined to heed this advice. Yet by opting for violent means either to respond to violence or to try to reach at times admittedly very worthy goals, the world has ensnared itself in a self-reinforcing cycle of violence and resistance. For Christian anarchists, Jesus makes clear that it is in the choice of means that the fatal mistake is committed. For the vicious cycle of violence to be broken, humanity needs an alternative method for responding to injustice and reaching moral aims.

## 5. Overcoming of the cycle of violence

Christian anarchists firmly believe Jesus both taught and lived out such an alternative, and that he best expressed it in those verses counselling non-resistance: “the sub-principle of Christian Non-Resistance,” Ballou maintains, is that “Evil can be overcome only with good.”<sup>90</sup> It is not an easy method, and at first, it can appear counterintuitive: Ellul indeed stresses that non-resistance implies “seeking another kind of victory, renouncing the marks of victory.”<sup>91</sup> Christian anarchists however believe it is the only real alternative for humankind, “the only possible way of breaking the chain of violence, of rupturing the circle of fear and hate.”<sup>92</sup>

At the same time, no Christian anarchist pretends it is painless. Overcoming evil with love requires a willingness to endure violence or evil without doing violence or evil in return, even – in fact, especially – when treated unjustly.<sup>93</sup> Hence it requires forgiveness since “by definition,” explains Andrews, it “means making the sacrifice that is necessary to accept an injustice without demanding satisfaction in return.”<sup>94</sup> That sacrifice is precisely the

“relinquishing [of a person’s] right to restitution or retaliation in order to restore a relationship.”<sup>95</sup>

Returning good for evil, Andrews says, “may not transform every bad relationship into a good friendship; but [...] is the *only* thing that ever has or ever will.”<sup>96</sup> Only such an attitude of love, non-violence and forgiveness makes healing possible. It forces “the oppressor to see you in a new light” and to reconsider the situation.<sup>97</sup> This opens “the possibility of the enemy’s becoming just as well,” which is important because as Wink continues, “Both sides must win.”<sup>98</sup> Non-resistance, and its concomitant willingness to suffer unjustly, clears the ground for reconciliation because it exposes the destructive violence of the situation and makes a moving plea to overcome it. It lays bare the cycle of violence and it refuses to prolong it.

Some might object that non-resistance is contrary to human nature in that it goes against the natural instinct of self-preservation. Ballou replies that actually, non-resistance is “the true method of self-preservation.”<sup>99</sup> He recalls that resistance always tend to be justified by self-defence:

It professes to eschew all aggression, but invariably runs into it. It promises personal security, but exposes its subjects not only to aggravated assaults, but to every species of danger, sacrifice and calamity. It shakes the fist, brandishes the sword, and holds up the rod in terrorem to keep the peace, but constantly excites, provokes, and perpetuates war. It has been a liar from the beginning. It has been a Satan professing to cast out Satan, yet confirming the power and multiplying the number of demons which possess our unfortunate race. It does not conduce to self-preservation, but to self-destruction, and ought therefore to be discarded.<sup>100</sup>

The usual method of self-preservation “constantly [runs] into the very wrongs it aimed to prevent.”<sup>101</sup> Like begets like, therefore “the disposition to injure begets a disposition to injure.”<sup>102</sup> In other words, resistance divides and actually destroys humanity, whereas non-resistance actually preserves it. Accordingly, Ballou concludes that non-resistance is not contrary but “in perfect accordance with” the “laws of nature.”<sup>103</sup> It is the only method which can preserve humanity in the long run.<sup>104</sup>

Christian anarchists thus firmly believe in a strict continuity between ends and means. They believe these cannot be separated because the means eventually become the ends. Violence leads to violence, resistance to resistance. By the same token, peace, love and forgiveness can only begin with peaceful, loving and forgiving pioneers. The cycle of violence cannot be broken by cathartic or exemplary acts of violence; it can only be overcome by love and non-resistance. “[That] there may not be violence,” Tolstoy insists, “it is necessary that *no-one under any pretext whatever should use violence, especially under the most usual pretext of retribution.*”<sup>105</sup> The only means to reduce violence in the world, Tolstoy deduces, “is the submissive peaceful endurance of all violence whatever.”<sup>106</sup>

Of course, such non-resistance is not easy. In the words of an Indian poet, “True love is not for the faint-hearted.”<sup>107</sup> Non-resistance requires an absolute commitment, and this means a willingness to suffer, even to die, rather than to resist. Thus non-resistance is not cowardly; it requires courage.<sup>108</sup> Gandhi observed that “bravery consists in dying, not in killing.”<sup>109</sup> (This readiness to pay the ultimate price is discussed in more detail elsewhere.)<sup>110</sup> Non-resistance involves courage because it demands a willingness to suffer, perhaps even to die (but not kill).<sup>111</sup>

Besides, non-resistance is what Jesus commands, and Tolstoy is adamant that “Jesus really means what he says.”<sup>112</sup> Indeed, Tolstoy only made sense of these verses when “he admitted to himself that perhaps Jesus meant that saying literally.”<sup>113</sup> He explains that he had been distracted by trying to explain the passage allegorically, even though, deep down, he knew that it expressed “the vital principle of Christianity.”<sup>114</sup> The teaching, however, could not be clearer:

It may be affirmed that the constant fulfilment of this rule is difficult, and that not every man will find his happiness in obeying it. It may be said that it is foolish; that, as unbelievers pretend, Jesus was a visionary, an idealist, whose impracticable rules were only followed because of the stupidity of his disciples. But it is impossible not to admit that Jesus did say very clearly and definitely that which he intended to say: namely, that men should not resist evil; and that therefore he who accepts his teaching cannot resist.<sup>115</sup>

When he asked his disciples not to resist evil, Jesus meant it. Moreover, Jesus practiced what he preached both throughout his life and in his very death.<sup>116</sup>

So, to repeat and sum up, Jesus says (according to Tolstoy): “The teaching of the world is that men should do evil to one another, but my teaching is that they should love one another.”<sup>117</sup> Jesus rejects the violence of the world by preaching non-resistance. His teaching overcomes the cycle of violence by refusing to resist. A faithful follower of Jesus – a Christian – therefore cannot resist, cannot participate in violence, and only by thus following Jesus’ instruction might help overcome the world’s vicious cycle of violence.

