

# Peace, Pacifism and Reconciliation in Pentecostal Theology

Allan Anderson

Head of School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion & Professor of Global Pentecostal Studies,  
University of Birmingham, UK

## *Early Twentieth Century Revivals*

This paper discusses the early pacifism of Pentecostalism, its demise between the two world wars and the implications of a Christian ethic of peace and reconciliation for world Christianity. It traces the theology and in particular, the eschatology that made such an impact on the revival movements of the early twentieth century. The implications of this theology for revivalistic Christianity in Korea with similar roots are briefly considered. Pentecostalism, in common with the "Korean Pentecost" of 1907-9 and other revival movements in the first decade of the twentieth century, was born in the radical evangelicalism of the nineteenth century. This revivalism emphasized the coming of the Holy Spirit into individual lives to bring confession of sins, power and motivation for evangelism and missions, and individual and personal salvation referred to as being "born again". There was the added dimension of divine healing that characterized some of these movements and followed the Korean revival movement especially through the ministry of Presbyterian pastors Kil Soen-Ju and Kim Ik Du. There was also a conviction that these revivals were signs of the end times and that the world was soon coming to an end.

The various revival movements began with a strong but individualistic peace and reconciliation theology. This was grounded in a premillennial eschatology that emphasized the need for urgent evangelization before the return of Christ, to get as many individuals "saved" as possible in as many nations as possible. The emphasis on individual salvation often meant that social transformation was neglected, but there were notable exceptions where philanthropic activities were pursued. Pentecostalism was one of those revival movements in evangelical Protestantism during the first decade of the twentieth century that broke out in different parts of the world. This was of course also the time of the Korean Revival, beginning in Wonsan among Protestant missionaries in 1903 and in Pyongyang in 1907-08. Various revival movements at this time also occurred in Wales, India, East China, Madagascar, the United States and other places, with many things in common like emotional repentance, loud weeping and simultaneous praying.

Eyewitness William Blair likened the 1907 Korean revival to the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2 and called it the “Korean Pentecost”, recording that “Christians returned to their homes in the country taking the Pentecostal fire with them”.<sup>1</sup> The revival quickly spread throughout a Korea facing impending Japanese occupation in 1910. The features of the revival still characterize Protestant churches in Korea, including Pentecostal ones: early morning prayer meetings daily, and all-night prayer, simultaneous prayer, Bible study, and an emphasis on evangelism and missions. But beyond this the Korean revival had more characteristically Pentecostal practices like healing the sick, miracles and casting out demons. As was the case in India, national evangelists, especially the Presbyterian leader Kim Ik Du (1874-1950), famous for his healing and miracle ministry, took the revival movement into directions that the missionaries might not have been completely comfortable with, but were fully compatible with the felt needs of Korean people.<sup>2</sup> Kim held revival healing services all over Korea from 1919 onwards with thousands of reported healings and miracles; one newspaper report of his 1920 revival in Daegu said that “thousands of people took leave of their senses and were in an ecstatic state”.<sup>3</sup>

### *Eschatological Mission*

It has been said that revivalistic Christianity is characterized by an inward-looking, pietistic and individualistic religion that is focused in salvation from personal sin and is not much concerned with wider social and political sins. The revivals were also characterized by a particular kind of other-worldly eschatological expectation, further adding to the urgency of mission service. There was a shift from the optimism of postmillennialism in nineteenth century Protestantism with its optimistic view of a coming “golden age” of material wealth and progress, to a pessimistic, premillennialist “secret rapture” dispensationalism that swept through evangelical circles in western Europe and North America later that century. This shift occurred gradually as a result of several factors, but was precipitated by the teaching of John Nelson Darby of the Plymouth Brethren in Britain. A monthly periodical *The Prophetic Times* commenced in 1863 and prophetic conferences like D.L. Moody’s annual Prophecy Conference in Massachusetts from 1880 prominently advocated Darby’s eschatological views. Popular preachers and healers A.T. Pierson, A.B. Simpson and A.J. Gordon all expounded premillennialism; eventually it was accepted by a majority of American evangelicals, it became a prominent theme of the Keswick conventions in England, and was a characteristic of the early twentieth century revivals. With a

few exceptions, most of the Holiness movement, many evangelicals and subsequently most early Pentecostals accepted premillennial eschatology. Among the complicated reasons for this shift was a pessimistic reaction to theological liberalism and the “social gospel” that increasingly came to identify the main Protestant denominations. This new complex and intricately-detailed eschatological system was the product of a highly rationalistic approach to biblical apocalyptic passages.<sup>4</sup>

