

Nailing Jello to a Tree: A Christian Approach to Ethics in Intelligence

Melanie Scherpereel

A Senior Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for graduation
in the Honors Program
Liberty University
Fall 2017

Acceptance of Senior Honors Thesis

This Senior Honors Thesis is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the Honors Program of Liberty University.

Stephen R. Bowers, Ph.D.
Thesis Chair

William Waddell, M.A.
Committee Member

Edward N. Martin, Ph.D.
Committee Member

David E. Schweitzer, Ph.D.
Assistant Honors Director

Date

Abstract

This paper will discuss Christian involvement in the intelligence field in addition to the ethical issues inherent to intelligence, specifically deception, including lying and manipulation, and technology as a force multiplier. Many Christians believe that intelligence is fundamentally a field of extensive deception that should be avoided. Ethics and morality, what it means to tell the truth, and biblical examples of people who used deception and were commended, will be analyzed from a Christian worldview perspective. The arguments will be presented in order that Christians may be able to understand how to apply the two greatest commandments, to love our neighbor and pursue Christ, even in the midst of the ethical challenges persistent in the intelligence field.

Nailing Jello to a Tree: A Christian Approach to Ethics in Intelligence

Introduction

A consideration of the field of intelligence forces one to face many challenging ethical issues, for example: Is it right to tell a lie when doing so will save lives? Is it right to manipulate the ideas of our enemies through propaganda to cause them to agree with us? How does technology affect these issues? These are all important questions to consider. Intelligence professionals will inevitably be in situations in which they will need to consider these issues, and as citizens in general, it is important to have an understanding of these issues in order to be able to interpret and assess the policies of the government's intelligence community. A foundation must be established before specific situations can be discussed productively. There are no clear and simple answers in the area of ethics, but there are several fundamental, guiding principles that will help us in our quest to discover God's will in any difficult situation we may encounter.

The Lordship of Christ

I will be approaching ethical issues in intelligence from a distinctly Christian perspective. Therefore, we must understand the applicability of Christ to all of life. There is no secular sphere that is somehow separated from the Lordship of Christ. John Stott (2006) in his book on issues facing Christians, talks about the secular/sacred dichotomy and how as Christians we should develop a "Christian mind", which he explains as "a mind which could think about even the most 'secular' topics 'Christianly' - that is, from a Christian perspective" (p. 61). Areas of life that challenge our worldview and our ideas of right and wrong should not be avoided by Christians. In fact, if all

things are under the Lordship of Christ, we ought to be able to engage on even the most difficult of subjects and illuminate those subjects by bringing wisdom. Proverbs 1:7 states, “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge.” With the Holy Spirit, Christians have the wisdom of God. We should, therefore, be able to think about even challenging and “secular” subjects from the standpoint of a Christian worldview.

In view of the principle that we should analyze all subject areas through a Christian worldview, the challenge of ethics in the field of intelligence should also be viewed as being subject to the Lordship of Christ. In fact, for the purposes of this research, I will presuppose the acceptance of the reality of Christ and a Biblical view of the world. Although ethics can be, and often are, discussed from a non-Christian viewpoint, without this absolute basis for truth and goodness found in the person of Christ, discussion can only end up in an endless circle of debate.

It is a fact that humans have an innate sense of right and wrong. Some may say this sense can be explained by our instincts, or learned behavior. But sometimes, our conscience tells us to do something that goes against our instincts. For example, if a house is on fire, our instinct would tell us to escape the danger, but something inside us tells us to enter the danger in order to do what we consider to be “good”. Why? Can this sense that tells us to ignore our instincts in favor of some other perceived “right” really be just a way of speaking, a fact of nature with no basis? C.S. Lewis (1952) addresses this question in *Mere Christianity*. This law of right and wrong must be something outside of us, something we did not invent ourselves. Apart from the God of the Bible, we have no impartial standard against which to measure morality and no way to know what is right

and wrong, true or false, good or evil. C.S. Lewis states, “But the standard that measures two things is something different from either. You are, in fact comparing them both with some Real Morality, admitting that there is such a thing as a real Right, independent of what people think” (p. 15). He explains further, “If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other there would be no sense in preferring civilized morality to savage morality or Christian morality to Nazi morality” (p. 15).

