

Martial Arts and Christianity – What the Bible Really Says!

Scripture out of context is always Scripture out of context
A little Leven? Is it ok?

[History of Martial Arts](#)

[The Recurring Theme](#)

[Zen](#)

[Buddhism](#)

[Christian Argument for Martial Arts](#)

[Biblical Viewpoint in Perspective and Context](#)

[Bowing](#)

[Meditation](#)

[Religious Influences](#)

[Training the Body](#)

[The Power](#)

[Fighting in the Bible](#)

[Military Training](#)

[Military Institutions of the Romans](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[References](#)

Written By:

Max Debono-De-Laurentis

8th June 2006

This is a divisive and often confusing topic amongst Christians. Many Christian families unwittingly send their children to martial arts classes unaware of its background and teachings.

There are those that claim Christianity and martial arts are compatible, even claiming that it is biblical. Then there are the Christians who claim it is anti-biblical and therefore anti-Christian in practice.

In this article we will look at both arguments, looking at both the logic and scriptures used in both camps, and then we will see what the Word of God says.

As for this author the final authority on this matter must be God's word – in context – with a willingness to accept God at His word, and change if we are wrong. I personally practiced martial arts for 17 years using several styles. Though this article is not about me, I am putting this bit of information in so that it clear the author has some knowledge of the topic. I no longer practice.

For most people the first introduction they have to the Martial Arts is Television or Cinema. Who hasn't heard of Bruce Lee? Martial Art expert extraordinaire and, important to note, a follower of the Buddhist way of life. We also have the now famous Steven Seagal who packs in the audiences with his films such as, Under Siege and Submerged. To watch any Steven Seagal film is to be bombarded by Buddhist teaching as he is a Buddhist and promotes it openly in his films.

There are 2 types of martial art:

One type, called "internal" or "soft" martial art, focuses on inner spiritual development, balance, form, and mental awareness. This soft art emphasizes two principles -- that the mind dictates action and that the opponent's own force is used to defeat him or her. Students are taught Taoist and Buddhist philosophical principles such as the "chi" force and the "yin and yang" concept. Through breath control, soft art practitioners seek to "collect, cultivate, and store" this chi force which is located in the body. Some believe they can use the chi force to strike down opponents from a distance. Examples of internal or soft martial arts include the Chinese Tai-chi Chuan and the Japanese Aikido.

The second category of martial arts is called the "external" or "hard" art. This type teaches that physical reactions precede mental reaction. It also promotes the idea that an opponent's force should be met with an equal but opposite force. While the hard martial art system also uses breath control like the soft arts, the emphasis is on developing strength and quickness through the use of straight and linear body motions. The hard arts include certain forms of Chinese kung fu, and Shao Lin boxing. The Japanese arts were adapted from Chinese kung fu. The hard arts include Ju-jitsu, Judo, Karate, Ninjitsu, and Kendo. The Korean martial arts include Tae Kwon Do and Tang Soo Do.

History of the Arts

There are many styles of martial arts, but they all stem from 5 main sources today.

[China](#)

[Japan](#)

[Korea](#)

[Africa](#)

[India](#)

Let's look at a brief history of each:

Capoeira (Africa – Brazil)

A study done in March 2000 gives an outline to this martial art: (Full article [here](#)¹)

A summary of History, Ethnomusicology & acquired Afrocentric-Brazilian Philosophies research regarding Capoeira !

by ethnomusicology researcher, Karen Taborn

special thanks to: Prof. Eduardo Ferreira

Fundação Cultural do Estado da Bahia

Biblioteca Municipal de São Paulo

March 22, 2000

The Brazilian martial arts-dance form of Capoeira is inherently African in its underlying philosophies. These philosophies are taught through song/text performed in the practice of Capoeira; through the mythological histories of the developmental roots of the art form; through lessons and stories that address the Afro-Brazilian experience both historically and in the present; and through lessons and stories that celebrate the tenacity and cleverness of the Afro-Brazilian to endure in spite of slavery, poverty, and racism. In the mid-1970s, when the practice of Capoeira began to attract students outside of Brazil and in particular in New York City, it broadened its practitioners to a multicultural, multiracial base. The hypothesis of this study is that through the practice of Capoeira and through exposure to Capoeira's underlying afrocentric philosophies, students have altered their perspectives of race, acquiring afrocentric philosophies themselves. In this study student's participate in a written survey to discern the alterations in their perspectives on race as result of their study of Capoeira.

Summation:

After completing this research of "A Philosophies in New York City Students through the Study of Capoeira", my original hypothesis as stated in my research proposal has been altered. My original hypothesis stated that "through the practice of Capoeira and through exposure to Capoeira's underlying Afrocentric philosophies, students have altered their perspectives of race, acquiring Afrocentric philosophies themselves". My now altered hypothesis is that students use the songs, histories and stories taught through Capoeira to broaden and deepen their *own philosophies* (emphasis added) in life, in particular to foster a sense of personal and mutual respect amongst themselves.

This is the statement of philosophy of the club used in the study: (can be found [here](#)²)

Their Stated PHILOSOPHY

Raízes do Brasil Capoeira - New York

The group Raízes do Brasil (Roots of Brazil) has its own philosophy. Our philosophy is to contribute for the formation of ethnic human values, based on respect, socialization and freedom. We try to inspire our capoeiristas (capoeira's students) to have a better vision of the capoeira Universe, focusing in the awareness of the following aspects:

Social Integration

Appreciation of Brazilian Culture

Positive Attitude

Protect nature and the environment

We are a community service organization that promotes positive values through programs that build spirit, mind and body, welcoming all people regardless of age, race, gender or athletic experience!

It would appear that throughout this discipline the belief system of the practitioners is fluid, but always leads to promotion of your own or Afro-Brazilian beliefs.

China

For this complete history please go [here](#)³

The Shaolin Temple is claimed to be the birthplace of the Martial Arts and Zen approach to Buddhism. The original Shaolin temple is located in Mount Song - the central mountain of the "five mountains" of China, near the city of Zhengzhou, Hunan Province. Mount Song is further divided into two mountains: the Taishi and the Shaoshi. The name "Shaolin" was inspired by the lush forest of the Shaoshi Mountain. Another story suggests that the temple

was built on a piece of land that had recently been ravaged by fire, because the builders planted many new trees. The temple was thus named Shaolin ("Shao" meaning "young" or "new", and "Lin" meaning "forest"). This monastery played a prominent role in Chinese history. For many periods, it was considered to be an imperial temple where emperors of the ruling dynasty would ascend to pray on behalf of the people. However, its fame also brought with it many hardships. During periods of unrest, the temple often became a focus for the imperial wrath and retribution. The temple had been destroyed many times only to be rebuilt one again.

Historically, Shaolin monks included some of the best generals, ministers, poets, philosophers, and various famous people. Thus, in Chinese history, the Shaolin Temple was both a focal point and an education centre for some of China's elite. It truly represents an important Chinese cultural landmark. The history of the Shaolin temple is long and controversial, but it is most important to acknowledge its impact on the Chinese population and the Martial Arts.

Please note that shaolin is the birthplace of martial arts in china and it is synonymous with Zen Buddhism.

Japan (article [here](#)⁴)

Japan developed many martial art forms of its own, including sumo wrestling, yawara, judo, ju-jitsu, ken-jitsu, ashikeri, and torite. The Japanese Budokai was a martial arts organization, supported by the government, which promoted these traditional martial arts.

Around a turn-of-the-century, young Okinawans drafted for the Japanese army were found to be in excellent physical condition, no doubt due to the introduction of karate into the high school curriculum. The Japanese army became very interested in karate for its fighting techniques and physical fitness benefits. The Japanese Budokai extended an invitation to the Okinawans to demonstrate the art in Japan. Gichin Funakoshi, a diplomat and scholar as well as karate master, was selected to represent the art, and he traveled to Japan in 1915, accompanied by Kenwa Mabuni. After repeated invitations from the impressed Japanese, Funakoshi returned to Japan in 1922 and spent his remaining years teaching there, founding the Shotokan School. Mabuni also established his own school of Shito-ryu, and eventually Choki Motobu, another prominent karateka, went to Japan and also founded the Sorin-ryu school there.

One of the most important developments in Japan was karate's introduction to the university system by such eminent karateka as Gichin Funakoshi, Shigeru Egami of Shotokai, Hinori Ohtshka, the founder of Wado Ryu, and Masatoshi Nakayama of Shotokan. It was also in building Japan that the practice of kumite, free form sparring developed in the 1930s. The theory, techniques, and principles of the art of the sword and ju-jitsu were also applied to karate by the Japanese. Judo's emphasis on the martial art as a sport also influenced karate in Japan, and karate as a sport became popular in the 1950s. Japan's growing dominance in Asia during the '20s, the '30s and '40s spread karate to Korea, throughout Southeast Asia, and into the Philippines and North China.