## 6. Anarchist implications

State theory and practice, however, reveal an attitude at odds with this fundamental teaching of Jesus. Put simply, the state is founded on violence. In order for it to enforce law and order, the state demands from its citizens a monopoly over the legitimate use of force.<sup>118</sup> Hence coercion is essential to government.<sup>119</sup> The famous “social contract” postulated by Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau rests precisely on the (hypothetical) consent, by a group of individuals, to grant the state a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence – allegedly to preserve order and security in an otherwise chaotic and sinful world.<sup>120</sup> For Hennacy, this means that “all governments – even the best – were founded upon the policemen’s club: upon a return of evil for evil, the very opposite of the teachings of Christ.”<sup>121</sup> The state is founded on the very thing Jesus prohibits.

Christian anarchists reject the differentiation between “violence,” with its negative connotations, and the state’s use of “force.”<sup>122</sup> Ellul writes:

I refuse to make the classic distinction between violence and force. The lawyers have invented the idea that when the state applies constraint, even brutal constraint, it is exercising “force;” that only individuals or nongovernmental groups (syndicates, parties) use violence. This is a totally unjustified distinction. The state is established by violence – the French, American, Communist, Francoist revolutions. Invariably there is violence at the start.<sup>123</sup>

Violence is employed at the start, and it permeates the day-to-day administration of government whenever “force” is involved. Ellul thus speaks of “administrative violence” and the “violence of the judicial system.”<sup>124</sup> The state, he therefore insists, “cannot maintain itself save by and through violence.”<sup>125</sup>

The resulting tragedy is that although the state promises to protect from evil, it itself “produces evil and extends it,” says Berdyaev.<sup>126</sup> Civil law, according to Peter Chelčický, “encourages a continuing fall of man,” because it “perpetuates lawsuits, punishments, and revenge: it returns evil for evil.”<sup>127</sup> For Christian anarchists, law is thus an inadequate and unchristian response to violence since it is itself another form of violence.

The state is also more visibly violent and therefore unchristian in another way: it wages war.<sup>128</sup> In doing so, it breaks not only Jesus’ instruction not to resist evil, but also one of the much older Ten Commandments, namely: “Thou shalt not kill.”<sup>129</sup> Chelčický believes this was an “absolute” command which “God never revoked.”<sup>130</sup> Yet as Berdyaev remarks, “murder is committed in an organized way and upon a colossal scale by the state.”<sup>131</sup> A letter to *A Pinch of Salt* notes that “states institutionalise killing by maintaining armed forces.”<sup>132</sup> The army is the state’s killing machine, its ultimate tool with which to murder and resist evil.

Some might retort that a distinction should be made between murder and war. To those, Ballou asks rhetorically:

How many does it take to metamorphose wickedness into righteousness? One man must not kill. If he does it is murder. Two, ten, one hundred men acting on their own responsibility must not kill. If they do it is still murder. But a state or nation may kill as many as it pleases and it is no murder. It is just, necessary, commendable, and right. Only get people enough to agree to it, and the butchery of myriads of human beings is perfectly innocent. But how many men does it take?<sup>133</sup>

Christian anarchists see no valid reason to distinguish between people acting on their own and people doing the same thing through the state. Christian commands apply in both cases. Hennacy even finds support on this in Pope Benedict XV, who said that “The Gospel command of love applies between states just as it does between individual men.”<sup>134</sup>

Both at home and abroad, then, the state directly contravenes the related commandments not to kill and not to resist evil. Hennacy affirms that “all government denies the Sermon on the Mount by a return of evil for evil in legislatures, courts, prisons, and war.”<sup>135</sup> Of his own (American) government, he says that it “represents the largest single example of the organised return of evil for evil, both in foreign relations and in domestic affairs.”<sup>136</sup> Through war and capital punishment, the state responds to evil with murder. A Christian should neither kill nor resist evil, yet the state does both.

Moreover, as Ballou explains, “what [a man] does through others he really does himself.”<sup>137</sup> Therefore human beings might find themselves resisting injury with injury “as constituent supporters of human government.”<sup>138</sup> That is,

if a political compact [...] requires, authorizes, provides for, or tolerates war, bloodshed, capital punishment, slavery, or any kind of absolute injury, offensive or defensive, the man who swears, affirms or otherwise pledges himself, to support such a compact [...] is just as responsible for every act of injury done in strict conformity thereto, as if he himself personally committed it.<sup>139</sup>

When the state resists evil, its citizens who have consented to it holding power to resist evil are just as responsible for its behaviour as they would be if they had resisted evil themselves. What the state commits with my implicit or explicit consent, I am doing myself through it.

