

WHY I AM A PACIFIST:
A CHRISTIAN RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE

Alhamdul A. Maigida

ABSTRACT

This essay explores the pragmatic pacifism approach to conflict resolution and its biblical standard. The essay argues that pacifism is not passivism and should be addressed as passivism. It explores the misinterpretation of the term pacifism for passivism. The essay notes the issue of violence from the Old Testament and How God strategically used a pacifistic approach to handle it. Lastly, the essay explores the New Testament and the teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ on pacifism as a right response to violence. Therefore, if Christ is our paradigm then the study summated Christ as a pacifist and promotes pacifism but definitely not passivism as a response to violence.

Key words: Passivism, Pacifism, Violence, OT, NT

INTRODUCTION

We are living in the world of war and crises. It is the world of offenders. Therefore, Violence and reaction toward violence are inevitable. The crises all over the world are signs that we do not understand ourselves and I doubt if we shall understand ourselves talk of our religions and their teachings. Crises are bound to come into our lives. A lot of churches, companies

and organizations have been pulling down because of violence. Our responses toward violence are too weak to settle violence in our societies. I ask, what can be done? It is a question for reflection. Scholars and pastors reflected in different ways; some of them out emotion insisted that violence with violence is the way-out, to the pacifist, being passive to violence is the way-out but to the nonviolent people, peaceful confrontation and love is the way-out. It is easy to form a strategy to handle violence. It is very easy to hold into a position of pacifist and be more spiritual than Christ or to also hold into the position of nonviolence and be like Christ but mostly in the midst of violence we are always those who use violence for violence as a means of violent resolution. Notwithstanding, Pacifism is the position taught by Christ and the apostles.

Scholars saw the need of forming organization for violence intervention and prevention. It is obvious that the first organization that was formed to handle violence in all ramifications is Christian Peacemaker Teams (CTP). The CTPers tried to let people from all aspect of life to come and join them to intervene and prevent violence. So the organization of CTP are doing their best but does not mean they are the best and their methods. Their mission is for Christians all over the world to use nonviolence direct action in the situation of violence and conflicts and if possible surrender their lives by dying in thousand to end war and violence once and for all. It is should have occur in their senses that ending violence once and for all can only be possible in the grave which is not actually the purpose and the focus of this paper. The paper's aim is to convince Christians that Christ Jesus is neither used nor taught violent to violent strategies nor passive to passive strategy of the pacifists, but he used and taught the nonviolent approach. Notwithstanding in Nigeria we only have theoretical pacifists but not practical pacifist.

The method that a Nigerian man is used to in the midst of violence is violent to violent method. It is preferable method to

some Nigerians whenever they are facing religious crises, economic crises, or political crises. That is the reason we do not settle our cases in Nigeria because the method is very wrong and unreliable for genuine peaceful resolution. Nigeria consists of 150 million people both Muslims and Christians. The violence around the country pieced our peaceful co-existence. The following are the popular unavoidable violence that have affected Nigerians: The February 2000 anti-Sharia crisis in Kaduna, the religious riots in 2001 and 2004 in Bauchi State, the dispute over a perceived insult to Islam during a beauty pageant in 2002, the riots over Danish cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed in 2006, and the August 2009 Boko Haram onslaught which led to major mayhem in the Northern parts of the country are all disturbing signs of this situation.¹ It is the consequences of the violence all over Nigeria that , pushed the Federal Government of Nigeria and some non-organization to look for a way of resolving the conflicts with some inter-religious organizations and some Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have set up various institutions to deal with ethno-religious conflicts in the country.² However, to be franked with the situation, the organization is more of business now then conflict resolution because it has hardly had any positive result in the pass years of religious violence. Therefore, as Christians we ought to be the providers of solution to the religious violence through following the teachings and the step of our lord Jesus Christ. And the question is, how do we response to violence as Christians? All the grammar of this paper gears through arriving at a successful method that is the ideal methods Christian ought to use to handle violence. So for the purposes of this research it is assumed that pacifism is about these convictions:

¹ Mashood Omotosho, "Managing Religious Conflicts in Nigeria: The Inter-Religious Mediation Peace Strategy," *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2(2014), 133 – 151.