Therefore, ethics based on a Christian worldview are different from any other religious or non-religious attempt to establish ethical guidelines because the Christian worldview provides a basis for absolute right and wrong (objective morality) as well as the flexibility to determine when a particular situation may require a deviation in ethical areas in pursuit of the higher law of love. In the Fall, man gained the knowledge of good and of evil in the world, which was the beginning of our struggle to identify right from wrong. Before the Fall, man only knew good as it existed in God, and he was in such communion with Him that there would be no difficulty in determining a proper course of action. With the separation from God came the knowledge of evil and separation from reality, which was God. However, there came to earth a remedy for the separation of man from the ultimate reality. As Bonhoeffer (2009) states, "In Jesus Christ the reality of God has entered into the reality of this world. The place where the questions about the reality of God and about the reality of the world are answered at the same time is characterized solely by the name: Jesus Christ" (p. 54). It is in Christ that we can ultimately be guided through good and evil and bring clarity to the challenges that exist within the intelligence field. Therefore, Christians can bring wisdom and clarity to the

field of ethics because Christianity gives us a standard outside of ourselves against which to measure what is right.

In summary, then, all humans have an innate sense of morality, but this innate sense cannot be explained apart from an absolute authority, God, who created humans and the world we live in. Therefore, a productive discussion of ethics cannot occur without the presupposition that God exists and is Lord over all things, including intelligence.

Because Christians accept that there is an absolute standard for morality, we have the opportunity to bring wisdom and clarity to ethical debates. Although this is not a paper about the reasons why Christians have a place in the intelligence field, one important reason for Christians to be involved in intelligence is that we have a better basis for ethical understanding and this basis gives us the capacity to make the transition from mere knowledge, which is simply information, to wisdom or predictive insight (G. Middleton, personal communication, July 2, 2014). We have this power because we have knowledge of the Wisdom of God, Jesus Christ. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whose example will be discussed later, was a German pastor and WWII spy whose experiences as a Christian in the midst of one of the most evil regimes in history influenced his beliefs about Christian ethics. His life is a textbook example of a situation in which our preconceptions of what is right and wrong in ethics and intelligence are challenged. In one of his books, he states, "Only that person is wise who sees reality in God. Knowledge of reality is not just knowing external events, but seeing into the essence of things ... Wisdom is recognizing the significant within the factual" (Bonhoeffer, 2009, p. 81). It is

this wisdom that we receive from God, when we ask Him, that will enable us to penetrate the ambiguity of ethical issues.

Morals and Ethics

Before discussing the principles that must guide our pursuit of goodness, we must define the difference that exists between morals and ethics. Writers vary on their definitions for these terms; there are four basic ideas philosophers have historically held. First, ethics and morals can be seen as distinct spheres with ethics having to do with “the pursuit of one’s own happiness or well-being and private lifestyle, that is, how we should live to make good lives for ourselves” while morality deals with “other people’s interests and deontological constraints” (Gordon, n.d., para. 4). Second, ethics and morals could be viewed as synonymous. Third, morality could be seen as part of ethics. Finally, morality could be seen as the object of ethics, with ethics as a philosophical theory. I will take the first perspective in which morals relate to principles: good and evil in an absolute sense. When we decide a question of morality, we are essentially asking ourselves: “Will I, or will I not do some act which is good or evil?” We make a decision to do something right versus doing something that is wrong. Ethics, on the other hand, asks: “How will I do what is good?” The decision to attempt to do good has already been answered in the affirmative, and the question has now become how. Take the often-cited example where doing something that would typically be considered wrong, such as telling a lie, is the only way to save lives. In this case, the desire is to do good, save life, and the ethical question deals with how: tell a lie or not. This distinction is necessary because as Christians, we believe in absolute morality, that there is an absolute basis from which to

determine good and evil. In God we have absolute truth and absolute goodness, because they are His nature. He does not simply make things good and true: He is Truth and Goodness itself. However, although we reject the postmodern notion that truth is relative, it is in the area of ethics where the reality of an evil, fallen world requires us to determine how to live our lives in line with those moral truths.

When discussing ethics, we must always keep our discussions practical and closely related to reality, because ethics is, by its very nature, situational. Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1955) states, “the simple fact is that the ethical cannot be detached from reality, and consequently continual progress in learning to appreciate reality is a necessary ingredient in ethical action” (p. 365). Ethics is not simply theoretical; it is tied to real life events and situations, and must be learned through experiences, interactions, and ultimately relationships.