America's victory over Japan and the stationing of U.S. troops in the area went to the introduction of karate through servicemen who had studied the art while stationed in Japan, Okinawa or Korea.

Korea (article [here](#)⁵)

Tae Kwon Do is the Korean term for a system of unarmed combat that is virtually identical to Japanese karate, and indeed was influenced in recent times by Japanese karate. The origins of Tae Kwon Do, however, can be traced to ancient Korean history.

Chuan Fa was introduced into northern Korea by Buddhist monks during the 4th century, and evolved into a form called Tae Kyon. The skills eventually spread beyond the temples and were passed on as a system of self-protection. Religious statues from the Silla period (A.D. 668-935) depict karate-like techniques, suggesting a close association between Tae Kyon and religion at the time.

Another group was important to the development of Tae Kwon Do in Korea. They were the Hwa-Rang-Do, and their purpose was to cultivate moral and patriotic ideals among Korean youth. Tae Kyon became part of the official training of the Hwa-Rang-Do, and the melding of these two groups produced a martial art, which stressed magnanimity, sympathy and respect for one's opponent.

In 935 A.D., the Silla kingdom was overthrown by the warlord Kyoghun, who established the kingdom of Koryo, which remained strongly martial in spirit. Many of the soldiers of the period were also students of Tae kyon and art flourished.

In the 15th century, the era of warrior Princes ended and was replaced by the Yi dynasty.

Confucianism replaced Buddhism as the state religion, and Tae Kyon virtually vanished.

When the Japanese overran Korea in 1915, outlawing the practice of Tae Kyon, many students left to live and work in China and Japan. There they were exposed to other forms of karate, and after World War II many Koreans returned to Korea and opened dojangs (karate schools), blending techniques learned in China, Okinawa, and Japan with what was remembered of the old Tae Kyon to form a new system. Eventually in 1955 the name of Tae Kwon Do, suggested by Choi Hong Chi, was adopted by leading masters of the art.

India (article [here](#)⁶)

It is generally accepted the karate had its beginnings in India around 450 A.D. Oral tradition tells us of a wealthy Indian Prince who experimented with slaves by jabbing them with needles to find the weak parts of the body. He also watched animals as they fought. He noticed how, for instance, the Tiger tensed its body before spinning into action and how it used its claws to tear its opponent. He also watched the movements of other animals and adapted them to the human body. Having done this he experimented on the slaves, this time using actual punches and kicks instead of needles discover where and how to strike to achieve the desired effect. According to the legend over 100 slaves were killed in this bizarre experiment.

Unarmed combat was an integral part of early Indian culture. The warrior class named the Kshatriya were the dominant strata in the early Indian society. This group antedates Buddhism and has a direct relationship to at least one early fighting style. The first written evidence of a weaponless fighting art is in the Buddhist scripture called the Lotus Sutra, translated by Fa Hua San Ch'ing in Chinese. It mentions a "pugilistic art" called Hsiang Ch'aHsiang Pu in Chinese which means, "mutual striking". The Lotus Sutra also mentions a fighting art called Nata, which apparently had dance like movements similar to chu'an fa katas. A bare handed martial art called VaJramushti, which was practiced by the Kshatriya warrior class, seems to be the first real karate-like technique. Many early Buddhist statues of Deities such as the *Nio Bodhisattvas seem to be executing karate like strikes and are usually in exact karate stance.* (emphasis added)

The Recurring Theme

Much study can be done on the history of martial arts; I have only given a cursory look at its origins.

Though, as we look at the history of martial arts we see that the theme throughout is always the same; Zen Buddhism.

Let us now to take a look at what Zen Buddhism is, and how its teachings affect the life of the follower. Also what it encourages them to believe.

Zen *(unknown author)*

The essence of Zen is attempting to understand the meaning of life directly, without being misled by logical thought, or language.

Zen often seems paradoxical - it requires an intense discipline which, when practised properly, results in total spontaneity and ultimate freedom. This natural spontaneity should not be confused with impulsiveness.

"Zen" - the word

"Zen" is the way the Chinese word "Ch'an" is pronounced in Japan. "Ch'an" is the Chinese pronunciation of the Sanskrit word "Dhyana", which means (more or less) meditation.

Zen - the essence and the difficulty

Christmas Humphreys, one of the leading pioneers in the history of Buddhism in Britain, wrote that "Zen is a subject extremely easy to misunderstand." He was right.

Zen is something a person does. It's not a concept that can be described in words.

Despite that, we'll use descriptive words to help you get some idea of what Zen is about. But always remember, Zen does not depend on words - you are said to have to experience it in order to "understand" it.

Enlightenment is inside

the essence of Zen Buddhism is that all human beings are Buddha, and that all they have to do is to discover that truth for themselves.

All beings by nature are Buddhas,
as ice by nature is water.
Apart from water there is no ice;
apart from beings, no Buddhas.
Hakuin Ekaku

You who are reading this now are said to be Buddha. You are just to find out the truth of your own true nature...

Zen sends us looking inside us for enlightenment. There's no need to search outside ourselves for the answers; we can find the answers in the same place that we found the questions.

Human beings can't learn this truth by philosophising or rational thought, or by studying scriptures, taking part in worship rites and rituals or many of the other things that people think religious people do.

The first step is to control our minds through meditation and other techniques that involve mind and body; to give up logical thinking and avoid getting trapped in a spider's web of words.

History

Zen Buddhism was brought to China by the Indian monk Bodhidharma in the 6th century CE. It was called Ch'an in China.

Zen's golden age began with the Sixth Patriarch, Hui-neng (638-713), and ended with the persecution of Buddhism in China in the middle of the 9th century CE.

Most of those we think of today as the great Zen masters came from this period.

Zen Buddhism survived the persecution though it was never the same again in China.

Zen spread to Korea in the 7th century CE and to Japan in the 12th century CE.

Zen Buddhism was popularised in the West by the Japanese scholar Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki (1870 - 1966); although it was found in the West before that.

Zen

"A special transmission outside the scriptures
Without reliance on words or letters
Directly pointing to the heart of humanity
Seeing into one's own nature."

Clues to the meaning of Zen

~~Because Zen is so hard to explain we're going to offer you a series of paragraphs that may help you get an idea of it:~~

The essence of Zen Buddhism is achieving enlightenment by seeing one's original mind (or original nature) directly; without the intervention of the intellect.

Zen is big on intuitive understanding, on just "getting it", and not so hot on philosophising.

Zen is concerned with what actually is rather than what we think or feel about what is.

Zen is concerned with things as they are, without trying to interpret them.

Zen points to something before thinking, before all your ideas.

The key to Buddha hood in Zen is simply self-knowledge.

To be a human being is to be a Buddha. Buddha nature is just another name for human nature – true human nature.

Zen is simply to be completely alive.

Zen is short for Zen Buddhism. It is sometimes called a religion and sometimes called a philosophy. Choose whichever term you prefer; it simply doesn't matter.

Zen is not a philosophy or a religion.

Zen tries to free the mind from the slavery of words and the constriction of logic.

Zen in its essence is the art of seeing into the nature of one's own being, and it points the way from bondage to freedom.

Zen is meditation.

Buddhism

Buddhists believe:

Buddhism is a path of practice and spiritual development leading to Insight into the true nature of life. Buddhist practices such as meditation are means of changing oneself in order to develop the qualities of awareness, kindness, and wisdom. The experience developed within the Buddhist tradition over thousands of years has created an incomparable resource for all those who wish to follow a path – a path which ultimately culminates in Enlightenment or Buddha hood.

Because Buddhism does not include the idea of worshipping a creator god, some people do not see it as a religion in the normal, Western sense. The basic tenets of Buddhist teaching are straightforward and practical: nothing is fixed or permanent; actions have consequences; change is possible. Thus Buddhism addresses itself to all people irrespective of race, nationality, or gender. It teaches practical methods (such as meditation) which enable people to realize and utilize its teachings in order to transform their experience, to be fully responsible for their lives and to develop the qualities of Wisdom and Compassion.

There are around 350 million Buddhists and a growing number of them are Westerners. They follow many different forms of Buddhism, but all traditions are characterized by non-violence, lack of dogma, tolerance of differences, and, usually, by the practice of meditation.

Now that we have an overview of the history and beliefs of the martial arts, let's take look at the Christian argument *for* being able to practice it.

The Argument *for* Christians to Practice Martial Arts

The main source of information and scriptural interpretation for this argument is to be found with those associated with the Christian Karate Association. Below is an extract of the apologetics used to support the stance that martial arts are 'ok' for Christians.