² Omotosho, "Managing Religious Conflicts in Nigeria," 133.

1. War is wrong for whatever reason to resolve conflict
2. We must prevent all means and processes
3. Passivism is not Pacifism and Pacifism is not Passivism
4. Pacifism only hates violence for violence principles of handling conflicts
5. Old Testament works toward pacifism
6. New Testament teaches pacifism
7. Christian ought to be pacifist, if we can handle violence in all ramifications

It is the essence of the research to explore the following in the space of the paper below and see how I can justify my argument that we should all be feminist with the biblical evidence especially through the exploration of Jesus' teachings to his disciples in the midst of violence. Violence is not something we want but something that define our fallen nature as human being in the fallen world. We must understand and see the oppressors of violence as those who are in need of grace instead of wrath or violent action from us; it is never the teaching of the scriptures not to be pacifists. It is a call which we must all receive. Anyone who is insisting otherwise should be able to gripe what pacifism entitles.

PACIFISM IS NOT PASSIVISM

Those who misunderstood always insisted that Pacifism is evil.³ It is a fundamental evil more than violence itself.

³ Violence is wrong and wrong response to violence is wrong to but using force or violence for violence is very wrong. Jan Narveson asserts, "The pacifist goes a very long step further. His belief is not only that violence is evil but also that it is morally wrong to use force to resist, punish, or prevent violence. This further step makes pacifism a radical moral doctrine... It is unnecessary to be a pacifist merely in order to deny the moral soundness of the principle, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." We need a clarification, then, from the pacifist as to just how far he is and is not willing to go. But this need should already make us

Pacifism does not eradicate evil. It is an act of irresponsibility for someone to be pacifist. The call for pacifism denies the rights of the oppressed to resist oppression and thus functions as part of the apparatus of domination. The decidedly pacifists reject violence in all forms of it which many people have subscribe to it. Among this kind of pacifistic mentality requires their brothers to live forces because of the reality of engaging in violence to settle peace. The foregoing should lay to rest Narveson's characterization that the pacifist's "belief is not only that violence is evil but that it is morally wrong to resist, punish, or prevent violence."⁴ Those statements above about pacifism does not give us an understanding of Pacifism. Pacifism is anti-violence but not anti-action.

There is a gap between the two. Passivism is folding of hands to watch everything without any action. It is an opposite of activism. That is passivism. You remain passive in the presence of situational challenges including violence. I think, those who remain silence during violence are passivists not pacifists. Pacifism is not folding of hands without taking

pause, for surely the pacifist cannot draw these lines in a merely arbitrary manner....hich the non-pacifist does not need to take any particular position. Consequently, a genuine pacifist cannot merely say that we may, if we wish, prefer not to resist violence with force. Nor can he merely say that there is something admirable or saintly about not doing so, for, as pointed out above, the non-pacifist could perfectly well agree with that. " Jan Narveson, "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis," *Ethics*, Vol.75. No. 4 (1965): 259-271. Jan Narveson, "is Pacifism Consistent?," *Ethics*, vol. 78, no. 2 (1968), 148. Many have been Misled by etymological similarities, many people identify pacifism with passivity; they think that to be against military means of defense is to be against any form of defense. But a moment's reflection will show that many of those whose names have been most closely connected with pacifistic means in recent years—gandhi, A. J. Muste, Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, Danilo Dolci—can hardly be said to have been passive in the face of those whom they have opposed. The choice before us, then, need not be between resistance and capitulation; rather it may well be between continued reliance on traditional military means of defense and reliance on nonmilitary means of defense. Daniel Diederich Farmer, "Pacifism Without Right and Wrong" *Public Affairs Quarterly* Vol. 25. No.1 (2011): 37-53.

⁴ 5 Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Robert The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr* (New Haven: Yale University Press, . 1986), 104.

action but make sure your action does not involve violence. It is the stand of pacifism that we should take every kind of action except violence that may result to violence itself. Pacifists believe that nothing good comes out of violence of any kind for any reason. We can talk against evil as Christians and preach against evil, but we should not energize people to involve into violence with our sermons. It is totally against the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ to give violent sermons on the pulpit for whatsoever reason. And stand against any form of violence with love and care to persuade the perpetrators to change not to fight the perpetrators to become more of enemies.