To put it as mildly as a contributor to *A Pinch of Salt*, the renunciation of violence taught by Jesus therefore “places a massive question [mark] against any use of violence by Christians or any approval of social structures which themselves embody the legitimization of the use of violence and coercion within territorial bounds – like states.”<sup>140</sup> Christians should neither coerce fellow human beings nor empower others to do so through legislation.<sup>141</sup> Hence it is because of their absolute commitment to non-violence that Christian anarchists refuse to endorse the institution and conduct of the state.<sup>142</sup>

Moreover and for the same reasons, Christian anarchists reckon that a true Christian cannot use courts of law to seek redress. Ballou explains that Jesus’ instruction “forbids not merely all personal, individual, self-assumed right of retaliation, but all revenge at law.”<sup>143</sup> According to Tolstoy, if any use of force is forbidden, then so are “all legal proceedings in which force is actually or implicitly employed to oblige any of those concerned [...] to be present and take part.”<sup>144</sup> Aylmer Maude (Tolstoy’s friend, biographer and translator) thus concludes that “This teaching involves nothing less than the entire abolition of all compulsory legislation, Law Courts, police, and prisons, as well as all forcible restraint of man by man.”<sup>145</sup> Christianity, that is, involves anarchism.

Hennacy therefore concludes that “Anarchism is the negative side” of “Pacifism and the Sermon on the Mount.”<sup>146</sup> According to Christian anarchists, anarchism is closer to the “social order” envisaged by Jesus than any alternative “of which force is a component.”<sup>147</sup> They believe Christian anarchism to be “an inevitable corollary of Christian pacifism.”<sup>148</sup> It is because it returns evil for evil that Hennacy would abolish the state.<sup>149</sup> It is because he

thought that “the very existence of governments and state apparatuses [make] domestic violence and international war inevitable” that Tolstoy was an anarchist.<sup>150</sup> It is because they take Jesus’ words in the Sermon on the Mount literally, and because they consider the state to be, both in theory and practice, in flagrant contravention of these, that Christian anarchists believe anarchism to be an inevitable corollary of Christianity.

Brock explains that, “like other anarchists,” Christian anarchists such as Tolstoy “wished to base the organization of society on consent, on cooperation, and not on force.”<sup>151</sup> Christian anarchists do not envision a chaotic society, but an organised one based on real consent, love and mutual help rather than the fictional granting of the legitimacy of violence to some monstrous Leviathan. Quite what such a society would look like is discussed elsewhere.<sup>152</sup>

Guseinov observes about Tolstoy’s anarchism that “one cannot deny his consistency.”<sup>153</sup> Christian anarchists move by consistent logical deductions from Jesus’ command not to resist evil, through their assessment of state violence in both theory and practice, to their ultimate rejection of the state. Tolstoy encapsulates the apparent simplicity of this logic in an often quoted syllogism of his: “Government is violence, Christianity is meekness, non-resistance, love. And, therefore, government cannot be Christian, and a man who wishes to be a Christian must not serve government.”<sup>154</sup>

Therefore, according to Tolstoy, every would-be Christian faces a choice: God or the state, Jesus’ teaching and example or state theory and practice. It is “impossible,” he says, “at one and the same time to confess the God-Christ, the foundation of whose teaching is non-resistance to evil, and yet consciously and calmly labour for the establishment of property, tribunals, kingdoms, and armies.”<sup>155</sup> He further believes that this choice is inevitable, that every single person must decide where they stand on this issue.<sup>156</sup> He writes:

Perhaps Christianity may be obsolete, and when choosing between the two – Christianity and love or the State and murder – the people of our time will conclude that the existence of the State and murder is so much more important than Christianity, that we must forego Christianity and retain only what is more important: the State and murder.

That may be so – at least people may think and feel so. But in that case they should say so!<sup>157</sup>

People should openly admit to have chosen what they have chosen and not pretend they have been able to combine the two, because each one of these alternatives directly repudiates the other. It is either Christianity, or the state.

Further Christian anarchist criticisms of the state (including state violence) are outlined elsewhere.<sup>158</sup> What matters here is that for Christian anarchists, in both theory and practice, the state is founded on violence and maintains itself through violence, a behaviour directly opposed to Jesus’ instruction not to resist evil. Moreover, if the state cannot but be violent, it follows that a perfectly Christian society would have done away with it. If the state cannot but be violent, then in preaching non-resistance to evil, Jesus prescribes a form of anarchism.

## Conclusion

Christian anarchists also see the broader Sermon on the Mount – of which only a few verses were discussed in this paper – as a political document, a manifesto for a Christian anarchist society.<sup>159</sup> Tolstoy moreover rejects the view that the Sermon, this “vital Christian teaching,” is “impracticable.”<sup>160</sup> He accepts that it might be difficult, but believes that what matters is constant progress in its direction.<sup>161</sup> For him, “These commandments are, as it were, signposts on the infinite road to perfection towards which mankind is moving.”<sup>162</sup> That this road may be difficult does not make the commandments any less binding. Jesus’ words may

be “hard words,” writes Peter Maurin (quoting Stevenson), “but the hard words of a book were the only reason why the book was written.”<sup>163</sup>

Of course, to show that this Christian (anarchist) manifesto is not impossibly utopian, those who claim to follow Christ need to live by it. Maurin writes, in his typical playful style, that “The Sermon on the Mount will be called practical when Christians make up their mind to practice it.”<sup>164</sup> Yet as Andrews (quoting Kurt Vonnegut) bemoans, the “most vocal” Christians “demand that the Ten Commandments be posted in public buildings” but none of them “demand that the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, be posted anywhere.”<sup>165</sup> Christians seem to elevate the Old Law as the ideal to live up to, but not the teaching of the teacher they profess to follow.<sup>166</sup> Christian anarchists wish the same energy and commitment were given to the Sermon: “What a fine place this world would be,” writes Maurin, “if Fundamentalist Protestants tried to exemplify the Sermon on the Mount.”<sup>167</sup>

Christian anarchists, for their part, do try to exemplify it. Dorothy Day says of both Maurin and Hennacy that they were constantly guided by the instructions of the Sermon.<sup>168</sup> One writer to *A Pinch of Salt* professes to be trying to take the Sermon literally, and adds that there is “no real justification” for doing otherwise.<sup>169</sup> Andrews describes how the Sermon became his community’s “manifesto” when he lived in India.<sup>170</sup> These and other attempts by Christian anarchists to live out the Christianity they profess are reviewed in more detail elsewhere.<sup>171</sup> The point to note here is that Christian anarchists do try to follow the instructions of the Sermon.