Ethics and Relationships

Now, having established a distinctly Christian understanding of morality based on the absolute truth and goodness of a holy God, we turn to the principles that guide our pursuit of ethical right and wrong. Ethics are ultimately about relationships. The relationships derived from living as individuals in a larger community is what will ultimately guide our ethical choices. It is in God's triune nature that the basis for individuality and community lies. Each member of the Trinity is an individual and has a specific role and place in the Trinity and yet they all commune together as one. (1 Peter 1:2; 1 Cor. 8:6). Stephen Plant (2004), in his book on Bonhoeffer, describes Bonhoeffer's definition of a community saying, "a community can be thought of as a collective person

with an 'objective spirit' that comes into being when two or more individuals come together to form a 'new' collective self, capable of thought, intention, feeling and action" (p. 68). It is in viewing our individual lives as part of the community of the human race that we learn the application of the second greatest commandment: to love our neighbor. Therefore, the basis for our ethical decisions will ultimately come down to one thing: As part of a community, and as a part of the greatest commandment to love God, we are called to love our neighbor. But what does this love look like?

Love

Love is about living a life of disposability (A. Frye, personal communication, June 10, 2015). This is living a life of selflessness, denying oneself for the sake of others. Jesus states, "This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:12-13, ESV). This does not solely mean laying down one's life physically for someone else, though that is also included, but it also includes the often more difficult task of dying to oneself and one's own desires and comforts every day for the good of one's neighbor.

Martin Luther (1931), in an essay entitled "Whether Soldiers too can be Saved" talks about how a work of love can sometimes look very unloving. He states:

Although slaying and robbing do not seem to be a work of love, and therefore a simple man thinks it not a Christian thing to do, yet in truth even this is a work of love. By way of illustration, a good physician, when a disease is so bad and so great that he has to cut off a hand, foot, ear, eye, or let it decay, does so, in order

to save the body. Looked at from the point of view of the member that he cuts off, he seems a cruel and merciless man; but looked at from the point of view of the body, which he intends to save, it turns out that he is a fine and true man and does a work that is good and Christian, as far as it goes. (p. 35)

In this same way, when a Christian soldier goes into war to fight and kill, he can still be involved in a Christian office and a godly work, attempting to bring peace to the world and to prevent and halt the evil that would exist if he did not intervene. We must look at the work of war in a broader perspective. Assuming the war is just, the soldier must fight in order to prevent the further evil that would occur if he did not. World War II would be a good example. Countries (including the United States) had to fight and kill, in order to prevent the evil that would have continued to occur had Hitler succeeded in his goal to take Europe.

Spying is also a part of this work. Darrell Cole (2008), in an article which references Luther's essay, states, "Spying, like soldiering, is an act of force that may be a justifiable means to securing order and justice in and among political communities, and, thus ... something that may command moral allegiance as an act of love of neighbor" (p. 127). Spying, as with soldiering, can be a respectable and even godly office if done with correct intentions. If a person maintains a constant and intimate relationship with God, seeking His will for every action to be sure that his actions and intention are correct for every situation, it is very possible for a soldier or spy to do God's work by acting according to His will.

Jesus did not come to abolish the law, but to fulfill it. "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:34-35). It is not in the Law of the Old Testament that we must ultimately find the answers to our ethical dilemmas. That law was not abolished, but it was fulfilled in Christ. He does not, therefore, call us to live up to the standard of the Mosaic Law, for that Law we are no longer slaves to, yet He has called us to a higher law, the law of love. We no longer live according to a set of rules or principles, but rather in a relationship with Christ in which communion with the Holy Spirit guides us toward what is pleasing to God. Eric Metaxas (2010) describes Bonhoeffer's understanding of the limits to principles saying, "his thinking [was] that Christians cannot be governed by mere principles. Principles could carry one only so far. At some point every person must hear from God, must know what God was calling him to do, apart from others" (p. 323). Under the Old Covenant, Israel followed principles and rules, but under the new covenant, we are called to a relationship. Metaxas states later, again speaking of Bonhoeffer, "To be true to God in the deepest way meant having such a relationship with him that one did not live legalistically by 'rules' or 'principles.' One could never separate one's actions from one's relationship to God" (p. 367).