Bob Orlando in his article; **Martial Arts and Christian Beliefs are they Incompatible?** ([Article here](#)⁷), argues that scripture does not teach passivism therefore self defence is not only shown to be acceptable but also encouraged. He is the author of two books on the martial arts: *Indonesian Fighting Fundamentals* and *Martial Arts America*

Orlando's argument goes like this:

The idea of turning the other cheek, if not one of the more difficult teachings of Jesus to understand, is certainly one of the more difficult ones to observe -- providing it is to be taken without qualification. From the gospel of Matthew, Chapter 5, verses 38 and 39, we read the following:

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 one who is evil. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.

There are two ways one can interpret the command to turn the other cheek. The first is to interpret the text literally, asserting that it means exactly what it says. That would impose a duty of non-resistance on all men in all circumstances. One cannot, however, require the literal acceptance of verse 38 without also requiring the same of the other verses in that chapter -- such as verses 29 and 30. Verse 29 reads, "... if your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out," and verse 30 adds, "... if your right hand causes you sin, cut it off." Taking these verses literally, without qualification, could quickly lead one to institutionalized confinement! No. This literal, unqualified interpretation seems untenable.

The other way to interpret the text is to say that it means exactly what it says, but with an understood reservation for those cases that everyone would naturally assume to be exceptions. For example, when I tell my children to be good, I do not have to tell them all of what that includes -- i.e., don't burn down the house, don't put the neighbour's car in the lake, and so on. Those things are understood. This is a normal interpretation. C. S. Lewis, a popular Christian theologian, put it like this:

Does anyone suppose that our Lord's 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 victim? I think it impossible that they could have so understood him. I believe the meaning of the words was perfectly clear -- insofar as you are simply an angry man who has been hurt, mortify your anger and do not strike back. If however, your motives are other than egoistic retaliation, then not only are you free to protect yourself and others, rather it is your responsibility to do so.

Can we find any scripture or biblical examples that confirm this? Yes. Look at Jesus' life. Jesus lived what he preached. He never returned evil for evil; he never retaliated (although he possessed the wherewithal to do so), but did he always "turn the other cheek?" In at least one case, he did not.

The 18th chapter of John's gospel records Jesus' arrest and trial before both the Jewish and Roman courts. In verse 22 of that chapter, Jesus is struck with the palm of the hand by one of the officers of the Jewish religious court for answering the high priest in what the officer thought was a disrespectful manner. In verse 23

Jesus responded, "If I have spoken wrongly, bear witness of the wrong; but if rightly, why do you strike Me?"

The officer could have struck him anywhere, but a slap across the face is a common response to disrespectful speech. Assuming that Jesus was slapped across the face, we find no evidence of his voluntarily offering his other cheek for more. On the contrary, he asks why he deserved such unjust treatment.

In the book of Acts, Chapter 16, we find that the apostle Paul took a similar stand. After being beaten and cast into prison unjustly, the Philippian magistrates decided that they would release Paul and his companions and forget the matter. To this Paul responded as follows in verse 37:

They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men who are Roman citizens, and have thrown us into prison; and do they now cast us out secretly? No! Let them come themselves and take us out.

Clearly, Paul accepted no such injustice. This refutes the literal interpretation and supports the normal interpretation. The actions of Jesus and his apostle Paul indicate that there are times when the believer can and should resist evil and not offer the other cheek.

The scriptures contain still other examples that support this. Paul, writing in the first epistle to Timothy, Chapter 5, verse 8 charges me, as a husband and father, with the following responsibility: "If any one does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his own family, he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever."

Provision means more than just food, shelter, and clothing. It also includes safety, security, and protection from harm. Jesus, when telling his followers that they should always be ready for his return, illustrated his point by saying that his return would be as a "thief in the night"; that is, unexpected. In Matthew 24, verse 43, he added, "But know this, that if the householder had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have watched and not have let his house to be broken into."

His arguments go on to cover such things as **Bow ing**, **m editation** and the religious influences.

Bow ing is shown to be just a polite way of showing respect for the teacher and the teacher the pupil.

Meditation is shown to be nothing more than focusing on God and thinking of His word.

Religious influences are said to be left out and Christ placed in the centre as the focus.

Biblical Viewpoint - in Perspective and Context

In our study so far we have looked at the history of the martial arts and its definite link to Buddhist philosophies. We have also taken a look at the belief system behind these philosophies.

A nominal Christian or unbeliever wishing to find support for their ideas in the Bible must destroy context to force Scripture to fit their point of view. Unfortunately this is prevalent not only today, but throughout the church history. We find context destruction and forced ideology from the scripture is what has destroyed the seriousness *of* and the validity *for*, Gods Word in both man and church today. If the Bible is interpreted to man's view point and not God's, then *we are* the ones who are deceiving ourselves and are in trouble. Isn't it better that we make sure that WE ARE WALKING IN GODS TRUTH as Gods judgement will be a terrible thing. Especially for those on the receiving end of that judgement.

As a believers seeking after all Gods truth and lead by the Spirit of God into that truth, we must take God's Word in its context, and understand its meaning correctly.

2Ti 2:15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

This is a Scripture that is overlooked by Christians in general, there is a tendency to just accept what we are told by the leaders', when in fact we are commanded to study ourselves and test all things against Scripture. It is the responsibility of every believer to rightly divide the Word of truth. If we are lead astray it is our own fault for not testing what is spoken to us by the teachers. (**Act 20:29** for I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock).

We are to be as the Bereans, they tested what they were told to see if it was true, and were eager to follow the truth.

Act 17:10 And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming *thither* went into the synagogue of the Jews.

Act 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

We are commanded by God to study His word and rightly understand it so we can lead others to Him in The Truth. Not as is recorded in the verse prior to this one as a warning:

2Ti 2:14 Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, *but* to the subverting of the hearers.

Do we want to be associated with those that subvert the hearers? God talks much in His word of those leading the flock astray and the seriousness of its penalties and HIS judgement upon them.

Removing the truth from scripture and adding opinions takes away the Gospel truth and makes it our truth. Any truth with a lie injected in is by default *No Longer a Truth*. If we were found to be doing this in any court of law, we would be found in contempt of that court, and punished accordingly. How much more so with God's Word.

GOD SAYS WHAT HE MEANS AND MEANS WHAT HE SAYS.

Let's take a closer look at the Scriptures quoted previously by the Christian Martial Artists to support their position:

Mathew 5 38-39

Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:
But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

Our martial arts apologist claims that this is one of Gods more difficult scriptures to understand. Let's look at it in context and see if this is so!

Mat 5:38 ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

Mat 5:39 But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

Mat 5:40 and if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloak also.

Mat 5:41 and whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

Mat 5:42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Mat 5:43 ye have heard that it hath been said; Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

Mat 5:44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

Mat 5:45 that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

Mat 5:46 for if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?

Mat 5:47 And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? Do not even the publicans so?

Mat 5:48 be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

It is plain reading the scripture in its context that the Lord is instructing us to walk in His light, showing His love in our lives as a witness of Him in our life. This is not talking about striving with the enemy, but loving him.

This is in fact a lot more difficult than fighting with them. A fight whether, martial arts, boxing or just hit and hope is over in a short space of time, usually with someone hurt. Hurting someone is not blessing them.

However, to love your enemy is a complete battle within the mind and will last a lifetime in the fighting.

Rom 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

The world's way of dealing with conflict is always to retaliate; the Lord is telling us to change this mindset.

To let go and trust the Lord in a situation is far more difficult than fighting back.

Rom 12:16 Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.

Rom 12:17 Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men.

Rom 12:18 If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

Rom 12:19 Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

Rom 12:20 Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirsts, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

Rom 12:21 Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

In other words, put your wrath away, as the Lord is the one to deal with that person. We are rather to bless and pray for the enemy.

Our apologist then uses Mathew 5:29-30 with an interpretation saying:

There are two ways one can interpret the command to turn the other cheek. The first is to interpret the text literally, asserting that it means exactly what it says. That would impose a duty of non-resistance on all men in all circumstances. One cannot, however, require the literal acceptance of verse 38 without also requiring the same of the other verses in that chapter -- such as verses 29 and 30. Verse 29 reads, "... if your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out," and verse 30 adds, "... if your right hand causes you sin, cut it off." Taking these verses literally, without qualification, could quickly lead one to institutionalized confinement! No. This literal, unqualified interpretation seems untenable.

Let's look at these Scriptures now in the context of what they are saying:

Mat 5:27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

Mat 5:28 But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

Mat 5:29 And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Mat 5:30 And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Mat 5:31 It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

Mat 5:32 But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

These scriptures are talking about adultery and the avoidance of it. If something is causing you to sin, turn from it, just like Job did. Job made a pact with his eyes:

Job 31:1 I made a covenant with mine eyes; why then should I think upon a maid?