The differences between these various interpretations of biblical apocalyptic literature were vast. Postmillennialists held that Christ would return after a thousand year period and therefore they laid greater stress on social activism in order to make the world a better place to live in. Their mission work included educational, philanthropic and medical activities as well as evangelism and church planting, but the latter was given less attention. In contrast, premillennialists believed that Christ’s return could be imminent and before the thousand-year period, so their view of the world was decidedly negative, where its activities were to be rejected and it was seen as a temporary place in which Christians were merely brief visitors. This increasingly pessimistic premillennialism believed that the world would get progressively worse until the return of Christ, so the missionary task was to rescue individuals from imminent peril rather than seek to transform society. But this view was not entirely pessimistic, for there was a certain tension between the negative view of the world and the very positive view of the missionaries’ place in it. The outpouring of the Spirit in the last days made mission and evangelizing the nations possible. Both Pentecostals and the Korean revivalists believed that they were in the last days revival and that their mission work was a direct consequence of it.

The second coming of Christ would occur when the Gospel had been proclaimed to every nation, these revivalists declared, and so it was necessary to engage in the most rapid evangelization possible. Despite their optimism about their role in this end-time mission, their view of the world around them, especially the religious world, was decidedly negative.<sup>5</sup> The Scripture most often linked to this eschatological motivation for mission was Matthew 24: 14: “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come”.<sup>6</sup> One of the clearest expositions of this link between mission and premillennial eschatology was made by the editor of an early Pentecostal periodical, Elisabeth Sexton, discussing the Edinburgh missionary conference of 1910. It was not the frantic and increased activity in itself that would achieve God’s purposes, she wrote, but the haste that was needed in these last days was in “preparation for that blessed day, and the making ready of the

Bride of Christ". Any missionary activity that did not have this end in view would "miss the highest privilege of this age".<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, two years later Cecil Polhill, director of the British Pentecostal Missionary Union drew attention to the calls of the Edinburgh conference for making the most of the unprecedented opportunities to engage in world evangelization. There had never been a decade like the second decade of the twentieth century where doors all over the world were opened.<sup>8</sup> Missionaries made premillennial eschatology part of their preaching wherever they went and the seeming delay in Christ's coming did not deter them. Sadly, the Great War was to put pay to these opportunities and leave the world reeling from its devastation.

There was also an implied link between this eschatology and the expectations regarding the "holy land", Palestine, until 1918 occupied by the Ottoman Turks. One of the signs of the end in this eschatology was that the Jews would return to their own land, and that political events showed that "everything promises to be working towards the occupancy of the land at no distant future by the only people who have a God-given right to it".<sup>9</sup> This belief in an exclusive, God-given right belonging to the Jews concerning Palestine persists in evangelical and Pentecostal circles to this day. During the First World War the conviction among premillennialists grew that Turkey would be defeated and Palestine would pass into the control of the Allies, thus paving the way for the return of the Jews to their land and the setting up of the nation of Israel. When British troops marched into Jerusalem in 1918, the prophecies seemed to have been fulfilled. Linked to these events would be the final battle of Armageddon, when Palestine would be invaded by Russia in the north, a belief that lasted throughout the twentieth century.<sup>10</sup> Most premillennialists held that before this final battle, the believers would be snatched away from the world in the time of the "Great Tribulation" and the world would be left to its own fate of bloodshed, unimaginable horror and eventual destruction. After this period Christ would return and set up a thousand year reign on earth when Satan and his demons would be confined to a tortuous prison (Hades). At the end of this Millennium, Satan would be released for a short period until his final destruction in the "lake of fire" (Hell). So when Pentecostals preached about the imminent return of Christ, many of them had this whole complicated panorama in mind. It was not just a simple case of Jesus coming back soon.