Pacifism insisted that violence is wrong and always wrong in response to violence. They insisted of taking the Jesus' statement literary and plainly; the passage such as the sermon on the mount, with its unavoidable injunction "not to resist an evil person" and to humbly and foolishly "turn the other cheek" (Matt. 5:38-39), so these passages built the ideology and philosophy of the Christian pacifist toward their response to violence. It is to some scholars not a single positional response to violence, but it is a constellation of positions that have to do with resisting the use of violence by all means.⁵ It is true that many pacifists believe that they have been misinterpreted and misunderstood. There are those who argued that it is erroneous to conflate pacifism with passivism. It is the argument of the day; it is a form of passivism, or it is remain its own distinctive form without any iota of passivism. Many take pacifism as a form of believe that someone does not need to do any action whenever war is going on. We should just fold our hands and watch the evilness of human heart through committing the evil of silence and

⁵ John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), 54.

nonresistance to violence. so we should stand idly as perpetrators of evil are perpetrating evil. ⁶

There are scholars who believe that pacifism⁷ is not passivism. They are not passivists but pacifists. It is the argument of Yoder and other pacifists that the only exceptional response to violence is the use of violence. The pacifists resisted the use of war to resolve violence not like the just war theories who agree absolutely about the use of war to handle and settle violence. They argued that violence in response to violence should not be justified for whatsoever reason.⁸ However, the position of the pacifist's worth asking the question, whether the early church fathers were pacifists? Many for sure believe and are convince that our early church fathers were pacifists. They did not justify violence nether did they contribute for the expansion of violence because of the violence they were facing prior to 200 BCE. Most of the early church fathers were martyred for their refusal to take up arm and fight for their safety. Their unwillingness to use violence to settle violence against them put them in the serious suffering and disaster.

We must know that they (early church fathers) remained pacifists for a long period of time before the Church was interwoven with the state during the period of Constantine. It is the period of disaster to the body of Christ because of the misconception and definition about the state and the church and they deployed violence in defense for the church. At that

⁶ Joel B. Green (G.ed.), *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group, 2011), 573.

⁷ "Virtue pacifism shares with utilitarian pacifism the conviction that violence is in itself undesirable and that it tends to breed more violence.¹⁷ Therefore it regards the ability of an agent to defuse volatile situations as an excellence of character. Peaceableness, in other words, is an interpersonal and political virtue. This type of excellence requires for its adequate characterization that we acknowledge (1) the central role of narrative in guiding human behavior, and (2) the judgment involved in mapping a particular experience onto the descriptive and prescriptive narrative best suited to it. let me say a bit more about each point."
Daniel Diederich Farmer, "Pacifism: Without Right and Wrong," 37-53.

⁸ Green (G.ed.), *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, 573.

period of time, their leaders were not pacifists but more of just-war fighters because they saw justified reasons for their defense of the state in the name of Christianity. It is a debatable issue whether they were changed because of their access to power or their betrayal of Christ's teaching that we should be peacemakers and war-makers and I add that we should be friendly and not beasts; love and value a human being with dignity and honor and do not hate and dehumanize any human being without seeing his dignity and honor as a human even with his or her act of dehumanization.⁹

Some the principles of Pacifism are¹⁰:

1. Pacifism does not mean passivity. The term "non-resistance" is seldom found in its vocabulary. It is essentially active, positive, outreaching. It seeks to make peace rather than to preserve peace. Pacifism does not renounce physical force.
2. Pacifism is not in any way identical with the "comfortable isolation" kind of peace. The get-away-from-the-rest-and-let-them-fight-it-out-among-themselves brand of peace is almost, if not quite, as bad as war. That might have been justifiable for our nation in its infancy; it is not now. The pacifists do not advocate any such peace policy as that. Their motive is not safety but service.
3. Pacifism does not deny that there are noble virtues and achievements that attach to war, nor does it condemn those who have "nobly fought and died "

⁹ Green (G.ed.), *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, 573; Jarvis Thomson, "self-Defense," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, vol. 20, no. 4 (1991), 283–310; Terry Dobson, "The Art of Reconciliation," in *What Would You Do? A Serious Answer to a Standard Question*, ed. John Howard Yoder, expanded edition (scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992), 104–107.