Deception

Having established a Biblical foundation for ethics on the principle of love, rooted in a relationship with God, we have a basis for our ethical decisions. We now turn to how this applies specifically in one area, perhaps the biggest of all of the issues in

intelligence because of its occurrence in so many intelligence situations, the issue of deception. Deception is a major part of intelligence, especially in warfare. It is used to generate surprises, to create misperceptions and to convince the enemy to agree with our perception and portrayal of reality. The Oxford dictionary defines the word *deceive*, to “deliberately cause (someone) to believe something that is not true especially for personal gain” (“Deceive”, n.d.). Deception involves both action and motivation. Therefore, not only can words be untrue, but motivations and situations can also be untrue. I will begin my discussion of deception by breaking it down into two basic types: lying and manipulation. The Oxford dictionary defines a lie as, “an intentionally false statement: used with reference to a situation involving deception or founded on a mistaken impression” (“Lie”, n.d.). Concealing truth could also be considered lying since it can be used to intentionally cause someone to have a mistaken impression. Therefore, lying can be further categorized into two ideas: concealing truth and telling direct falsehoods. Moreover, manipulation is a form of deception in which a person is misled into believing a predetermined perception of reality. The Oxford dictionary defines manipulation, to “control or influence (a person or situation) cleverly or unscrupulously” (“Manipulate”, n.d.). I will begin by discussing the ethics of lying including biblical precedent and biblical and historical examples, followed by the ethics of manipulation with reference to the use of propaganda by the intelligence community.

Lying

Thou shalt not lie. Contrary to what we sometimes are taught as children, that commandment is not exactly in scripture. The ninth commandment tells us not to bear

false witness against our neighbor, of which lying is a part, but the commandment not to engage in lying is not actually in the ten commandments. Of course, that is not to say we are free to lie indiscriminately. Many other scriptures demonstrate the fact that God is Truth itself and he hates the liar. Proverbs 12 says, “Truthful lips endure forever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment. Deceit is in the heart of those who devise evil, but those who plan peace have joy.... Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord, but those who act faithfully are his delight” (Proverbs 12:19-20, 22). Interestingly, the next verse, however, says, “A prudent man conceals knowledge, but the heart of fools proclaims folly.” In this verse, it is the prudent man who is, in a sense, being deceptive by concealing knowledge. A word study on deception is difficult because the words translated “deception” do not fit neatly into categories. If we were to categorize them, we see that there are at least four different categories of deception: those who “actively and deliberately oppose the Kingdom,” “errors that emerge from within the disciple group itself,” “errors of self-deception,” and “‘wandering’ caused by simple ignorance” (Pioneers, n.d.). 2 Thessalonians 2:11 is an interesting example because it is the only time deception seems to originate with God. It states, “Therefore God sends them a strong delusion, so that they may believe what is false.” In this case, it is a result of the fact they refused to be saved. We need to understand the Christian meaning of lying and its opposite “telling the truth”, because ethics is a little bit like nailing jello to a tree. Just when we think we have it, it slips away.

Os Guinness (2000) defines truth as, "that which is ultimately, finally, and absolutely real ... being grounded and anchored in God's own reality and truthfulness" (p.

78). Jesus is the Truth; it is his nature. He refers to himself in John 14:6 as "the way, the truth, and the life." On the contrary, we see that Satan is called the father of lies. John 8:44 states, "He [Satan] was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies." What is Satan's ultimate nature of being a liar? 1 John 2:22 says, "who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ?" Satan was the first to deny God, and all who continue to deny God follow in Satan's steps. Similarly, Bonhoeffer (1955) chooses to define lying in the following way:

The lie is a contradiction of the word of God, which God has spoken in Christ, and upon which creation is founded. Consequently the lie is the denial, the negation and the conscious and deliberate destruction of the reality which is created by God and which consists in God, no matter whether this purpose is achieved by speech or by silence. The assigned purpose of our words, in unity with the word of God, is to express the real, as it exists in God; and the assigned purpose of our silence is to signify the limit which is imposed upon our words by the real as it exists in God. (p. 369-370)

Our intention in telling the truth then, is an attempt to explain reality accurately. In appropriate situations, our silence, or our deliberate concealing of knowledge serves this purpose more exactly than speaking would. Bonhoeffer explains, "If one is to say how a thing really is, i.e. if one is to speak truthfully, one's gaze and one's thought must be directed towards the way in which the real exists in God and through God and for God" (p. 365). God is the ultimate reality in whom we, "live and move and have our being"

(Acts 17:28a). He is our fundamental source of truth and goodness, so truthful speech should be that which correctly explains that which is really real. Telling the truth, under these definitions, allows for deception when circumstances require it, without moral culpability on the part of the deceiver.