Premillennialism was also a feature of the Korean revival and the preachers involved in its aftermath. The famous Korean Presbyterian leader Kil Seon-Ju (1869-1935) urged his followers to forgive the Japanese occupiers in the light of preparing for the second coming of Christ. His

favourite topic was to preach from the Book of Revelation, which he took literally, and he predicted the imminent coming of Christ in his only published theological work, *Eschatology*.<sup>11</sup> Korea was about to enter Japanese occupation, followed four decades later by the devastating Korean civil war in which the country was rent asunder through the machinations, ideology and rivalry of the so-called “super-powers”. Premillennialism continued to characterize Protestant Christianity in Korea throughout these tumultuous events. It tended to draw them away from issues of structural evil and social justice, but it is no wonder that Korean Christians in this era found the hope offered them by premillennialism attractive and motivating them to be courageous.

### *War and the Coming of Christ*

Premillennial eschatology was also the primary reason for early Pentecostal pacifism, because of their view that the world was evil and that war was a manifestation of the last days. Although pacifism has mostly been associated with the “historic peace churches” like the Quakers, Brethren and Mennonites, and John Wesley himself opposed war, there were many nineteenth century evangelicals who took a stand against Christians being involved in war, and some churches took official positions. These included Wesleyan Methodists, Free Methodists, Church of the Nazarene, Disciples of Christ, the evangelist D.L. Moody, and the healer John Alexander Dowie.<sup>12</sup> Early Pentecostals were familiar with these widespread views and were generally conscientious objectors to war and the taking up of arms, especially during the First World War. For most of them, the outbreak of the Great War in August 1914 was further evidence that the end had come and that the world, of which they were certainly no part, was involved in a bloody conflagration that would lead to the final battle of Armageddon preceding the return of Christ. As believers they would be snatched away from the world’s conflicts, and therefore they should have no part in this war. Many of them faced terrible consequences as a result of this stand and in Germany, some Pentecostals were court-marshaled and executed.<sup>13</sup> These Pentecostals were exclusivist in their pacifism: this was only for Christians, as the world and its wars were evil and inevitable.<sup>14</sup> Pentecostals believed that the First World War was predicted in the Bible. Some prophecies about the coming war were printed in Pentecostal periodicals before the event, such as this quite remarkable one in early 1912:

We are on the eve of one of the greatest upheavals in Europe that the world has ever seen; the bloodiest battles, with the most terrific carnage both on land and sea, will take place very shortly, engaging almost all the great powers of this continent, when prophecy will be fulfilled to the very letter. Europe at the present moment may be likened to a vast armed camp, with fourteen million soldiers enrolled and ready for a terrible butchery of each other. Every deadly instrument which modern science and human ingenuity can devise has been adopted for this hellish purpose of the destruction of human life.<sup>15</sup>

Pentecostal periodicals saw the outbreak of war as pointing to the end times. After a summary of recent events leading to the declarations of war, a Chicago-based Pentecostal periodical asked: "Is this the final conflict? Are we at Armageddon?" Even more significantly, the paper looked at the potentially devastating effects of the War on missions, lamenting "the cruel, murderous warfare among the so-called Christian nations" that "cannot help but cripple missionary effort in foreign lands, and there is little doubt that we are in the tribulation days."<sup>16</sup>

Christianity as a whole had lost credibility through the determination of so-called "Christian nations" to exterminate each other. Some American periodicals were even more definite in linking the outbreak of war to Armageddon, while the British periodical *Confidence* was just as adamant that this was not the final war before the coming of Christ. The official periodical of the American Assemblies of God heralded the war as preliminary to the dawning of the Great Tribulation prophesied in the Book of Revelation, although hastened to add that this was not Armageddon but "the beginning of the great wars which will wind up in the battle of Armageddon".<sup>17</sup> In April 1917 the Assemblies of God published an article against participating in war as Christians, and a testimony by an English Pentecostal conscientious objector.<sup>18</sup> Some Pentecostals were imprisoned for their stand. The Secretary of the Pentecostal Missionary Union wrote against involvement in the war to his missionaries and William Burton, a British missionary leader in the Congo, praised the anti-war stand taken by Pentecostals in Britain.<sup>19</sup> Among the more vocal advocates of pacifism was the former Quaker turned Salvationist and then Pentecostal, Arthur Booth-Clibborn (1855-1939), Irish husband of Catherine, daughter of General William Booth.<sup>20</sup> Booth-Clibborn's anti-war book *Blood against Blood* was first published in about 1903 and contrasted "carnal power and worldly war, expressed in hatred and ending in death" versus "spiritual power and gospel war, expressed in love and ending in life".<sup>21</sup> It was the blood of Christ against the blood of war, war as the antithesis of Christian mission. This was linked to his premillennial pessimism about the future of the world in its present form.<sup>22</sup> The book was banned in Britain after conscription was introduced in 1916. Across the Atlantic,