He was avoiding temptation, as we are instructed to do. Using Scriptures decrying adultery to support the position of the martial artist is perhaps showing the adulteress direction a foreign god takes you?

Matthew Henry's Commentary has this to say:

Mat 5:27-32 -

We have here an exposition of the seventh commandment, given us by the same hand that made the law, and therefore was fittest to be the interpreter of it: it is the law against uncleanness, which fitly follows upon the former; *that* laid a restraint upon sinful passions, *this* upon sinful appetites, both which ought always to be under the government of reason and conscience, and if indulged, are equally pernicious.

I. The command is here laid down ([Mat 5:27](#)), *Thou shalt not commit adultery*; which includes a prohibition of all other acts of uncleanness, and the desire of them: but the Pharisees, in their expositions of this command, made it to extend no further than the act of adultery, suggesting, that if the iniquity was only *regarded in the heart*, and went no further, God could not hear it, would not regard it ([Psa 66:18](#)), and therefore they thought it enough to be able to say that they were *no adulterers*, [Luk 18:11](#).

II. It is here explained in the strictness of it, in three things, which would seem new and strange to those who had been always governed by the tradition of the elders, and took all for oracular that they taught.

1. We are here taught, that there is such a thing as *heart-adultery*, adulterous thoughts and dispositions, which never proceed to the act of adultery or fornication; and perhaps the defilement which these give to the soul, that is here so clearly asserted, was not only included in the seventh commandment, but was signified and intended in many of those ceremonial pollutions under the law, for which they were to *wash their clothes, and bathe their flesh in water*. *Whosoever looketh on a woman* (not only another man's wife, as some would have it, but any woman), *to lust after her, has committed adultery with her in his heart*, [Mat 5:28](#). This command forbids not only the acts of fornication and adultery, but, (1.) All appetites to them, all lusting after the forbidden object; this is the beginning of the sin, *lust conceiving* ([Jam 1:15](#)); it is a bad step towards the sin; and where the lust is dwelt upon and approved, and the wanton desire is rolled under the tongue as a sweet morsel, it is the commission of sin, as far as the heart can do it; there wants nothing but convenient opportunity for the sin itself. *Adultera mens est - The mind is debauched*. Ovid. Lust is conscience baffled or biassed: biassed, if it say nothing against the sin; baffled, if it prevail not in what it says. (2.) All approaches toward them; feeding the eye with the sight of the forbidden fruit; not only looking for that end, that I may lust; but looking till I do lust, or looking to gratify the lust, where further satisfaction cannot be obtained. The eye is both the inlet and outlet of a great deal of wickedness of this kind, witness Joseph's mistress ([Gen 39:7](#)), Samson ([Jdg 16:1](#)), David, [2Sa 11:2](#). We read the *eyes full of adultery, that cannot cease from sin*, [2Pe 2:14](#). What need have we, therefore, with holy Job, to *make a covenant with our eyes*, to make this bargain with them that they should have the pleasure of beholding the light of the sun and the works of God, provided they would never fasten or dwell upon any thing that might occasion impure imaginations or desires; and under this penalty, that if they did, they must smart for it in penitential tears! [Job 31:1](#). What have we the covering of the eyes for, but to restrain corrupt glances, and to keep out of their defiling impressions? This forbids also the using of any other of our senses to stir up lust. If ensnaring looks are forbidden fruit, much more unclean discourses, and wanton dalliances, the fuel and bellows of this hellish fire. These precepts are hedges about the law of heart-purity, [Mat 5:8](#). And if looking be lust, they who dress and deck, and expose themselves, with design to be looked at and lusted after (like Jezebel, that *painted her face and tired her head, and looked out at the window*) are no less guilty. Men sin, but devils tempt to sin.

2. That such looks and such dalliances are so very dangerous and destructive to the soul, that it is better to lose the eye and the hand that thus offend than to give way to

the sin, and perish eternally in it. This lesson is here taught us, [Mat 5:29](#), [Mat 5:30](#). Corrupt nature would soon object against the prohibition of heart-adultery, that it is impossible to be governed by it; *It is a hard saying, who can bear it?* Flesh and blood cannot but look with pleasure upon a beautiful woman; and it is impossible to forbear lusting after and dallying with such an object. Such pretences as these will scarcely be overcome by reason, and therefore must be argued against with *the terrors of the Lord*, and so they are here argued against.

(1.) It is a severe operation that is here prescribed for the preventing of these fleshly lusts. *If thy right eye offend thee, or cause thee to offend*, by wanton glances, or wanton gazing's, upon forbidden objects; *if thy right hand offend thee, or cause thee to offend*, by wanton dalliances; and if it were indeed impossible, as is pretended, to govern the eye and the hand, and they have been so accustomed to these wicked practices, that they will not be withheld from them; if there be no other way to restrain them (which, blessed be God, through his grace, there is), it were better for us to *pluck out the eye*, and *cut off the hand*, though the *right eye*, and *right hand*, the more honourable and useful, than to indulge them in sin to the ruin of the soul. And if this must be submitted to, at the thought of which nature startles, much more must we resolve to *keep under the body, and to bring it into subjection*; to live a life of mortification and self-denial; to keep a constant watch over our own hearts, and to suppress the first rising of lust and corruption there; to avoid the occasions of sin, to resist the beginnings of it, and to decline the company of those who will be a snare to us, though ever so pleasing; to keep out of harm's way, and abridge ourselves in the use of lawful things, when we find them temptations to us; and to seek unto God for his grace, and depend upon that grace daily, and so to *walk in the Spirit*, as that we may not *fulfil the lusts of the flesh*; and this will be as effectual as *cutting off a right hand* or *pulling out a right eye*; and perhaps as much against the grain to flesh and blood; it is the destruction of the old man.

(2.) It is a startling argument that is made use of to enforce this prescription ([Mat 5:29](#)), and it is repeated in the same words ([Mat 5:30](#)), because we are loth to hear such rough things; [Isa 30:10](#). *It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish*, though it be an eye or a hand, which can be worse spared, *and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell*. Note, [1.] It is not unbecoming a minister of the gospel to preach of hell and damnation; nay, he *must* do it, for Christ himself did it; and we are unfaithful to our trust, if we give not warning of *the wrath to come*. [2.] There are some sins from which we need to be *saved with fear*, particularly *fleshly lusts*, which are such *natural brute beasts* as cannot be checked, but by being frightened; cannot be kept from a forbidden tree, but by *cherubim, with a flaming sword*. [3.] When we are tempted to think it hard to *deny ourselves*, and to *crucify fleshly lusts*, we ought to consider how much harder it will be to lie for ever in *the lake that burns with fire and brimstone*; those do not know or do not believe what hell is, that will rather venture their eternal ruin in those flames, than deny themselves the gratification of a base and brutish lust. [4.] In hell there will be torments for the body; *the whole body will be cast into hell*, and there will be torment in every part of it; so that if we have a care of our own bodies, we shall *possess them in sanctification and honour*, and *not in the lusts of uncleanness*. [5.] Even those duties that are most unpleasant to flesh and blood, are *profitable for us*; and our Master requires nothing from us but what he knows to be for our advantage.

Mat 6:23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!

Deception is a great enemy to the believer. If we can be lead into spiritual adultery, then Satan is doing his job right. After all, he is the god of this world.

Scripture out of context is always Scripture out of context.

The next argument used is:

This is a normal interpretation. C. S. Lewis, a popular Christian theologian, put it like this:

Does anyone suppose that our Lord's 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 victim? I think it impossible that they could have so understood him. I believe the meaning of the words was perfectly clear -- insofar as you are simply an angry man who has been hurt, mortify your anger and do not strike back. If however, your motives are other than egoistic retaliation, then not only are you free to protect yourself and others; rather it is your responsibility to do so.

This is an interesting quote, however, using man's opinion to justify Scripture is neither logical nor good exegesis. Scripture must support Scripture; if it doesn't then it is our understanding that is lacking.

Another point is that C.S.Lewis was an author and not a biblical Scholar; he was an atheist all his life till the last few years when he embraced faith through the Anglican Church (Church of England).

We will look at God's ideas on self defence and military training nearer the end of this article.

The next argument is saying:

The 18th chapter of John's gospel records Jesus' arrest and trial before both the Jewish and Roman courts. In verse 22 of that chapter, Jesus is struck with the palm of the hand by one of the officers of the Jewish religious court for answering the high priest in what the officer thought was a disrespectful manner. In verse 23 Jesus responded, "If I have spoken wrongly, bear witness of the wrong; but if rightly, why do you strike Me?"