Christian anarchists take seriously the political implications of Jesus’ instructions, especially non-resistance of evil. Tolstoy claims that it “should be the binding principle of our social life.”<sup>172</sup> For him, Jesus tells mankind: “You think that your laws correct evil; they only increase it. There is only one way of extirpating evil – to return good to all men without distinction. You have tried your principle for thousands of years; try now mine, which is the reverse.”<sup>173</sup> Jesus is thus calling for his disciples to transcend *lex talionis*, to love and forgive evildoers in order for the cycle of violence which has blighted humanity to be overcome. For Christian anarchists, this cannot but require a rejection of state theory and practice. Moreover, they argue that the state also contravenes – or through it obliges its citizens to contravene – the rest of the Sermon on the Mount. For Christian anarchists, therefore, the Sermon contains “the most revolutionary teaching in the world.”<sup>174</sup> It calls for revolution by its implied criticism of the state, but it also instructs Christians on how to behave in order for them to lead that revolution – a revolution which Jesus further taught and practiced throughout the rest of his life, including in his acceptance of his own death by crucifixion.

---

\* This paper is a revised version of parts of Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel* (Exeter: Imprint Academic, 2010), chap. 1. Please refer to that source for citing.

<sup>1</sup> Aurelius Augustine, *The Sermon on the Mount Expounded, and the Harmony of the Evangelist*, ed. Marcus Dods, trans. William Findlay and S. D. F. Salmond (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1873), 1; Hans Küng, *Christianity: Its Essence and History*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1995), 52.

<sup>2</sup> For an introduction to Christian anarchism and Christian anarchists, see Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*; Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, "Christian Anarchism: A Revolutionary Reading of the Bible," in *New Perspectives on Anarchism*, ed. Nathan Jun and Shane Wahl (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> Dave Andrews, *Not Religion, but Love: Practicing a Radical Spirituality of Compassion* (Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2001), 65; Dave Andrews, *A Spiritual Framework for Ethical Reflection*, available from <http://www.daveandrews.com.au/publications.html> (accessed 3 December 2006), 3.

<sup>4</sup> Leo Tolstoy, *What I Believe <My Religion>*, trans. Fyvie Mayo? (London: C. W. Daniel, [1902?]), 13.

<sup>5</sup> Archie Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State* (Hagerstown: James Lowry/Deutsche Buchhandlung, 2000), 38.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew 5:1-7:29; Luke 6:20-49.

<sup>7</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 66 (see also: 50).

<sup>8</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 3.

<sup>9</sup> John H. Yoder is also cited in this paper because, despite being a pacifist Mennonite who was keen to dissociate himself from the anarchist conclusions that his argument has been said to lead to, his writings do further reinforce certain flanks of the Christian anarchist critique. A similar reasoning applies for the inclusion of Walter Wink.

<sup>10</sup> A more detailed introduction to Christian anarchist writings can be found in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, introduction.

<sup>11</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 18.

<sup>12</sup> For Tolstoy's autobiographical account of his existential crisis, see Leo Tolstoy, "A Confession," in *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*, trans. Jane Kentish (London: Penguin, 1987). For his consequent understanding of the teaching of Jesus, see, in particular, Tolstoy, *What I Believe*.

<sup>13</sup> Geoffrey Ostergaard, *Resisting the Nation State: The Pacifist and Anarchist Tradition* (Peace Pledge Union), available from [http://www.ppu.org.uk/e\\_publications/dd-trad1.html](http://www.ppu.org.uk/e_publications/dd-trad1.html) (accessed 8 August 2007), section 12.

<sup>14</sup> The Greek word in the original text is *πονηρός*, which can be *grammatically* translated both as "evil" and as "him that is evil" or "the evildoer." The *meaning* of the expression, however, points to "evil" in general rather than to some specific entity "that is evil." The majority of the versions of the Bible, therefore, have opted for a translation into "evil" in the broad sense. In their own translation, Christian anarchists (and Christian pacifists) sometimes fluctuate between one variant and the other. Either way, these alterations have little consequence on the formulation of Christian anarchist thought since Christian anarchists nevertheless always *interpret* it as meaning "evil" in the broad sense.

<sup>15</sup> Matthew 5:38-42 (King James Version's italics removed).

<sup>16</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*. On Romans 13 and "render unto Caesar" specifically, also available is Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, "Responding to the State: Christian Anarchists on Romans 13, Rendering to Caesar, and Civil Disobedience," in *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives*, ed. Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).

<sup>17</sup> Walter Wink, *Jesus' Third Way* (Philadelphia: New Society, 1987), 15.

<sup>18</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 15.

<sup>19</sup> Michael C. Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture* (London: SCM, 1990), 176.

<sup>20</sup> Archie Penner makes a similar point: Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 44.

<sup>21</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 176.