Not only must our words be true, our intentions must also be true. Take Judas as a bad example of this principle. In the garden of Gethsemane, he kissed Jesus on the cheek, an action of respect that would be considered a good deed, however, even though his action was good, his heart was evil. His intention was not true, thus reversing the apparent goodness of his action. Moreover, when a person speaks hypocritically or flatteringly or sarcastically, the words he uses may in themselves be true, but his intention may not be true. For example, some people pride themselves in telling the truth indiscriminately to everyone around them. In Matthew 5:22, Jesus says, “whoever insults his brother will be liable to the council; and whoever says, ‘You fool!’ will be liable to the hell of fire.” Perhaps the brother really was a fool, but in this case, that does not matter. I may believe a person to be stupid, ugly, arrogant, and disgusting, but I have no right to express those sentiments under the pretense of “telling the truth.” Even if the words themselves are true, they not intended lovingly.

Take another example: A child draws a picture and shows it to his parent. The parent tells him it is beautiful, even if it is just scribbling on a piece of paper. Why? Is this a lie? No, because in this instance, the parent is encouraging the child. The straight truth would not be helpful to the child, but love allows the parent to encourage the child

knowing that he must practice in order to improve. Paul makes this clear in 1 Corinthians 13:1-3 when he says,

If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give away all I have, and if I deliver up my body to be burned, but have not love, I gain nothing.

Without love, the truth is worthless.

Bonhoeffer (2006), in an essay on what it means to tell the truth argues that it is differences in relationship that determine what truth is to be told. He states, "The question must be asked whether and in what way a person is justified in demanding truthful speech from another" (p. 602). As we have seen, not only must our words and intentions be true to reality as it exists in God, but beyond that, they must be true and appropriate to the relationship with the other person.

From infancy, we are taught to always tell the truth. But this demand of truthfulness is conditionally restricted to the family relationship. Bonhoeffer (1955) states,

in the sense in which our parents intend it, this demand applies strictly only within the family circle. It is also to be noted that the relation which is expressed in this demand cannot simply be reversed.... The life of the small child lies open before the parents, and what the child says should reveal to them everything that is

hidden and secret, but in the converse relationship this cannot possibly be the case. (p. 358)

Already we can see that the requirement of telling the truth is not so very clear. One's relationship to another person, and the particular situation, makes things different. Our responsibility to tell the truth may look different depending on whether we are talking to parents, teachers, strangers, enemies, or even God.

If our responsibility to tell the truth is conditional, can we say then that we may lie to any person, so long as we are truthful in speaking to God, since He is ultimately the only one to whom our lives should remain fully open? As the Apostle Paul might say, "By no means!" (as in Romans 6:15). God is Truth; he is a living God, so our truthfulness toward him is necessarily carried over into the world around us. So how does this work in real life? Bonhoeffer (1955) states, "'Telling the truth', therefore is not solely a matter of moral character; it is also a matter of correct appreciation of real situations and of serious reflection upon them. The more complex the actual situations of a man's life, the more responsible and the more difficult will be his task of 'telling the truth'" (p. 359).

Especially in the area of intelligence, we will often be faced with complex situations in which our responsibility to tell the truth will not be easy.

Not only can words be true or untrue, situations can be true or untrue if the context of a question is inappropriate. Bonhoeffer (1955) explains:

When the various orders of life no longer respect one another, words become untrue. For example, a teacher asks a child in front of the class whether it is true that his father often comes home drunk. It is true, but the child denies it. The

teacher's question has placed him in a situation for which he is not yet prepared.

He feels only that what is taking place is an unjustified interference in the order of the family and that he must oppose it. (p. 367)

The child knows that certain facts are secret and confined to a certain sphere, in this case that of the family, and these secrets should not be shared in another sphere (the school).