The officer could have struck him anywhere, but a slap across the face is a common response to disrespectful speech. Assuming that Jesus was slapped across the face, we find no evidence of his voluntarily offering his other cheek for more. On the contrary, he asks why he deserved such unjust treatment.

In the book of Acts, Chapter 16, we find that the apostle Paul took a similar stand. After being beaten and cast into prison unjustly, the Philippian magistrates decided that they would release Paul and his companions and forget the matter. To this Paul responded as follows in verse 37:

They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men who are Roman citizens, and have thrown us into prison; and do they now cast us out secretly? No! Let them come themselves and take us out.

Clearly, Paul accepted no such injustice. This refutes the literal interpretation and supports the normal interpretation. The actions of Jesus and his apostle Paul indicate

that there are times when the believer can and should resist evil and not offer the other cheek.

Jn 18:22 And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so?

Jn 18:23 Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?

This was an unjust strike. Jesus answered the question truthfully yet the soldier took it as defiance, (this may just be a man who liked to inflict pain, we don't know). A man by law should not be punished until convicted. Despite this being 2000 years ago, there were laws which protected the innocent just like today. A rebuttal against an injustice (notice it is done verbally) is acceptable.

Jesus simply pointed out that the man had acted irresponsibly and had stuck out with no justification.

The next verse is along the same lines:

Act 16:37 But Paul said unto them, they have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast *us* into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out.

Again, yes we should stand against an injustice done, we are not to turn our backs on people breaking the law and let them continue to get away with it. It is to be brought to the attention of the authorities, so that these men are punished. They are to be reported. We are not to stand idly by while people break the law.

As believers it is our responsibility to observe and obey the law of the land. So long as that law does not contradict with Gods Word.

The law tells us to report a crime when witnessed, that is what was happening in the quoted Scriptures.

Mat 24:43 But know this that if the Goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up.

and would not have suffered his house to be broken up: or "dug through"; see [Job 24:16](#) concerning which, there is a law in [Exo 22:2](#) and is explained by the Jewish canonists thus:

"He that comes in by digging, whether by day or by night, there is no blood for him (i.e. to be shed for him, if he is killed); but if the master of the house, or any other man kill him, they are free; and every man has power to kill him, whether on a weekday, or on a Sabbath day; and with whatsoever death he can put him to, as it is said, there is no blood for him, [Exo 22:2](#). And one that comes in, "by digging", or a thief that is found in the midst of a man's roof, or in his court, or within his hedge, whether in the day or in the night, (may be killed;) and wherefore is it called digging? because it is the way of most thieves to come in by digging in the night

The scripture tells us that if a man is caught breaking into our home; we are justified in killing him. The normal means by which this was done was to run him through with a sword or some sort of weapon. There is no mention of open hand fighting, or martial arts of any kind.

So the argument used by the martial art apologist, judging by scripture means we should all have a sword and supply of weapons by which to defend our homes. This in theory may sound like a good idea but is in fact illegal in a majority of the world

The law has changed in the way we are to deal with criminals (not God's law but man's) and the law has strict guidelines in regards to the punishment of said criminal. As right, wrong or fair as those laws may be. We are to adhere to them.

The American constitution may give every citizen the right to bare arms, but America is not the entire world. Many countries live by another standard of law, if a crime is being committed, report it. To kill a man entering your home, no matter how illegally is in fact illegal in itself.

It is totally possible however to manhandle a thief to the ground or an attacker into submission without martial arts training, if needed in the defense of your family or someone being attacked as stated by C.S.Lewis.

Bowing

Ex. 20:5 Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me;

The bowing came from worship within a false religion, so to continue to support it is inexcusable. Attempting to change the meaning to justify an opinion does not change what it meant by the act in the first place. To an unbeliever watching, we are no different from those that practice this for other reasons. We are to separate ourselves from these anti-Christ systems.

Those that bowed to other gods are those that hate God. Should we partake of that even *if we* change the meaning to suit ourselves? If Buddhism is the spirit behind Martial arts then we are committing spiritual adultery by bowing or partaking in any way. It is not honouring anyone if we blatantly and abjectly defy God's Word.

Meditation

As we have seen previously, meditation in the Zen sense is to empty your mind, just feel, and let reaction and flesh take over.

At the end of your training you are asked to relax, it seems harmless enough. You sit or kneel, clear your mind, and relax. This is supposed to help you rid your mind of any anxieties it may have achieved through the violent acts you have just been practicing. To bring a calm and inner peace

If what was just done needs to be cleansed from the mind, is there not something wrong with it. The last thing you can meditate on is God's word when you have been learning how to hurt people quickly and efficiently in the name of defence or sport. It is contradictory. Unless perhaps the god thought upon is not the God of the Bible.

Meditating on God's Word means that we are to read the Scriptures, IN CONTEXT, and to understand through them how God is leading us to change, to come closer to

Him and live more like Him. Jesus did not practice the martial arts nor did he teach it to His disciples. Biblical meditation is not for looking inward to your own self as we are all born into a sinful nature, nor is it to think up ways for Scripture to suit our needs.

Religious Influences

The most important point to note in this study is, as we have read in the brief history of martial arts. That it is always spread by Buddhist monks. This by default would mean you can not teach these systems without the belief system that has promoted it. They are synonymous for a reason.

To say otherwise is naïve or at worst, a deliberate denial of God and His Word relating to deception.

Capoeira which is the exception to the Buddhist rule is not without its philosophical influences. In fact a look at the traditions, myths and legends behind this Art will lead the reader to see that it is based on the same ideas though it may or may not have developed independently. (At least in the physical world).

Training the Body

1Ti 4:8 For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

The focus of the martial arts; apart from the mental disciplines (which were designed to focus the mind inward); and the breathing techniques (which promote a spirituality and an emptying of the mind): Is the physical exercise.

The bible states that physical exercise profits us nothing. This does not mean we can all sit around and do nothing. We are to remain active to stay healthy physically. We are, however, not to focus our time on self to the extent it leads to pride and vanity. There is not a Martial Artist anywhere that can honestly say I am not pleased with what my training is achieving in my body and my mind.

This thinking is placing the focus in the wrong place. Our focus should be on the Lord and heavenly things. The focus inverted on ourselves is pride. Martial Arts are now called a sport. Calling it a sport is a way of hiding what is behind it, it does not remove it.

Base jumping is the jumping off of cliffs or tall buildings with a parachute. If we remove the parachute and call it a sport, that does not make it one, it would make it a suicide leap. Calling something a sport does not in Gods eyes justify something, nor should it in ours.

The Power

In Martial Arts training you learn that the power and strength behind what you do is developed in the stomach. This is called K I or C H I . What is not explained, or usually not explained to the student, is that Ki or chi is a spirit or the energy of life. It is properly called the spirit of Chi or Ki. For the training to have meaning and affect one must increase in this spirit. The more one practices the stronger it becomes. The faster it grows the faster and stronger you become.

Clip from study on Chi or Ki (Found [here](#)⁸)

The task is not simple since many sensei's are reluctant to talk about ki. Those who do, do it in a very oriental way: full of metaphor, image and lack of clarity. The aim of this article is surveying the writing and teaching of Kaiso, his deshi's: Ueshiba, Tohei, Yamada, Shioda, Saito, Saotome, Nadeau, Dobson, Homa ... (listed in no particular order) to find out what they did mean when they mentioned the concept ki, or to find out whether one can come up with a definite answer at all. For the sake of simplicity, let's propose three simple definitions of ki:

1. Ki: the principle that governs the universe AND the individual, the cosmic truth.
2. Ki: the action from a particular state of mind and body that can have physical/psychological/physiological effect. This ki can be expressed, and hence, perceived through physical appearance, behaviour, and body language.
3. Ki: similar to (2). However this ki can be expressed and perceived by means including but not limited to those listed in (2).

One can see that from (1) to (3) the degree of abstract decreases while the physical component increases. The meaning of Ki of course is not limited by the individual or combined definitions mentioned above.

Jn 7:38 He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

If living water is to flow from the bellies of those that believe, what is the excuse to allow Ki or Chi to work within the belly or the body at all? We are to be filled with the Holy Spirit, and not, *any spirit*.

K i or as it is shouted during training K 'i (kee-eye) is used to enhance your punches, kicks and throws. It is believed that this chant forces the power from your belly (Chi or Ki) into the manoeuvre. This is calling upon a spirit to help in your defence. Along with the emptying of the mind, it should make one wonder what and who is in charge of the martial artist; it certainly is not the Holy Spirit.

2Co 11:12 But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.

2Co 11:13 For such *are* false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.

2Co 11:14 And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.

2Co 11:15 Therefore *it is* no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.

I am not accusing all those that practice the martial as being deceivers, there are also those that are deceived, and it is my earnest prayer that they see the truth and remove themselves from this deception.