however, the Assemblies of God enthusiastically endorsed the book as a “most striking, realistic and forceful book” that presented “war from a Christian standpoint”. Their Gospel Publishing House was the USA distributor for it, offering the book at a special price. It was widely publicized in other American Pentecostal periodicals.<sup>23</sup> The Assemblies of God periodical recommended that its readers “purchase it and become imbued with the spirit of its contents, in a complete opposition and protest against war and the shedding of blood”.<sup>24</sup>

Prominent early American Pentecostal pacifists included Frank Bartleman, the early chronicler of the Azusa Street revival, and Bishop Charles H. Mason of the Church of God in Christ, who was jailed for his pacifism during the First World War.<sup>25</sup> On his return from Europe in 1915, Bartleman prolifically expressed his opinion in articles concerning the futility of war, the exploitation of British colonialism and warned of the dangers of the war to the USA. These articles were given a high profile in leading Pentecostal papers.<sup>26</sup> Bartleman’s censure of Britain would probably find more sympathetic (and certainly more interested) ears in a later generation as he wrote, “A nation trained to sporting, running down poor little foxes with a regiment of men, women, horses, and dogs must make professional killers”.<sup>27</sup> One article even suggested that the recruiting of men into the war that was taking place in some churches in Canada amounted to the Antichrist “getting possession of the House of God”.<sup>28</sup> Stanley Frodsham was a British immigrant to the US who became editor of all Assemblies of God publications from 1921-49 and also served as one of the denomination’s first General Secretaries. For many years he consistently provided theological justification for his stand against war and for peacemaking. For him, war and national pride were “abominations”, and the coming of the Kingdom of God in Christ had a simple principle: “Peace on earth, good will toward men”.<sup>29</sup> The periodical made an official statement titled “Pentecostal Saints Opposed to War”, which stated: “The Pentecostal people, as a whole, are uncompromisingly opposed to war, having much the same spirit as the early Quakers, who would rather be shot themselves than that they should shed the blood of their fellow-men”.<sup>30</sup> Their General Council adopted a resolution in 1917 “toward any Military Service which Involves the Actual Participation in the Destruction of Human Life”, declaring itself in favor of conscientious objection. It stated that while the church affirmed its “unswerving loyalty to Government of the United States”, it was “constrained to define our position with reference to taking of human life”. Quoting various Scriptures against killing and in favor of peace, the resolution went on to declare that “these and other Scriptures have always been

accepted and interpreted by our churches as prohibiting Christians from shedding blood or taking human life” and stated:

Therefore, we, as a body of Christians, while purposing to fulfill all the obligations of loyal citizenship, are nevertheless constrained to declare we cannot conscientiously participate in war and armed resistance which involves the actual destruction of human life, since this is contrary to our view of the clear teachings of the inspired Word of God, which is the sole basis of our faith.

This statement against war remained in the By-Laws of the Assemblies of God until 1967, when it was changed to allow for individual choice and to reflect the sea-change that had occurred since the Second World War.<sup>31</sup>

Not all early American Pentecostals were pacifists, however. The official organ of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, *The Apostolic Evangel*, published an article in 1917, “Can a Christian go to War and keep his Christian Experience?” which it answered in the affirmative. Alexander Boddy, whose Church of England supported the War, retorted that “conscientious objectors should obtain this copy”.<sup>32</sup> Aimee McPherson preferred to take a moderate line as America became involved in the War in 1917, but made the eschatological link to the Great War as a sign of the end times.<sup>33</sup> By 1917 Pentecostals were softening their beliefs that the War was the final battle before the coming of Christ, and the *Weekly Evangel* published an article by Charles Leonard, missionary in Palestine, who said that he did not believe that the War in Palestine was “the last great struggle before He comes, but rather that there will be a short time to preach the Gospel of the kingdom before the coming of the King”.<sup>34</sup>