The best option would be for the child to find a way to answer the question that would be appropriate to the situation and comply with the Christian principles of truthfulness for both spheres, but he has not yet learned how to do this. If we were all-knowing, we would be able to see the correct way to answer these questions. For example, in Mark 12:13-17 the Pharisees came to Jesus to attempt to trap him. They asked him whether or not they ought to pay taxes to Caesar. Instead of falling into their trap by taking a side, he simply asked to see a denarius, the currency of the day, and then stated, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" (Mark 12:17). They marveled, because he answered in a way that they had never heard before. A normal person would likely have tried to lie to avoid this trap, but Jesus did not need to do this. This leads to an observation about the situations in which we lie. For a well-intentioned person, whose goal is to tell the truth as much as possible, lying is often the result of feeling trapped and uncertain in an unfamiliar situation. When we encounter a situation we have never experienced before or we feel that another person is trying to trap us, we do not think of that perfect word that would satisfy the rules of truthfulness, so we lie instead. Some things simply are not appropriate to share with all people, and we recognize that, but we do not have the experience to get out of the situation without lying.

Sometimes, in these cases, the fault lies in the hands of the person who asked the question, for example the teacher in the previous scenario, because she is the one who should not have asked the inappropriate question in the first place.

Examples of lying. All of this is somewhat helpful, but it still does not really tell us what scripture has to say directly about deception. Therefore, it is best to take examples of people who engaged in deception but yet were commended for it. Let us consider some biblical and historical examples of people who lied. The story of Rahab in Joshua 2 is one of the clearest examples of someone being commended for lying. After 40 years of Israel wandering in the desert, Joshua sent spies into Canaan once again, just as Moses had done before him. This time, however, they went to spy out Jericho alone and were to report only to Joshua. They came to lodge at the house of Rahab, a harlot, though it seems that though she had previously been a harlot, she was no longer. More than just giving them a place to stay, she concealed them and directly defied the king by denying that they were still at her house, telling the king's men that they had left. She had heard of the God of the Israelites and believed that He would deliver Canaan into Israel's hands. The author of Hebrews commends her faith saying, "By faith Rahab the prostitute did not perish with those who were disobedient, because she had given a friendly welcome to the spies" (Hebrews 11:31). Rahab is commended with many other pillars of the faith in Hebrews for her active deception to hide the spies. Why? Considering the situation, she was making the most truthful decision she could. She had to respond to their question; what was she to say? Had Jesus been in this same situation, like many times in the Gospels when the Pharisees attempted to trap him, he may have

had an answer that would have satisfied the soldiers while not actually telling a lie.

Rahab, however, as most of us, did not see another way to protect the spies than to tell a lie to the soldiers.

Bonhoeffer (1955) gives several questions we can use to evaluate situations like Rahab's. We can decide whether we are speaking the truth by considering who causes us to speak and what entitles us to speak, the place in which we speak, and through this context, the object about which we are to speak. The people who caused Rahab to speak were enemies of the God she served. Her action of hiding the spies demonstrated her faith. Matthew Henry (1985) explains,

Had she said, 'I believe God is yours and Canaan yours, but I dare not show you any kindness,' her faith had been dead and inactive, and would not have justified her. But by this it appeared to be both alive and lively, that she exposed herself to the utmost peril, even of life, in obedience to her faith.... Those that have God for their refuge and hiding place must testify their gratitude by their readiness to shelter his people when there is occasion. (p. 9)

Her faith in God demanded that she protect the spies. It would have been a sin for her to betray the spies and in that way side with the enemies of God. Henry further explains, "it does not appear that she had any other way of concealing them than by this ironical direction to the officers to pursue them another way, which if they would suffer themselves to be deceived by, let them be deceived. None are bound to accuse themselves" (p. 10). In this case, the place in which she stood demanded that she keep the secret that the spies were still concealed within her house. Her situation did not

demand of her that she tell the king's soldiers where the spies were but she was unable to find an alternative, so she lied.

A second example is given when we see how Gideon concealed the truth in order to defeat the Midianites. When they left the town to go out and fight the Midianites, they had 32,000 men with them. But God wanted them to know that it was not their skill or cunning that would deliver the Midianites into their hands, but instead His hand.

Ultimately, the number was reduced to 300 men. The Lord told him the Midianites would be delivered into the hands of the Israelites, but Gideon still developed a strategy for attack. Judges 7 explains, "And he divided the 300 men into three companies and put trumpets into the hands of all of them and empty jars, with torches inside the jars. And he said to them, 'Look at me, and do likewise. When I come to the outskirts of the camp, do as I do. When I blow the trumpet, I and all who are with me, then blow the trumpets also on every side of all the camp and shout, "For the Lord and for Gideon."'" When they arrived at the edge of the camp, they did just as Gideon had said, blowing their trumpets, shouting, and smashing their jars. They held the trumpets in one hand and the torches in the other. All of these things made it seem that they had a much larger force than they actually did. The Midianites were so afraid that they ran, and the Israelites pursued and defeated them. Gideon is commended along with many other judges in Israel who used questionable and deceptive means in order to accomplish God's purpose for the nation. Hebrews 11:32-34 says, "For time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets—who through faith conquered kingdoms, enforced justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the

power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were made strong out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to flight.”