2Ti 4:3 For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;

2Pe 2:1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

These scriptures and many more are warnings for the end times and a constant reminder of the seriousness of the Lords stand in His Word. If He warns us of these things, there must be reasons. BROAD IS THE ROAD.

Heb 5:12 For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.

As believers we should not have to go back to basics again. Or is it that the basics of the faith were not taught in the first place?

It is possible to spend weeks turning this article into a book covering all aspects of the belief systems and Scripture twisting involved to promote the martial arts. That however is a task for another time. This article is to try and give a general overview and point out some things that most believers do not know.

Let us spend some time now studying what the Bible says about self defence, fighting and war.

Fighting in the Bible

Before we go any further here, I recommend you read this excellent article written about war in the Bible. It can be found [here](#)⁹ on the [Calvary Chapel](#)¹⁰ Website.

The first thing we should note about war and fighting in the Bible is that it is brought about by rebellion. God is at war with those that rebel against Him.

[Deu 31:27](#); [Jos 22:22](#); [1Sa 15:23](#); [Ezr 4:19](#); [Neh 9:17](#); [Job 34:37](#); [Pro 17:11](#);
[Jer 28:16](#); [Jer 29:32](#);

War is fought:

(points 1, 2 & 3 copied from [Article](#)¹¹)

1. *First, war is rooted in rebellion.* In Genesis 14 it states:

Genesis 14:1-4 – And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of nations,² that they made war with Bera king of Sodom, Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar).³ All these joined together in the Valley of Siddim (that is, the Salt Sea).⁴ Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer, and in the thirteenth year they rebelled.

2. *Second, war always affects innocent victims.* It goes on to say in Genesis 14:

Genesis 14:5-12 – In the fourteenth year Chedorlaomer and the kings that *were* with him came and attacked the Rephaim in Ashteroth Karnaim, the Zuzim in Ham, the Emim in Shaveh Kiriathaim,⁶ and the Horites in their mountain of Seir, as far as El Paran, which *is* by the wilderness.⁷ Then they turned back and came to En Mishpat (that is, Kadesh), and attacked all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites who dwelt in Hazezon Tamar.⁸ And the king of Sodom, the king of Gomorrah, the king of Admah, the king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar) went out and joined together in battle in the Valley of Siddim⁹ against Chedorlaomer king of Elam, Tidal king of nations, Amraphel king of Shinar, and Arioch king of Ellasar– four kings against five.¹⁰ Now the Valley of Siddim *was full of* asphalt pits; and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled; *some* fell there, and the remainder fled to the mountains.¹¹ Then they took all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah, and all their provisions, and went their way.¹² They also took Lot, Abram's brother's son who dwelt in Sodom, and his goods, and departed. 7

War spreads and war always engulfs innocent victims such as Lot. This is what terrible and sorrowful, the hurt and harm brought to innocent victims. Granted, Lot chose to live in a decadent and immoral city, but he had nothing to do with the war here. He was in the wrong place at the wrong time but a victim nonetheless.

3. *Three, war is sometimes just.* In Genesis 14 it continues:

Genesis 14:13-16 – Then one who had escaped came and told Abram the Hebrew, for he dwelt by the terebinth trees of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner; and they *were* allies with Abram.¹⁴ Now when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his three hundred and eighteen trained *servants* who were born in his own house, and went in pursuit as far as Dan.¹⁵ He divided his forces against them by night, and he and his servants attacked them and pursued them as far as Hobah, which *is* north of Damascus.¹⁶ So he brought back all the goods, and also brought back his brother Lot and his goods, as well as the women and the people.

When Abram heard of the capture of his nephew Lot, he was right and just to take up arms and go to his helpless nephews defence. War is sometimes just and necessary.

God is not just a God of love. He is a God of Hosts, which means armies. He did not however, organise the training of his armies with martial arts. In fact, many of the battles fought were by untrained soldiers, but they won because God lead the fight and ordered.

God is no longer calling us to bear arms and attack His enemies; He has now commanded us to love our enemies, to bless them. This does not change the fact that vengeance belongs to God, it is just that He is not asking us to fight that kind of battle anymore.

The Battle Belongs To the Lord

Other than verbally defending and rebuking, Jesus never raised His hands, open or otherwise to those that attacked Him. He took all torture and punishments dealt to Him with a love and pity towards those that hated Him. WE ARE TO BE MORE LIKE HIM the Word says.

This takes us on to how soldiers were trained and how we are to fight

Important to note that soldiers take up arms to fight, they are trained to use weapons. This is where the training lies. They learn defence and attack by the sword; they also learn tactics in warfare. They did not learn Buddhism and martial arts.

In this New Age society we now live in, it is easy to see where all this acceptance of Buddhism and other religious influences come from. It is so prevalent in our society that it is easy to accept these things as normal. Even within the church we see these teachings mixed with the true word, thus mixing the truth and deceiving the flock.

It is our duty and indeed calling as believers to be alert and aware of what is happening. Remember Tim 2:15 .

Biblical (Historic) Military Training

The most accurate records we can find today are the training and fighting techniques of the Roman Empire. They were undoubtedly the best trained warrior of their age, and the most advanced, in both armed training and the art of warfare. Let us look at their system of training and see if it involved martial arts:

The information that follows is extracted from:

The Military Institutions of the Romans

(De Re Militari)

By Flavius Vegetius Renatus

Translated from the Latin by Lieutenant John Clarke

Text written in 390 A.D. British translation published in 1767.

Copyright Expired

Etext version by Mads Brevik (2001)¹²

INITIAL TRAINING

The first thing the soldiers are to be taught is the military step, which can only be acquired by constant practice of marching quick and together. Nor is anything of more consequence either on the march or in the line than that they should keep their ranks with the greatest exactness. For troops who march in an irregular and disorderly manner are always in great danger of being defeated. They should march with the common military step twenty miles in five summer-hours, and with the full step, which is quicker, twenty-four miles in the same number of hours. If they exceed this pace, they no longer march but run, and no certain rate can be assigned.

But the young recruits in particular must be exercised in running, in order to charge the enemy with great vigour; occupy, on occasion, an advantageous post with greater expedition, and prevent the enemy in their designs upon the same; that they may, when sent to reconnoitre, advance with speed, return with greater celerity and more easily come up with the enemy in a pursuit.

Leaping is another very necessary exercise, to enable them to pass ditches or embarrassing eminences of any kind without trouble or difficulty. There is also another very material advantage to be derived from these exercises in time of action; for a soldier who advances with his javelin, running and leaping, dazzles the eyes of his adversary, strikes him with terror, and gives him the fatal stroke before he has time to put himself on his defence. Sallust, speaking of the excellence of Pompey the Great in these particulars, tells us that he disputed the superiority in leaping with the most active, in running with the most swift, and in exercises of strength with the most robust. Nor would he ever have been able to have opposed Serrorius with success, if he had not prepared both himself and his soldiers for action by continual exercises of this sort.

TO LEARN TO SWIM

Every young soldier, without exception, should in the summer months be taught to swim; for it is sometimes impossible to pass rivers on bridges, but the flying and pursuing army both are often obliged to swim over them. A sudden melting of snow or fall of rain often makes them overflow their banks, and in such a situation, the danger is as great from ignorance in swimming as from the enemy. The ancient Romans, therefore, perfected in every branch of the military art by a continued series of wars and perils, chose the Field of Mars as the most

commodious for their exercises on account of its vicinity to the Tiber, that the youth might therein wash off the sweat and dust, and refresh themselves after their fatigues by swimming. The cavalry also as well as the infantry, and even the horses and the servants of the army should be accustomed to this exercise, as they are all equally liable to the same accidents.

THE POST EXERCISE

We are informed by the writings of the ancients that, among their other exercises, they had that of the post. They gave their recruits round bucklers woven with willows, twice as heavy as those used on real service, and wooden swords double the weight of the common ones. They exercised them with these at the post both morning and afternoon.

This is an invention of the greatest use, not only to soldiers, but also to gladiators. No man of either profession ever distinguished himself in the circus or field of battle, who was not perfect in this kind of exercise. Every soldier, therefore, fixed a post firmly in the ground, about the height of six feet. Against this, as against a real enemy, the recruit was exercised with the above mentioned arms, as it were with the common shield and sword, sometimes aiming At the head or face, sometimes at the sides, at others endeavoring to strike at the thighs or legs. He was instructed in what manner to advance and retire, and in short how to take every advantage of his adversary; but was thus above all particularly cautioned not to lay himself open to his antagonist while aiming his stroke at him.