For their pacifist stand, many Pentecostal men were imprisoned in Britain and sent to forced labor camps. In Germany, some Pentecostals were executed for refusing to bear arms. When the PMU Men’s Training Home in London had to be closed, former students were sent to work camps and prison. Such information could not be published in the periodicals because of censorship, but PMU Secretary Mundell reported that only one had enlisted, while “the other dear men are in various parts and positions in England, some of them suffering for Christ’s sake very acutely”.<sup>35</sup> One American woman missionary in the Congo suggested on the eve of the USA’s entering the war that instead of laying down their lives in the “fearful carnage” as British young men had done, they should come to Africa as missionaries.<sup>36</sup> The American AG iterated its opposition to bearing arms and killing in a statement released in its *Weekly Evangel* in August 1917, just as the USA was being drawn into the War. This article, “The Pentecostal



Movement and the Conscription Law” stated clearly what the AG considered to be the position of Pentecostals everywhere:

From the very beginning, the movement has been characterized by Quaker principles. The laws of the Kingdom, laid down by our elder brother, Jesus Christ, in His Sermon on the Mount have been unqualifiedly adopted, consequently the movement has found itself opposed to the spilling of the blood of any man, or of offering resistance to any aggression. Every branch of the Movement, whether in the United States, Canada, Great Britain or Germany, has held to this principle. When the war first broke out in August of 1914, our Pentecostal brethren in Germany found themselves in a peculiar position. Some of those who were called to the colors responded, but many were court marshalled and shot because they heartily subscribed to the principles of non-resistance. Great Britain has been more humane. Some of our British brethren have been given non-combatant service, and none have been shot down because of their faith.<sup>37</sup>

However, some early British Pentecostals, like the Anglicans Boddy and Polhill, took a stand in favor of a “just war” against the oppressing German regime, Boddy serving in France to help tend the wounded troops.<sup>38</sup> His periodical *Confidence* soon became a strong defender of the “just war” doctrine and published news on the progress of the Allied troops and patriotic literature.<sup>39</sup> Polhill similarly thought that war was the means of bringing about “manliness, patriotism, then righteousness, holiness and godliness”. Nevertheless, by 1918 the PMU Council, increasingly distant from the views of Polhill, had made the “unanimous decision” that if any missionaries volunteered for War service, they would have “entirely severed their connection with the PMU”.<sup>40</sup> Among other reasons, the fundamental difference between the pacifist and non-pacifist views within British Pentecostalism would ultimately lead to the separation of Boddy and Polhill from the movement in the 1920s and the setting up of the British Assemblies of God. Not until the 1960s would British Anglicans again be involved in Charismatic activities. Early Pentecostal denominations were essentially pacifist organizations and in Britain this issue effectively ended their relationship with the patriotic Anglicans. Boddy regularly publishing patriotic statements, news and letters from British soldiers in *Confidence* must have alienated many British Pentecostals who believed strongly that they should abstain from any involvement in this end-times conflagration. In any event, the Great War effectively ended the leadership of Boddy and Polhill over the British Pentecostal movement and its missionaries.

The pressures of history, conformity to society, and politics often change theological views, and those on Pentecostal pacifism are no exception. Booth-Clibborn’s opposition to war was based on two “Christian” nations fighting each other and was soon forgotten. A new generation grew up that did not remember the courageous stand for peace taken by their forebears. Nowhere