¹⁰ John Wright Buckham, "The Principles Of Pacifism," *The American Journal of Theology*. Vol. 1, No. 1 (1920): 88-89; Tom Regan, "A Defense of Pacifism," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 2, no. 1 (1972), 73–86; 74.

in the past. It recognizes the law of moral development by which humanity comes progressively to recognize social evils and one by one to slough them off in spite of the incidental benefits that cling to them. Pacifism believes that war has become criminal and that to continue its reign is obscurantism and folly. Whatever glamor invested war in past generations has now vanished.

4. Pacifism holds that the way to peace is along the road of peace, not that of war. To be concerned only for our "rights " and our "defenses" when a bleeding and insane world is in need of a steady brain and a friendly arm is neither Christian nor human.

Pacifism can also be used to portray an obligation to nonviolence in society and one's personal life that might include the attempt to cultivate pacific virtues such as tolerance, patience, mercy, forgiveness and love especially in the body of Christ. It is our duty to see pacifism as a Christian style of life.

OLD TESTAMENT AND PACIFISM

However, the pacifists find it difficult to relate their positions with the Old Testament. The Old Testament is a book that even God seems to be one of the perpetrators of violence and at the same time support the issue of violence to violence mentality. It is very hard to justify that God call us to the act of nonviolence because even God himself did not act nonviolently when responding to violence in the Old Testament. He is guilty but who am I to tell you that he is guilty because he defines what is guilty. It seems whatever God does is right and whatever man does contrary to God's permission he is wrong irrespective of the deeds.

There are scholars who are defending the position of God and even argue that his actions and permission of violence do not make him look contrary to the position of pacifists. God hates

violent response to violent action and so in the Old Testament God does make sure his servants are being careful when it comes to violence.¹¹ Most of the pacifists' translation of Gen. 10:9-20 which is an embodied the character of a violent person in the name of Nimrod that he was a mighty warrior before the lord. However the pacifists' translation is that "Nimrod was a violent man, whom God kept a close eye. It is obvious that God does not look at Nimrod with favor because he was mighty warrior, but God looks at Nimrod with an extra close watch because he appeals to violence so easily. Notwithstanding, another problematic passage of the bible is eye for eye and tooth for tooth, hand for hand, leg for leg injunction" (Exodus 21:23-25). Reading the passage it is an opportunity for someone to have insisted in concluding that the passage permits violence for violence as a way out of violence. The context of the text cannot be isolated. At that time people do pay evil with the greater evil. In fact, if you removed a person's eye at that time and context whenever the person comes to pay back, he will not only remove your eyes but the eyes of your entire family or clan. So it is a confrontation of paying evil with the much greater evil at that time. It is a warning here that God is given that they should not practice greater evil if they must pay the evil done to them. They should do exactly to the person without adding more evil to the evil.¹²

God was limiting his children's perspectives in the Old Testament about violence both in the two passages above and the other passages of the Old Testament. That is why both in the prophets and the kings God told the people that they can go to war only with his permission. And the issue of God's permission is a progressive move from violence embodiment. That is why we do have late Isaiah and the image of the

¹¹ Green (G.ed.), *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, 574.

¹² Green (G.ed.), *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, 574.

suffering servant in Isaiah 53.¹³ Overcoming evil with suffering is a submission of God in the Old Testament for us all to learn. And some pacifists persist that following the context of the Old Testament text, it obvious that God is gradually moving his people away from every form of violence till the very time of Christ. The pacifistic view of the Old Testament is that God progressively weans his children away from the use of violence to the point that they can see in the model of Jesus one who shows to us what it means to overcome evil with suffering not with violence. It is the significance of the Cross itself. ¹⁴

NEW TESTAMENT AND PACIFISM

This is where Christian pacifists built their philosophical, ideological, and biblical response to violence. The statements of Jesus are their backbones. I am happy that as a pacifist, a lot misunderstood our interpretation of Jesus statement and other biblical passages. The pacifism is not foolishness and not also about being too wise to the worldly standard because often as a Christian, our biblical decisions mostly do not make scientific science to the follows of the God of scientific enquiry. We must critically look at what it means to conduct oneself in this world of violence and without being guilty of violence as followers of Christ.