NOT TO CUT, BUT TO THRUST WITH THE SWORD

They were likewise taught not to cut but to thrust with their swords. For the Romans not only made a jest of those who fought with the edge of that weapon, but always found them an easy conquest. A stroke with the edges, though made with ever so much force, seldom kills, as the vital parts of the body are defended both by the bones and armour. On the contrary, a stab, though it penetrates but two inches, is generally fatal. Besides in the attitude of striking, it is impossible to avoid exposing the right arm and side; but on the other hand, the body is covered while a thrust is given, and the adversary receives the point before he sees the sword. This was the method of fighting principally used by the Romans, and their reason for exercising recruits with arms of such a weight at first was, that when they came to carry the common ones so much lighter, the greater difference might enable them to act with greater security and alacrity in time of action.

THE USE OF MISSILE WEAPONS

Besides the aforementioned exercise of the recruits at the post, they were furnished with javelins of greater weight than common, which they were taught to throw at the same post. And the masters at arms were very careful to instruct them how to cast them with a proper aim and force. This practice strengthens the arm and makes the soldier a good marksman.

THE USE OF THE BOW

A third or fourth of the youngest and fittest soldiers should also be exercised at the post with bows and arrows made for that purpose only. The masters for this branch must be chosen with care and must apply themselves diligently to teach the men to hold the bow in a proper position, to bend it with strength, to keep the

left hand steady. to draw the right with skill, to direct both the attention and the eye to the object, and to take their aim with equal certainty either on foot or on horseback. But this is not to be acquired without great application, nor to be retained without daily exercise and practice.

The utility of good archers in action is evidently demonstrated by Cato in his treatise on military discipline. To the institution of a body of troops of this sort Claudius owed his victory over an enemy who, till that time, had constantly been superior to him. Scipio Africanus, before his battle with the Numantines, who had made a Roman army ignominiously pass under the yoke, thought he could have no likelihood of success except by mingling a number of select archers with every century.

THE SLING

Recruits are to be taught the art of throwing stones both with the hand and sling. The inhabitants of the Balearic Islands are said to have been the inventors of slings, and to have managed them with surprising dexterity, owing to the manner of bringing up their children. The children were not allowed to have their food by their mothers till they had first struck it with their sling. Soldiers, notwithstanding their defensive armor, are often more annoyed by the round stones from the sling than by all the arrows of the enemy. Stones kill without mangling the body, and the contusion is mortal without loss of blood. It is universally known the ancients employed slingers in all their engagements. There is the greater reason for instructing all troops, without exception, in this exercise, as the sling cannot be reckoned any incumbrance, and often is of the greatest service, especially when they are obliged to engage in stony places, to defend a mountain or an eminence, or to repulse an enemy at the attack of a castle or city.

THE LOADED JAVELIN

The exercise of the loaded javelins, called *martiobarbuli*, must not be omitted. We formerly had two legions in Illyricum, consisting of six thousand men each, which from their extraordinary dexterity and skill in the use of these weapons were distinguished by the same appellation. They supported for a long time the weight of all the wars and distinguished themselves so remarkably that the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian on their accession honored them with the titles of Jovian and Herculean and preferred them before all the other legions. Every soldier carries five of these javelins in the hollow of his shield. And thus the legionary soldiers seem to supply the place of archers, for they wound both the men and horses of the enemy before they come within reach of the common missile weapons.

TO BE TAUGHT TO VAULT

The ancients strictly obliged both the veteran soldiers and recruits to a constant practice of vaulting. It has indeed reached our times, although little regard is paid to it at present. They had wooden horses for that purpose placed in winter under cover and in summer in the field. The young soldiers were taught to vault on them at first without arms, afterwards completely armed. And such was their attention to this exercise that they were accustomed to mount and dismount on either side indifferently, with their drawn swords or lances in their hands. By assiduous practice in the leisure of peace, their cavalry was brought to such

perfection of discipline that they mounted their horses in an instant even amidst the confusion of sudden and unexpected alarms.

AND TO CARRY BURDENS

To accustom soldiers to carry burdens is also an essential part of discipline. Recruits in particular should be obliged frequently to carry a weight of not less than sixty pounds (exclusive of their arms), and to march with it in the ranks. This is because on difficult expeditions they often find themselves under the necessity of carrying their provisions as well as their arms. Nor will they find this troublesome when inured to it by custom, which makes everything easy. Our troops in ancient times were a proof of this, and Virgil has remarked it in the following lines:

The Roman soldiers, bred in war's alarms,
Bending with unjust loads and heavy arms,
Cheerful their toilsome marches undergo,
And pitch their sudden camp before the foe.

THE ARMS OF THE ANCIENTS

The manner of arming the troops comes next under consideration. But the method of the ancients no longer is followed. For though after the example of the Goths, the Alans and the Huns, we have made some improvements in the arms of the cavalry, yet it is plain the infantry are entirely defenceless. From the foundation of the city till the reign of the Emperor Gratian, the foot wore cuirasses and helmets. But negligence and sloth having by degrees introduced a total relaxation of discipline, the soldiers began to think their armour too heavy, as they seldom put it on. They first requested leave from the Emperor to lay aside the cuirass and afterwards the helmet. In consequence of this, our troops in their engagements with the Goths were often overwhelmed with their showers of arrows. Nor was the necessity of obliging the infantry to resume their cuirasses and helmets discovered, notwithstanding such repeated defeats, which brought on the destruction of so many great cities.

Troops, defenceless and exposed to all the weapons of the enemy, are more disposed to fly than fight. What can be expected from a foot-archer without cuirass or helmet, who cannot hold at once his bow and shield; or from the ensigns whose bodies are naked, and who cannot at the same time carry a shield and the colours? The foot soldier finds the weight of a cuirass and even of a helmet intolerable. This is because he is so seldom exercised and rarely puts them on.

But the case would be quite different, were they even heavier than they are, if by constant practice he had been accustomed to wear them. But it seems these very men, who cannot support the weight of the ancient armour, think nothing of exposing themselves without defence to wounds and death, or, which is worse, to the shame of being made prisoners, or of betraying their country by flight; and thus to avoid an inconsiderable share of exercise and fatigue, suffer themselves ignominiously to be cut in pieces. With what propriety could the ancients call the infantry a wall, but that in some measure they resembled it by the complete armour of the legionary soldiers who had shields, helmets, cuirasses, and greaves of iron on the right leg; and the archers who had gauntlets on the left arm. These were the defensive arms of the legionary soldiers. Those who fought in the first

line of their respective legions were called principes, in the second hastati, and in third triarii.

The triarii, according to their method of discipline, rested in time of action on one knee, under cover of their shields, so that in this position they might be less exposed to the darts of the enemy than if they stood upright; and also, when there was a necessity for bringing them up, that they might be fresh, in full vigour and charge with the greater impetuosity. There have been many instances of their gaining a complete victory after the entire defeat of both the principes and hastati.

The ancients had likewise a body of light infantry, slingers, and ferentarii (the light troops), who were generally posted on the wings and began the engagement. The most active and best disciplined men were selected for this service; and as their number was not very great, they easily retired in case of a repulse through the intervals of the legion, without thus occasioning the least disorder in the line.

The Pannonian leather caps worn by our soldiers were formerly introduced with a different design. The ancients obliged the men to wear them at all times so that being constantly accustomed to have the head covered they might be less sensible of the weight of the helmet.

As to the missile weapons of the infantry, they were javelins headed with a triangular sharp iron, eleven inches or a foot long, and were called pila. When once fixed in the shield it was impossible to draw them out, and when thrown with force and skill, they penetrated the cuirass without difficulty. At present they are seldom used by us, but are the principal weapon of the barbarian heavy-armed foot. They are called bebrae, and every man carries two or three of them to battle.

It must be observed that when the soldiers engage with the javelin, the left foot should be advanced, for, by this attitude the force required to throw it is considerably increased. On the contrary, when they are close enough to use their pila and swords, the right foot should be advanced, so that the body may present less aim to the enemy, and the right arm be nearer and in a more advantageous position for striking. Hence it appears that it is as necessary to provide soldiers with defensive arms of every kind as to instruct them in the use of offensive ones. For it is certain a man will fight with greater courage and confidence when he finds himself properly armed for defence.