<sup>22</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 176.

<sup>23</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 176.

<sup>24</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 16.

<sup>25</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 176-177.

<sup>26</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 18-19. Here again, Penner agrees that the example concerns the area of litigation: Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 44.

<sup>27</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 19.

<sup>28</sup> Here, Penner breaks this illustration in two, and suggests that while verse 41 "is from the area of forced service to government," verse 42 "is from the area of personal property"; but all he concludes is that as with the

---

previous two examples, the point Jesus is making is that resistance “should not be practiced”. Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 44-45.

<sup>29</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 21.

<sup>30</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 177.

<sup>31</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 177.

<sup>32</sup> Christoyannopoulos, "Responding to the State."; Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 4.

<sup>33</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 12.

<sup>34</sup> All the quotations since the previous footnote are taken from Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 13.

<sup>35</sup> On this, see also Glen H. Stassen, *Living the Sermon on the Mount: A Practical Hope for Grace and Deliverance* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), especially chap. 4; Glen H. Stassen, *The Fourteen Triads of the Sermon on the Mount* (Fuller), available from

[http://documents.fuller.edu/sot/faculty/stassen/cp\\_content/homepage/homepage.htm](http://documents.fuller.edu/sot/faculty/stassen/cp_content/homepage/homepage.htm) (accessed 31 December 2008); Glen H. Stassen and David P. Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in the Contemporary Context* (Madison: Intervarsity, 2003), especially chap. 6.

<sup>36</sup> Adin Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance* (Friends of Adin Ballou), available from

<http://www.adinballou.org/cnr.shtml> (accessed 12 February 2007), chap. 1, para. 48.

<sup>37</sup> Adin Ballou, "A Catechism of Non-Resistance," in *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, by Leo Tolstoy, trans. Aylmer Maude (New Delhi: Rupa, 2001), 14.

<sup>38</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "The Gospel in Brief," in *A Confession and the Gospel in Brief*, trans. Aylmer Maude (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 165 (emphasis added).

<sup>39</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 87 (emphasis added).

<sup>40</sup> Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, "Turning the Other Cheek to Terrorism: Reflections on the Contemporary Significance of Leo Tolstoy's Exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount," *Politics and Religion* 1/1 (2008); Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 4.

<sup>41</sup> Jonathan Bartley, *Faith and Politics after Christendom: The Church as a Movement for Anarchy* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 174-175 (Bartley's emphasis).

<sup>42</sup> Elliott, *Freedom, Justice and Christian Counter-Culture*, 175, 178.

<sup>43</sup> Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 40.

<sup>44</sup> Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 41.

<sup>45</sup> Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 42.

<sup>46</sup> Indeed, according to Stephen W. Carson, restoration – not retribution – was the goal of Mosaic Law. Stephen W. Carson, *Biblical Anarchism*, available from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/carson2.html> (accessed 8 November 2007), especially para. 5.

<sup>47</sup> Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 38.

<sup>48</sup> Penner, *The New Testament, the Christian, and the State*, 42.

<sup>49</sup> Both quotations from Andrews in this paragraph are from Dave Andrews, *Subversive Spirituality, Ecclesial and Civil Disobedience: A Survey of Biblical Politics as Incarnated in Jesus and Interpreted by Paul*, available from <http://anz.jesusradicals.com/subspirit.pdf> (accessed 17 July 2006), 1.

<sup>50</sup> Ammon Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, ed. Jim Missey and Joan Thomas, Second ed. (Baltimore: Fortkamp, 1994), 491.

<sup>51</sup> Bartley, *Faith and Politics after Christendom*, 191.

<sup>52</sup> John Howard Yoder, "The Political Axioms of the Sermon on the Mount," in *The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism* (Scottsdale: Herald, 1998), 49.

<sup>53</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 1 and conclusion.

<sup>54</sup> See Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 2.

<sup>55</sup> This theme is examined in more detail in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, conclusion; Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos and Joseph Milne, "Love, Justice, and Social Eschatology," *The Heythrop Journal* 48/6 (2007).

<sup>56</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 17.

<sup>57</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 30.

<sup>58</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 17.

<sup>59</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 68.

<sup>60</sup> George Kennan, "A Visit to Count Tolstoi," *The Century Magazine* 34/2 (1887).

<sup>61</sup> Ballou, "A Catechism of Non-Resistance," 17.

<sup>62</sup> Leo Tolstoy, quoted in Kennan, "A Visit to Count Tolstoi," 257.

<sup>63</sup> These words are usually attributed to Mohandas K. Gandhi, but the exact reference for them is nonetheless never specified. Whether or not he did say these words, they do eloquently sum up his critique of violence as a means to any end. In any case Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence was in fact strongly influenced by his reading of Tolstoy. Moreover, Andrews, a Christian anarchist who admittedly spent many years in India and was

---

influenced by Gandhi, repeats this famous quote in his discussion Jesus' teaching in Dave Andrews, *Plan Be: Be the Change You Want to See in the World* (Milton Keynes: Authentic, 2008), 3.

<sup>64</sup> Jacques Ellul, *Violence: Reflections from a Christian Perspective*, trans. Cecilia Gaul Kings (London: SCM, 1970), 93-108. For an interesting explorative comparison of the thought of Ellul with that of René Girard on violence, see Matthew Pattillo, *Violence, Anarchy and Scripture: Jacques Ellul and René Girard*, available from [http://www.preachingpeace.org/documents/Patillo\\_Ellul\\_Girard.pdf](http://www.preachingpeace.org/documents/Patillo_Ellul_Girard.pdf) (accessed 17 March 2009).