It is Paul who was a pacifist asserted in Romans 12:17, 19-21 that “Do not repay anyone evil for evil. Be careful to do what is right in the eyes everybody. Don’t take revenge, my friends, but live room for God’s wrath, for it is written: “it is mine to revenge; I will repay,” says the Lord. On the contrary: “if your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. In doing this, you will he ap burning coals on his

¹³ Sunday Bobai Agang, *No More Cheeks To Turn?* (Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers, 2017),35

¹⁴ Agang, *No More Cheeks To Turn?*47.

head. Do not be overcome by evil but overcome evil with good.” Additionally, Yusuf John Gajere & Yako Ibrahim Handan added that “in returning evil for evil, or good for good is the way most people live. But Christian must live on the higher level and return good for evil.”¹⁵ It is not a Christian teaching to return evil for evil. The response of Christian is more to make an enemy a friend than an enemy. We are ought to response in such a way that the enemy will be draw closer to the cross not to be sent far away from the cross. Jesus and Paul non-violently challenged social and political injustices throughout their ministries, and encouraged peace-making rather than retaliation. That is why blessed are the peace-makers (Matt. 5:9). Jesus told peter when he was asked that “he should forgive those who offended him not seven times but seventy –seven times” (Matt. 18:22).¹⁶ I convince that Jesus was indirectly telling peter every time you ought to forgive your offenders or oppressors. Jesus knew that we always have to forgive because in every area it will affect our lives and the lives of our enemies negatively.

Jesus Christ has been misunderstood for centuries by scholars and readers of the Bible. We have misquoted him and misrepresented him during conflict resolution in the name of pacifism. His arguments and perspectives have been misled and been considered as impractical idealism.¹⁷ Mostly some of our views are counterproductive about Jesus’ teachings on violence. Jesus never taught his disciples to remain passive to violence, but he taught them the non-violence approach. Scholars who working to handle violence have misunderstood Christ in Mt 5, 38-41. For many of the evangelical Christians, the turning of the other cheek means letting your enemy to slap you for several times without any nonviolence action to

¹⁵ Yusuf John Gajere & Yako Ibrahim Handan, “Forgiveness: A Veracity For the Nigerian Christians’ Response to Violence, “*Kagoro Journal of Theology (KAJOT)* . vol 3. No1 (2019): 53.

¹⁶ Agang, *No More Cheeks To Turn?*47.

¹⁷ Walter Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence: A Third Way* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press,2013), 16

stop the foolishness. Such misinterpretation makes a person to look holier than the Jesus Christ himself. Jesus is challenging his listeners to have positive response or attitude toward personal injustice and abuse. Even due Jesus is talking about personal injury not a public injury but still a pacifistic perspective. Jesus here is teaching the oppressed a new perspective in handling violence against them.

Contextually, the teaching of Jesus here is very clear because for someone to slap you at the right, he or she can only be possible with a backhand. Turn the other cheek. The saying specifically refers to a blow that is dealt on the right cheek. Wink asserts, "The only way one could strike the right cheek with the right hand would be with the back of the right hand. What we are dealing with here is unmistakably an insult, not a fistfight. The intention is not to injure but to humiliate to put someone in his or her "place."¹⁸ For Wink, the placement of the strike is significant. According to him, a strike on the right cheek means that the blow must have been delivered with the back of the right hand (i.e. a backhand slap). The backhanding of a person then, is to remind an individual his or her position. It is the way masters humiliate servants, or husbands their wives, or parents their children. The purpose of backhanding is not injury but reminding an underling of his or her place. It is not a sign of foolish submission and foolish inaction from the oppressed. It is the opposite when turning another cheek. As asserted:

Logistically, it is now impossible to repeat the backhand (this must be physically acted out to see the problem), and a blow by the fist would establish the equality of both parties--the last thing any of these strikers wishes to achieve. The subordinate is saying, in effect: you cannot humiliate me any longer, I am a human being,

¹⁸ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 17.

just like you; you may have me flogged, but you cannot demean me.¹⁹

So it is never a way of passivism but passivism in the presence of violence to turn another cheek for a slap. Wink posits it better when he says,

But the whole point of the back of the hand is to reinforce the caste system and its institutionalized inequality. Even if he orders the person flogged, the point has been irrevocably made. The oppressor has been forced, against his will, to regard this subordinate as an equal human being. The powerful person has been stripped of his power to dehumanize the other. This response, far from admonishing passivity and cowardice, is an act of defiance.²⁰

Turning of the other cheek does not mean foolishness but comprehensiveness. It does not connote passiveness. That is

C. S. Lewis in his essay “why I Am Not a Pacifist,” he considers Jesus’ injunction concerning “turning the other cheek,” which he believes cannot be intended to rule out protecting others. Does anyone suppose,” he asks, “ that our lord hearers understood him to mean that if a homicidal maniac, attempting to murder a third party, tried to knock me out of the way, I must stand aside and let him get his victims?”²¹ Therefore, to Lewis Jesus’ audience consisted of “private people in a disarmed nation,” and “war was not what they would have been thinking of” by any stretch of the imagination. ²²The audience is not an issue but the approach and he never meant that we should be passivists but we

¹⁹ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 16.

²⁰ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 16.

²¹ C. S. Lewis, “Why I Am Not a Pacifist,” in *the weight of glory and other addresses*, rev.ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 2001), 86.

²² Lewis, “Why I Am Not a Pacifist,” 50,

should remain nonviolence. It is very glaring that Lewis misunderstood Pacifists too. He also thinks Pacifists are against the teachings of the scriptures. Jesus does not teach the masses to passively accept their social degradation. Nor does Jesus endorse any sort of violent revolution. Rather, he calls for a “third way:” “active nonviolent resistance.”²³ It is the “third third way of Walter Wink that the pacifists are talking about. The way of absolute non-violence is where you embrace war with peace and look so foolish to the standard of this world. It is the evil of retaliation; we are talking about as pacifists. Sungay Agang asserted, “But we should also note that not to retaliating is not the same thing as being completely inactive or passive when under attack.....jesus is not asking us to be passive when we face violence. We can take action but not violent action. That should left in God’s hands.”²⁴ The passivity is not biblical but foolishness of our irresponsibility and it is not the teaching or philosophy of pacifism.

There is another issue that is similar to the ideology of “turning the other cheek” which is the Pauline assertion in Romans 5:38-4, “You have heard that it was said, “An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.” But I say to you, Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; and if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well; and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile.” Many thought that paul was agitating about foolish submission and passivism. They insist on the mentality of quoting the bible without adequate comprehension. The word that connotes “resist not evil” is *antistenai* and some scholars imagine the KJV version as rendering more than just a translation from Greek to English but also a translation of worldview, from nonviolence resistance to docility.²⁵ Therefore, this page is within we

²³ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 16.

²⁴ Sunday Bobai Agang, *No More Cheeks To Turn* ?,30.

²⁵ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 11.

should flight or fight. Jesus is not proposing fighting that will lead to war and was not proposing flirting that will lead to foolishness and irresponsibility. So Wink proposed the third alternative of interpreting the verse. And the third alternative, is that we should resist but not with violence. Jesus is proposing the pacifism kind of resistance toward evil. The Greek word *anti*, a word still used in English for "against," and *histemi*, a verb that in its noun form (stasis) means violent rebellion, armed revolt, sharp dissent. Whereas it is preferable to be translated and should be translated as "Don't strike back at evil (or, one who has done you evil) in kind."²⁶ "Do not retaliate against violence with violence." The Scholars Version is brilliant: "Don't react violently against the one who is evil."²⁷ It is using the same violent method to respond to violence that Jesus is against and that is why he taught us to be wise as serpent but humble like Dove.