ENTRENCHED CAMPS

Recruits are to be instructed in the manner of entrenching camps, there being no part of discipline so necessary and useful as this. For in a camp, well chosen and entrenched, the troops both day and night lie secure within their works, even though in view of the enemy. It seems to resemble a fortified city which they can build for their safety wherever they please. But this valuable art is now entirely lost, for it is long since any of our camps have been fortified either with trenches or palisades. By this neglect our forces have been often surprised by day and night by the enemy's cavalry and suffered very severe losses. The importance of this custom appears not only from the danger to which troops are perpetually exposed who encamp without such precautions, but from the distressful situation of an army that, after receiving a check in the field, finds itself without retreat and consequently at the mercy of the enemy. A camp, especially in the neighborhood of an enemy, must be chosen with great care. Its situation should be strong by nature, and there should be plenty of wood, forage and water. If the army is to

continue in it any considerable time, attention must be had to the salubrity of the place. The camp must not be commanded by any higher grounds from whence it might be insulted or annoyed by the enemy, nor must the location be liable to floods which would expose the army to great danger. The dimensions of the camps must be determined by the number of troops and quantity of baggage, that a large army may have room enough, and that a small one may not be obliged to extend itself beyond its proper ground. The form of the camps must be determined by the site of the country, in conformity to which they must be square, triangular or oval. The Praetorian gate should either front the east or the enemy. In a temporary camp it should face the route by which the army is to march. Within this gate the tents of the first centuries or cohorts are pitched, and the dragons* and other ensigns planted.

The Decumane gate is directly opposite to the Praetorian in the rear of the camp, and through this the soldiers are conducted to the place appointed for punishment or execution.

There are two methods of entrenching a camp. When the danger is not imminent, they carry a slight ditch round the whole circuit, only nine feet broad and seven deep. With the turf taken from this they make a kind of wall or breastwork three feet high on the inner side of the ditch. But where there is reason to be apprehensive of attempts of the enemy, the camp must be surrounded with a regular ditch twelve feet broad and nine feet deep perpendicular from the surface of the ground. A parapet is then raised on the side next the camp, of the height of four feet, with hurdles and fascines properly covered and secured by the earth taken out of the ditch. From these dimensions the interior height of the intrenchment will be found to be thirteen feet, and the breadth of the ditch twelve. On the top of the whole are planted strong palisades which the soldiers carry constantly with them for this purpose. A sufficient number of spades, pickaxes, wicker baskets and tools of all kinds are to be provided for these works.

There is no difficulty in carrying on the fortifications of a camp when no enemy is in sight. But if the enemy is near, all the cavalry and half the infantry are to be drawn up in order of battle to cover the rest of the troops at work on the entrenchments and be ready to receive the enemy if they offer to attack. The centuries are employed by turns on the work and are regularly called to the relief by a crier till the whole is completed. It is then inspected and measured by the centurions, who punish such as have been indolent or negligent. This is a very important point in the discipline of young soldiers, who when properly trained to it will be able in an emergency to fortify their camp with skill and expedition.

EVOLUTIONS

No part of drill is more essential in action than for soldiers to keep their ranks with the greatest exactness, without opening or closing too much. Troops too much crowded can never fight as they ought, and only embarrass one another. If their order is too open and loose, they give the enemy an opportunity of penetrating. Whenever this happens and they are attacked in the rear, universal disorder and confusion are inevitable. Recruits should therefore be constantly in the field, drawn up by the roll and formed at first into a single rank. They should learn to dress in a straight line and to keep an equal and just distance between man and man. They must then be ordered to double the rank, which they must perform very quickly, and instantly cover their file leaders. In the next place, they are to double again and form four deep. And then the triangle or, as it is

commonly called, the wedge, a disposition found very serviceable in action. They must be taught to form the circle or orb; for well-disciplined troops, after being broken by the enemy, have thrown themselves into this position and have thereby prevented the total rout of the army. These evolutions, often practiced in the field of exercise, will be found easy in execution on actual service.

MONTHLY MARCHES

It was a constant custom among the old Romans, confirmed by the Ordinances of Augustus and Hadrian, to exercise both cavalry and infantry three times in a month by marches of a certain length. The foot were obliged to march completely armed the distance of ten miles from the camp and return, in the most exact order and with the military step which they changed and quickened on some part of the march. Their cavalry likewise, in troops and properly armed, performed the same marches and were exercised at the same time in their peculiar movement and evolutions; sometimes, as if pursuing the enemy, sometimes retreating and returning again with greater impetuosity to the charge. They made these marches not in plain and even ground only, but both cavalry and infantry were ordered into difficult and uneven places and to ascend or descend mountains, to prepare them for all kinds of accidents and familiarize them with the different maneuvers that the various situations of a country may require.

CONCLUSION

These military maxims and instructions, invincible Emperor, as a proof of my devotion and zeal for your service, I have carefully collected from the works of all the ancient authors on the subject. My design herein is to point out the certain method of forming good and serviceable armies, which can only be accomplished by an exact imitation of the ancients in their care in the choice and discipline of their levies. Men are not degenerated in point of courage, nor are the countries that produced the Lacedaemonians, the Athenians, the Marsians, the Samnites, the Peligni and even the Romans themselves, yet exhausted. Did not the Epirots acquire in former times a great reputation in war? Did not the Macedonians and Thessalians, after conquering the Persians, penetrate even into India? And it is well known that the warlike dispositions of the Dacians, Moesians and Thracians gave rise to the fable that Mars was born among them.

To pretend to enumerate the different nations so formidable of old, all which now are subject to the Romans, would be tedious. But the security established by long peace has altered their dispositions, drawn them off from military to civil pursuits and infused into them a love of idleness and ease. Hence a relaxation of military discipline insensibly ensued, then a neglect of it, and it sunk at last into entire oblivion. Now will it appear surprising that this alteration should have happened in latter times, if we consider that the peace, which lasted about twenty years or somewhat more after the first Punic war, enervated the Romans, before everywhere victorious, by idleness and neglect of discipline to such a degree, that in the second Punic war they were not able to keep the field against Hannibal. At last, after the defeat of many consuls and the loss of many officers and armies, they were convinced that the revival of discipline was the only road to victory and thereby recovered their superiority. The necessity, therefore, of discipline cannot be too often inculcated, as well as the strict attention requisite in the choice and training of new levies. It is also certain that it is a much less expense to a State to train its own subjects to arms than to take foreigners into its pay.

As we can see, Flavius Vegetius Renatus was a strategist and military leader of some note. His works and studies have been passed down for study and training in the military. His system of training, though updated for modern weapons is still used today by most military trainers worldwide.

Please note that Flavius drew upon the best of the fighting techniques of the Persians and other great military countries in the past. At no point has he mentioned or even intimated training of the martial arts under any guise.

Conclusion

We can see by the study of the roots of the martial arts that it is passed down and inextricably linked with Buddhism. We also see that the biblical arguments used to promote the martial arts are verses out of context. And finally the argument that martial arts was always taught to the military through history is also a false lead. We must conclude that the martial arts promoters are actively seeking to subvert the faith through subterfuge and deceit, or, that they are themselves deceived from the truth to maintain a lifestyle they enjoy.

Either way, continuing in an anti-Christian practice brought about the worship of foreign god's is not something we can remain a part of if we are seeking after the truth of God, through His word and the Holy Spirit unto salvation through Jesus.

2Co 6:14 be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?

2Co 11:14 and no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.

Eph 5:8 for ye were sometimes darkness, but now *are ye* light in the Lord: walk as children of light:

1Jo 1:6 if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth:

1Jo 1:7 But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

1Jo 1:8 if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.

1Jo 1:9 if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Denying the truth of the Gospel in respect to certain things we want to keep in our lives is hiding from the truth.

Jn 3:20 for every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.

Jn 3:21 But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

We are a royal priesthood. Should we not act like it? A royal priest would never consort with the enemy, nor allow deceptive ways to be brought into the truth.

1Pe 2:9 But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:

We are called into the light: should we not heed that call and step out of the darkness and deception that is Buddhism and martial arts and glorify God in our lives and walk with Him.

Articles Reference

All quotes taken from the KJV of the Bible

Thank you to [e-sword](http://www.e-sword.net)¹³ for their fantastic program

¹ <http://www.capeoiranyc.com/study.html>

² <http://www.capeoiranyc.com/philosophy.html>

³ <http://home.att.net/~taekwondo.junkie/TKDHistory.html>

⁴ <http://home.maine.rr.com/poiuyt/history.html>

⁵ <http://home.maine.rr.com/poiuyt/history.html>

⁶ <http://home.maine.rr.com/poiuyt/history.html>

⁷ <http://www.pastornet.net.au/response/articles/2.htm#endnote1back>

⁸ <http://www.aikidofaq.com/philosophy/index.html>

⁹ <http://www3.calvarychapel.com/hope/library/stauffer-claude/studies-topical/war/war.htm>

¹⁰ <http://www.calvarychapel.com/>

¹¹ <http://www3.calvarychapel.com/hope/library/stauffer-claude/studies-topical/war/war.htm>

¹² **The Military Institutions of the Romans**

(De Re Militari)

By Flavius Vegetius Renatus

Translated from the Latin by Lieutenant John Clarke

Text written in 390 A.D. British translation published in 1767. Copyright Expired

Etext version by Mads Brevik (2001)

¹³ <http://www.e-sword.net/index.html>