<sup>65</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 100 (Ellul's emphasis).

<sup>66</sup> See, for instance: Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 59; Ellul, *Violence*, 102.

<sup>67</sup> Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*, trans. Donald A. Lowrie (London: Victor Gollancz, 1952), 88.

<sup>68</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 103.

<sup>69</sup> Berdyaev, *The Realm of the Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*, 87.

<sup>70</sup> Leo Tolstoy, quoted in Kennan, "A Visit to Count Tolstoy," 259.

<sup>71</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence," in *A Confession and Other Religious Writings*, trans. Jane Kentish (London: Penguin, 1987), 163 (Tolstoy's emphasis).

<sup>72</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 99.

<sup>73</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 99.

<sup>74</sup> John Howard Yoder, "Peacemaking Amid Political Revolution," (Elkhart: Associate Mennonite Biblical Seminary, [1970?]), available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/library/yoder/peacemakingamidrevolution.pdf> (accessed 16 May 2006), 60.

<sup>75</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," in *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (New Delhi: Rupa, 2001), 269.

<sup>76</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 95.

<sup>77</sup> Andrew Goddard, *Living the Word, Resisting the World: The Life and Thought of Jacques Ellul*, ed. David F. Wright, et al. (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2002), 168.

<sup>78</sup> Kennan, "A Visit to Count Tolstoy," 257.

<sup>79</sup> Richard B. Gregg, *The Power of Nonviolence*, Abridged ed. (Lusaka: M. M. Temple, 1960), 46.

<sup>80</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 94.

<sup>81</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 173.

<sup>82</sup> This is further discussed in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, conclusion.

<sup>83</sup> John Howard Yoder, "The Theological Basis of the Christian Witness to the State," (Elkhart: Associate Mennonite Biblical Seminary, 1955), available from <http://www.jesusradicals.com/library/yoder/witnesstostate.pdf> (accessed 16 May 2006), 24.

<sup>84</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 49.

<sup>85</sup> Ronald Sampson, "Tolstoy on Power," *Journal of the Conflict Research Society* 1/2 (1977), 68.

<sup>86</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, "Declaration of Sentiments Adopted by the Peace Convention," in *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, by Leo Tolstoy, trans. Aylmer Maude (New Delhi: Rupa, 2001), 7.

<sup>87</sup> Tolstoy, "The Gospel in Brief," 269.

<sup>88</sup> John Milbank makes a similar point in his criticism of Augustine's pedagogy of punishment. John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 419-422.

<sup>89</sup> Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 205.

<sup>90</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 73.

<sup>91</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 173. This is discussed further in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 4 and conclusion.

<sup>92</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 173. See, also: Dave Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy: Discovering a Radical Spirituality of Compassion* (Oxford: Lion, 1999), 100; Andrews, *Not Religion, but Love*, 23.

<sup>93</sup> See, for instance: [Anonymous], *Ninety-Five Theses in Defense of Patriarchy* (Vine and Fig Tree), available from <http://members.aol.com/VF95Theses/thesis.htm> (accessed 20 April 2007), thesis 88; Andrews, *Christi-Anarchy*; Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*; Tolstoy, *What I Believe*; Andrews, *Plan Be*, 62.

<sup>94</sup> Dave Andrews, *The Crux of the Struggle*, available from <http://www.daveandrews.com.au/publications.html> (accessed 3 December 2006), 29.

<sup>95</sup> Andrews, *The Crux of the Struggle*, 29.

<sup>96</sup> Andrews, *Not Religion, but Love*, 106 (Andrews' emphasis).

<sup>97</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 23.

<sup>98</sup> Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, 32.

<sup>99</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 4, para. 10.

<sup>100</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 4, para. 12.

<sup>101</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 4, para. 17.

<sup>102</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 4, para. 37.

---

<sup>103</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 4, para. 33.

<sup>104</sup> There is an inconsistency in Ballou's argument: *humanity* might preserve itself by not resisting, but an *individual* might perish. Non-resistance preserves humanity as a whole, but not necessarily individuals facing injury. Ballou, however, still believes that an individual has better chances of survival by not resisting, as he suggests in Adin Ballou, *Non-Resistance in Relation to Human Governments* ([www.nonresistance.org](http://www.nonresistance.org)), available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007), 15-16. In any case, this also touches on the important theme of personal sacrifice, which is discussed in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 2 and 5. The point here is that while there may be a case for humanity's *collective* natural instinct to be one of non-resistance, that case would have to be formulated slightly differently to apply to human beings' *individual* natural instinct – and Ballou does that, but elsewhere.

<sup>105</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "The End of the Age: An Essay on the Approaching Revolution," in *Government Is Violence: Essays on Anarchism and Pacifism*, ed. David Stephens, trans. Vladimir Tchertkoff (London: Phoenix, 1990), 25 (Tolstoy's emphasis).

<sup>106</sup> Tolstoy, "The End of the Age," 26.

<sup>107</sup> Kabir, quoted in Anna Davie, "Setting Prisoners Free: A Workshop on an Anarchist Christian Response to Imprisonment," paper presented at *God Save the Queen: Anarchism and Christianity Today*, All Hallows Church, Leeds, 2-4 June 2006, available from [http://uk.jesusradicals.com/Setting\\_the\\_Prisoners\\_Fre.pdf](http://uk.jesusradicals.com/Setting_the_Prisoners_Fre.pdf) (accessed 4 June 2006), 4.

<sup>108</sup> Ernest Howard Crosby, *Tolstoy and His Message* (BoondocksNet Edition), available from <http://www.boondocksnet.com/editions/tolstoy/index.html> (accessed 18 August 2003), chap. 4, para. 29-30.