was this more dramatically illustrated than in the American Assemblies of God (AG). Before the Second World War, this denomination continued to officially oppose war, and it published pacifist articles in its official periodical. Both the Chairman of the British AG, Donald Gee, and the General Superintendent of the American AG from 1929-49, Ernest S. Williams, were pacifists and wrote articles against war, although Williams favored non-combatant service and later retreated from his earlier position altogether.<sup>41</sup> The AG scholar Paul Alexander traces the main reasons for the decline in support for a Christian peacemaking stance to one of support for a "just war" to be the rise of nationalism and militarism.<sup>42</sup> Early Pentecostals allowed their members to act according to their individual consciences and did not forbid them from enlisting in the military, even though the majority view was that they should only enlist as non-combatants. However, by the time the USA had entered the Second World War in 1941, and the American AG joined the National Association of Evangelicals the following year, the denomination had become part of the national religious establishment that was increasingly veering towards conservative and nationalistic politics. Militarism, military chaplaincy and American patriotism were hailed as strong virtues in the organization. In the 1967 General Council meeting all references to a pacifist stance in the AG in its by-laws were removed, and the AG now actively supported American war efforts while acknowledging "the right of each member to choose for himself whether to declare his position as a combatant, a non-combatant, or a conscientious objector".<sup>43</sup> It is ironic that individual choice was allowed in major issues of public morality like this, but on less important matters of dress and jewelry, the consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and attending cinemas, Pentecostals have had strong rules imposed on members. The AG has become increasingly militaristic and fully supportive of all American war efforts ever since.<sup>44</sup> Walter Hollenweger asks why modern American Pentecostalism can be ignorant of or antagonistic towards its own roots, including "its fight for peace and justice".<sup>45</sup> Murray Dempster writes that this might be because early Pentecostal pacifism did not produce a firm theological rationale, which could be outlined as threefold: their eschatological roots in a restoration of New Testament Christianity, their pacifism as a moral critique of the existing evil world order and power structures, and as a universal affirmation of the value of human life.<sup>46</sup> The early Pentecostal pacifists were "people of eschatological mentality, with moral conviction about the individual and institutional nature of human sin, and deeply aware of the value of human life." The modern Pentecostal church, in contrast, even

though committed to “the evangelism of the world and to the fellowship of believers” had “an undeveloped social conscience”.<sup>47</sup>

### *Conclusion*

No Christian will deny that the life of Jesus as depicted in the New Testament emphasises peace and non-violent resistance to evil, whether personal or structural. Loving our enemies, turning the other cheek, and resisting evil with good are not mutually incompatible concepts. Peace-making is not an option for Christians; it is the very means by which they are known as children of God. This history of a stand for peace in early Pentecostalism and its decline in later years is a warning to Christians concerning accommodation to a prevailing climate of violence and war. As Weaver points out, the example of a lost Pentecostal pacifism reminds us that “The commitment to the non-violence of Jesus needs to be a visible and intrinsic element” of spiritual revival experiences; if not, they will become “practices devoid of social relevance for the ethic of the peace church”.<sup>48</sup> The Church is called to a theologically responsible peace and reconciliation initiative that bases its mission on the love of God through the Holy Spirit. This will include support for just peace-making efforts in Korea and throughout the world that actively prevent the possibility and perpetuation of war.<sup>49</sup>

### NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> William N. Blair & Bruce Hunt, *The Korean Pentecost and the Sufferings which Followed* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977), pp. 71, 75.

<sup>2</sup> Ig-Jin Kim, *History and Theology of Korean Pentecostalism* (Zoetermeer, Netherlands: Boekencentrum, 2003), pp.36-41; Chang Ki Lee, *The Early Revival Movement in Korea (1903-1907)* (Zoetermeer, Netherlands: Boekencentrum, 2003), pp.142-49; Young Hoon Lee, *The Holy Spirit Movement in Korea* (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 2009), pp.24-48.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Lee, *Holy Spirit Movement*, p.44.

<sup>4</sup> D. William Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp.99, 104-05, 110-12.

<sup>5</sup> *Bridegroom's Messenger* 94 (15 Sept 1911), p.1; Stanley, *Bible & Flag*, p.76.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew 24:14, AV.

<sup>7</sup> *Bridegroom's Messenger* 69 (1 Sept 1910), p.1.

<sup>8</sup> *Flames of Fire* 9 (Jan 1913), p.7.

<sup>9</sup> *Word & Work* 31:11 (Nov. 1908), 347.