CONCLUSION

Pacifism preserves our Christian dignity and respect in responding to violence. It helps the oppressor understand the need to have a change heart or an understandable self-evaluation of self. Wink asserts, "even if nonviolent action does not immediately change the heart of the oppressor, it does affect those committed to it."²⁸ There is going to be a reforming world where hatred gives way to love and violence gives way to peace. The creativeness of our response ought not to go beyond the box of pacifism to achieve a positive result for our good and the good of the world itself. The biblical teachings give no room for any response beyond pacifism. Jesus theologically teaches his disciples the humanness of their oppressors in the worldview of God. Agang "The oppressed are victims of violence, the perpetrators of violence are also captives of violence. Both groups desperately need deliverance.

²⁶ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 11.

²⁷ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 11.

²⁸ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 26.

So the good news Jesus brings concerns the oppressed and the oppressors.”²⁹

There is a need of reconsidering our response for effective transformation of both oppressor and the oppressed. Remain passive is evil and responding with violence is evil too. therefore, we must balance the two. We must not flight and must not fight. We must stand and confront the oppressor with love and peace. Wink observes that,

I was hiding behind the Christian "injunction" to "turn the other cheek," rather than asking, "What is the most creative, transformative response to this situation?" Perhaps I had done the right thing for the wrong reason, but I suspect that creative nonviolence can never be a genuinely moral response unless we are capable of first entertaining the possibility of violence and consciously saying "No." Otherwise our nonviolence may actually be a mask for cowardice, as it most certainly was for me.³⁰

However, we are not encouraged to do otherwise from the pacifistic teachings of our lord and savior Jesus Christ. The nature of peace is the NT pacifistic mentality that call us to love and not to hate to save and not to kill and to preserve lives and not to damage those lives with the mentality that at the end, God's grace through our Lord Jesus Christ will be availed to them to see how much they need Christ and hunger for love and transformative heart instead of war and violence. It is dangerous and disastrous to go with the mentality of violence for violence and the same time, it is foolishness to go with a mentality of passivism. We should neither flirt nor fight but we should confront violence in love and prayers.

²⁹ Agang, *No More Cheeks To Turn*,36.

³⁰ Wink, *Jesus and Nonviolence*, 36.

Sources

- Agang, Sunday Bobai. *No More Cheeks To Turn*. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers, 2017.
- Buckham, John Wright. "The Principles Of Pacifism," *The American Journal of Theology*. Vol. 1, No. 1 (1920): 88-89.
- Dobson, Terry. "The Art of Reconciliation," in *What Would You Do? A Serious Answer to a Standard Question*, ed. John Howard Yoder, expanded edition. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992.
- Farmer, Daniel Diederich. "Pacifism Without Right and Wrong" *Public Affairs Quarterly* Vol. 25. No.1 (2011): 37-53.
- Gajere, Yusuf John. & Handan, Yako Ibrahim. "Forgiveness: A Veracity For the Nigerian Christians' Response to Violence," *Kagoro Journal of Theology (KAJOT)* . vol 3. No1 (2019): 46-53.'
- Green, Joel B. (G.ed)., *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group, 2011.
- Lewis, C. S. "Why I Am Not a Pacifist," in *the weight of glory and other addresses*, rev.ed. New York: HarperCollins, 2001.
- Narveson, Jan. "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis," *Ethics*, Vol.75. No. 4 (1965): 259-271.'
- _____, Jan "is Pacifism Consistent?," *Ethics*, vol. 78, no. 2 (1968), 141- 148.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Omosho, Mashood. "Managing Religious Conflicts in Nigeria: The Inter-Religious Mediation Peace Strategy," *Africa Development*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2(2014), 133 – 155.
- Regan, Tom. "A Defense of Pacifism," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 2, no. 1 (1972):73–86; 74.
- Thomson, Jarvis. "Self-Defense," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, vol. 20, no. 4 (1991): 283–310.
- Wink, Walter. *Jesus and Nonviolence: A Third Way*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972.