<sup>109</sup> Gandhi, quoted in Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988), 286.

<sup>110</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 2 and 5.

<sup>111</sup> Of this willingness to die, Andrews comments: "Someone dying for a cause doesn't make it right. But a manifesto of love, written in blood, cannot be easily dismissed." Andrews, *Plan Be*, 63.

<sup>112</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 15.

<sup>113</sup> Aylmer Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy: Later Years* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), 33.

<sup>114</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 19.

<sup>115</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 18-19.

<sup>116</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 43; Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 2.

<sup>117</sup> Tolstoy, "The Gospel in Brief," 297.

<sup>118</sup> This notion of the state as the monopoly of the use of force over a certain territory is very similar to Weber's definition of the state. Ruth Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005), 46.

<sup>119</sup> For examples of Christian anarchists making this point that the state is based on violence, on a monopoly over the legitimate use of force, see Jason Barr, *Radical Hope: Anarchy, Christianity, and the Prophetic Imagination*, available from <http://propheticheretic.files.wordpress.com/2008/03/radical-hope-anarchy-christianity-and-the-prophetic-imagination.pdf> (accessed 11 March 2008), 9; William Vanwagenen, "An Introduction to Mormon Anarchism," *The Mormon Worker*, issue 1, September 2007, available from [http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1\\_issue1.pdf](http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1_issue1.pdf) (accessed 28 February 2008), 2-3; Enrico C. S. Molnár, *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life and a Translation from Czech of Part One of His Net of Faith*, ed. Tom Lock (Oberlin: www.nonresistance.org, 2006), available from <http://www.nonresistance.org/literature.html> (accessed 28 March 2007), 30, 95, 100; Bartley, *Faith and Politics after Christendom*, 185; James Redford, *Jesus Is an Anarchist: A Free-Market, Libertarian Anarchist, That Is – Otherwise What Is Called an Anarcho-Capitalist*, available from <http://praxeology.net/anarchist-jesus.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2006), 5-8; [Anonymous], *Ninety-Five Theses in Defense of Patriarchy*, thesis 12; Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 209-212, 315; Tolstoy, "The End of the Age," 35; Leo Tolstoy, "An Appeal to Social Reformers," in *Government Is Violence: Essays on Anarchism and Pacifism*, ed. David Stephens, trans. Vladimir Tchertkoff (London: Phoenix, 1990), 57-61; Ballou, *Non-Resistance in Relation to Human Governments*, 3; Hugh O. Pentecost, *Murder by Law*, available from <http://www.deadanarchists.org/Pentecost/murder.html> (accessed 22 November 2007); Roger Young, *A Plea to Christians: Reject the State! (Strike the Root)*, available from <http://www.strike-the-root.com/columns/Young/young3.html> (accessed 21 November 2007), para. 3; Stephen W. Carson, *Christians in Politics: The Return of the 'Religious Right'*, available from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/carson/carson17.html> (accessed 21 November 2007), para. 59-61.

<sup>120</sup> For a concise summary of "social contract" theory, see William T. Cavanaugh, "The City: Beyond Secular Parodies," in *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*, ed. John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock, and Graham Ward (London: Routledge, 1999), 186-190. Incidentally, Ellul does not even agree with "social contract" theory that the state's mandate comes from the people's consent for it to rule over them. Instead he thinks that "the state is legitimized when the other states recognise it" – the consent of the governed is less important than the consent

---

of other power holders that this or that state shall govern over this or that territory. Ellul, *Violence*, 84. This view is also espoused by Charles Tilly who, while not an anarchist himself, has written a paper which anarchists think highly of: Charles Tilly, "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime," in *Bringing the State Back In*, ed. Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 171.

<sup>121</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 62.

<sup>122</sup> Similarly, Pentecost refuses not to call capital punishment murder. Pentecost, *Murder by Law*, para. 3.

<sup>123</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 84. See also Goddard, *Living the Word, Resisting the World*, 169-170.

<sup>124</sup> Jacques Ellul, quoted in Goddard, *Living the Word, Resisting the World*, 50.

<sup>125</sup> Ellul, *Violence*, 84.

<sup>126</sup> Berdyaev, *The Realm of the Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*, 83.

<sup>127</sup> Molnár, *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life*, 99 (quoting Chelčický).

<sup>128</sup> For a short discussion of Tolstoy's views on war, see Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, "Leo Tolstoy on the State: A Detailed Picture of Tolstoy's Denunciation of State Violence and Deception," *Anarchist Studies* 16/1 (2008), 24-25.

<sup>129</sup> Exodus 20:13. This passage is also quoted to make this point in William Van Wagenen, "War and the State," *The Mormon Worker*, issue 1, September 2007, available from [http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1\\_issue1.pdf](http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1_issue1.pdf) (accessed 28 February 2008), 9.

<sup>130</sup> Respectively: Molnár, *A Study of Peter Chelčický's Life*, 14 (quoting Chelčický); Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1957), 60.

<sup>131</sup> Nicolas Berdyaev, "Personality, Religion, and Existential Anarchism," in *Patterns of Anarchy: A Collection of Writings on the Anarchist Tradition*, ed. Leonard I. Krimerman and Lewis Perry (Garden City: Anchor, 1966), 159. A similar point is made Rockwell: Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., *What Moral Rules Bind the State?*, available from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/rockwell/moralrules.html> (accessed 21 November 2007), para. 7.

<sup>132</sup> Frits ter Kuile, "Anarcho Theologie," *A Pinch of Salt*, issue 12, March 1989, 16.