- 
- <sup>10</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 102 (7 Aug 1915), p.3.
- <sup>11</sup> Lee, *Early Revival Movement*, pp.65, 126-27, 134-35; Lee, *Holy Spirit Movement*, pp.37-38.
- <sup>12</sup> Jay Beaman, *Pentecostal Pacifism* (Hillsboro, Kansas: Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies, 1989), pp.4-15, 38-41; Paul Alexander, *Peace to War: Shifting Allegiances in the Assemblies of God* (Telford, Pennsylvania: Cascadia, 2009), pp.97-103.
- <sup>13</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 200 (4 Aug 1917), p.6.
- <sup>14</sup> Glen H. Stassen & David P. Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2003), p.168.
- <sup>15</sup> *Latter Rain Evangel* 4:7 (Apr 1912), p.15.
- <sup>16</sup> *Latter Rain Evangel* 6:12 (Sept 1914), p.13.
- <sup>17</sup> *Word & Work* 36:9 (Sept 1914), p.262; *Conf* 7:9 (Sept 1914), p.163; 7:11 (Nov 1914), pp.203-8.
- <sup>18</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 187 (28 Apr 1917), pp.5, 7.
- <sup>19</sup> Moorhead, *Missionary Pioneering*, p.91.
- <sup>20</sup> James Robinson, *Pentecostal Origins: Early Pentecostalism in Ireland in the Context of the British Isles* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2005), pp.49-67.
- <sup>21</sup> Arthur S. Booth-Clibborn, *Blood Against Blood* (New York: Charles C. Cook, n.d.), p.14.
- <sup>22</sup> Booth-Clibborn, *Blood Against Blood*, pp.44-54, 147-48.
- <sup>23</sup> *Conf* 8:1 (Jan 1915), p.6; *Word & Witness* 12:7 (July 1915), p.8; *Latter Rain Evangel* 8:8 (May 1916), p.24.
- <sup>24</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 95 (19 June 1915), p.1.
- <sup>25</sup> Alexander, *Peace to War*, pp.103-06.
- <sup>26</sup> *Word & Witness* 12:6 (June 1915), p.5; *Word & Work* 37:11 (Nov 1915), pp.300-1; 37:12 (Dec 1915), pp.332-3; 38:15 (Aug 1916), pp.296-7; *Weekly Evangel* 93 (5 June 1915), p.3; 98 (10 July 1915), p.3; 102 (7 Aug 1915), p.1; Bartleman, *Azusa Street*, p.159.
- <sup>27</sup> *Word & Work* 38:15 (Aug 1916), pp.296
- <sup>28</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 140 (20 May 1916), p.13.
- <sup>29</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 107 (11 September 1915), p.3.
- <sup>30</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 95 (19 June 1915), p.1.
- <sup>31</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 190 (19 May 1917), p.8; "Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God", 1920, p.31; 1921, pp.35-6; 1923, pp.43-4; "Constitution and By-Laws of the General Council of the Assemblies of God", 1939, p.42; Beaman, *Pentecostal Pacifism*, p.25; Alexander, *Peace to War*, p.228.
- <sup>32</sup> *Apostolic Evangel* (Apr 1917), p.16; *Confidence* 10:3 (May-June 1917), p.39.
- <sup>33</sup> *Word & Work* 39:38 (Nov 1917), pp.633-4.
- <sup>34</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 175 (3 Feb 1917), p.9.
- <sup>35</sup> Letter, T.H. Mundell to W.J. Boyd, 21 Oct 1916
- <sup>36</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 199 (21 July 1917), p.12.
- <sup>37</sup> *Weekly Evangel* 200 (4 Aug 1917), p.6.
- <sup>38</sup> Letter, T.H. Mundell to the Swifts, 17 July 1915.

---

<sup>39</sup> *Confidence* 7:9 (Sept 1914), p.163; 7:11 (Nov 1914), pp.203-8; 8:1 (Jan 1915), p.5.

<sup>40</sup> Letter, T.H. Mundell to A. Swift, 28 May 1918.

<sup>41</sup> Alexander, *Peace to War*, pp.157-67.

<sup>42</sup> Alexander, *Peace to War*, pp.177-241.

<sup>43</sup> Alexander, *Peace to War*, p.237.

<sup>44</sup> Alexander, *Peace to War*, pp.254-84.

<sup>45</sup> Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Development Worldwide* (Peabody, Massachusetts, 1997), p.189.

<sup>46</sup> Murray W. Dempster, "Reassessing the Moral Rhetoric of Early American Pentecostal Pacifism", *Crux* 26:1 (March 1990), 23-36, cited in Alexander, *Peace to War*, pp.314-17.

<sup>47</sup> Dempster, "Reassessing the Moral Rhetoric", p.33.

<sup>48</sup> J. Denny Weaver, "Series Editor's Foreword", in Alexander, *From Peace to War*, p.18.

<sup>49</sup> Stassen & Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics*, pp.169-74.