<sup>133</sup> Ballou, quoted in Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 13.

<sup>134</sup> Benedict XV, quoted in Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 373.

<sup>135</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 124.

<sup>136</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 259.

<sup>137</sup> Ballou, "A Catechism of Non-Resistance," 16.

<sup>138</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 51.

<sup>139</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 1, para. 53.

<sup>140</sup> David Mumford, "The Bible and Anarchy," *A Pinch of Salt*, issue 14, March 1990, 8.

<sup>141</sup> Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance*, chap. 7.

<sup>142</sup> [Anonymous], *The Christmas Conspiracy* (Vine and Fig Tree), available from <http://thechristmasconspiracy.com> (accessed 10 April 2007).

<sup>143</sup> Ballou, *Non-Resistance in Relation to Human Governments*, 12.

<sup>144</sup> Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy*, 36.

<sup>145</sup> Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy*, 36. See also: Crosby, *Tolstoy and His Message*, chap. 4; Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 40-41.

<sup>146</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 99.

<sup>147</sup> Evacustes A. Phipson, "A Happier Social Order," *A Pinch of Salt*, issue 14, March 1990, 10.

<sup>148</sup> Note that Peter Brock was using this turn of phrase to express a slightly different point. The full sentence reads: "We may agree that anarchism is not an inevitable corollary of Christian pacifism; yet it appears, at least to me, as an essential element of Tolstoyism." Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 459.

<sup>149</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 123.

<sup>150</sup> Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914*, 460.

<sup>151</sup> Peter Brock, *The Roots of War Resistance: Pacifism from the Early Church to Tolstoy* (New York: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1981), 73.

<sup>152</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 5.

<sup>153</sup> A. A. Guseinov, "Faith, God, and Nonviolence in the Teachings of Lev Tolstoy," *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 38/2 (1999), 100. Aylmer Maude makes a similar point in Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy*, 57.

<sup>154</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "Letter to Dr. Eugen Heinrich Schmitt," in *Tolstoy's Writings on Civil Disobedience and Non-Violence*, trans. Aylmer Maude (New York: Bergman, 1967), 129.

<sup>155</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 22.

<sup>156</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 26-27.

- 
- <sup>157</sup> Leo Tolstoy, "Address to the Swedish Peace Congress in 1909," in *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, trans. Aylmer Maude (New Delhi: Rupa, 2001), 540.
- <sup>158</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 3.
- <sup>159</sup> The Christian anarchist interpretation of other verses is discussed in Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 1.
- <sup>160</sup> Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 106. See also: Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 41-50; Andrews, *Plan Be*, 5.
- <sup>161</sup> Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 107-110.
- <sup>162</sup> Tolstoy, "The Kingdom of God Is within You," 111.
- <sup>163</sup> Robert Louis Stevenson, quoted in Peter Maurin, *Easy Essays* (Washington: Rose Hill, 2003), 137.
- <sup>164</sup> Maurin, *Easy Essays* (2003), 180.
- <sup>165</sup> Kurt Vonnegut, quoted in Dave Andrews, "Heaven on Earth: Trinity, Community and Society," unpublished draft book for future publication, sent by email by its author to Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos on 8 November 2006, 145 (emphasis removed). See also Andrews, *Plan Be*, 71-72.
- <sup>166</sup> In a special report on religion and public life, the *Economist* mentions the following striking statistic when discussing, in passing, the sometimes worrying ignorance by militant religious converts of their founding texts: "although 83% of Americans regard the Bible as the word of God, half of them do not know who preached the Sermon on the Mount." Of course, Americans are only mentioned as one of several examples, there is no suggestion that all Americans Christian are militant, and ignorance of who preached the Sermon on the Mount does not imply ignorance of some of its content. Nonetheless, the statistic does come as something of a surprise, and perhaps suggests that the Christian anarchist interpretation of Christianity is bound to sound quite radical today. [Anonymous], "O Come All Ye Faithful," *The Economist*, issue 385, 3 November 2007, 9.
- <sup>167</sup> Maurin, *Easy Essays* (2003), 193 (see also: 146).
- <sup>168</sup> Dorothy Day, *Selected Writings: By Little and by Little*, ed. Robert Ellsberg (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2005), 137-144; Dorothy Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of the Legendary Catholic Social Activist* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1952), 179; Dorothy Day, *Peter's Program* (The Catholic Worker), available from <http://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/reprint.cfm?TextID=176> (accessed 11 April 2005), para. 10. Mormon anarchists inspired by Catholic Workers also see it as "our duty to build the kind of society and community that Christ' Sermon on the Mount outlined." Cory Bushman, "The Mormon Worker," *The Mormon Worker*, issue 1, September 2007, available from [http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1\\_issue1.pdf](http://www.themormonworker.org/articles/issue1/volume1_issue1.pdf) (accessed 28 February 2008), 1.
- <sup>169</sup> Kenny Hone [?], "The Gift," *A Pinch of Salt*, issue 3, Pentecost 1986, 12. Kenny Hone was the editor of a Canadian Christian anarchist newspaper, known initially as *The Digger* and later as *The Digger and Christian Anarchist*.
- <sup>170</sup> Andrews, "Heaven on Earth," 103. In recent years, he has also been actively promoting an internet-based community trying to live up to the Beatitudes, which he saw as a summary of the Sermon on the Mount – see Andrews, *Plan Be*.
- <sup>171</sup> Christoyannopoulos, *Christian Anarchism*, chap. 6.
- <sup>172</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 41.
- <sup>173</sup> Tolstoy, *What I Believe*, 41.
- <sup>174</sup> Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, 62.