Third, Hushai is a scriptural example of a double agent. He was David’s chief advisor, but, when David’s son Absalom usurped the throne, David asked Hushai to pretend to join Absalom gaining his trust, but then giving him bad advice. Hushai sent all the information he gathered through messengers to David. Eventually, in 2 Samuel 17, Hushai’s work paid off and he saved David’s life by giving him time to escape from Absalom. In this situation, Hushai both lied directly and concealed the truth.

Another example of the use of deception is that of Bonhoeffer himself. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was a pastor who lived in Germany during World War II. As the war progressed, Bonhoeffer was confronted with a difficult decision: Germany was requiring all its young men to be drafted into the army. Bonhoeffer could not conscientiously join the army under Hitler’s regime, yet his refusal would put the church in Germany in a bad position since the regime would look on his refusal as representative of the views of the church. Eric Metaxas (2010) explains, “He was looking for a way out that would allow him to obey his conscience, but that would not force *others* to obey his conscience” (p. 323). As Hitler’s policies became more and more drastically anti-Christian, Bonhoeffer could no longer passively accept what was happening. Ultimately, he joined the resistance, but as part of it, he strove to remain inconspicuous. He concealed the truth of his station by acting as if he was in agreement with the regime in order to work against it. In order to make the Gestapo leave the church alone, the resistance decided to have Bonhoeffer join the Abwehr as part of its military intelligence division. Metaxas states,

Bonhoeffer was pretending to be a pastor—but was only pretending to be pretending, since he really was being a pastor. And he was pretending to be a member of Military Intelligence working for Hitler, but...he was in reality working against Hitler.... He was involved in a high stakes game of deception upon deception, and yet Bonhoeffer himself knew that in all of it, he was being utterly obedient to God. (p. 370)

Some may say his choice was wrong, that he should never have pretended to support the Nazis in order to defeat them, but one thing is undeniable: through it all, his faith in the God he served remained strong and he believed with all his heart that what he did was right and obedient to God's will for his life and the time and situations with which he was presented.

Bonhoeffer believed that ethical principles were good, but could only take a man so far; sometimes obedience to God required deviating from one's own convictions about ethics. He was willing to go so far as to join in the plot to assassinate Hitler in order to end an evil regime, and died a martyr for the faith he had lived for. It was his experiences which brought him to the conclusions he discusses in his book on ethics. His work is distinguished from the many theories and opinions on ethics because he lived the things he preached. Faced with the choice between serving an evil regime, dying in protest, or deceiving the enemy by pretending to submit while in reality resisting its hold, he chose the latter. Metaxas (2010) states, "Bonhoeffer's willingness to engage in deception stemmed not from a cavalier attitude toward the truth, but from a respect for the truth that was so deep, it forced him beyond the easy legalism of truth telling" (p.

365). Bonhoeffer was pursuing the higher law of love, love of his neighbor, and in doing so, he incurred rejection from almost everyone. The higher law he was called to live by required him to die to himself, for even the comfort of support from other Christians was denied to him.

Still another example is Corrie ten Boom who concealed Jews in a secret chamber in her house during World War II, telling Nazi soldiers they were not there. Through her activities, it is estimated that over 800 Jews were saved (Biography.com Editors, 2015). Brother Andrew also used deception to conceal and transport Bibles into the USSR during the Cold War. There were times when he chose to leave the Bibles within sight of the border guards and God proved his faithfulness during those times by miraculously allowing Brother Andrew to pass through without attracting attention. Yet for the most part, Brother Andrew concealed the Bibles and went into the USSR under cover in order to avoid detection.

Finally, in 1 Samuel 16, we encounter a situation in which God tells Samuel directly to conceal the whole truth from Saul in order to save Samuel's life. In the previous chapter, Saul demonstrated poor leadership and a lack of trust in God when he chose to give in to the people by allowing them to keep the livestock they had captured from the Amalekites instead of killing them as God had commanded. As a result of Saul's failure, God rejected him from being king and sent Samuel to anoint Jesse's son David as king. Samuel was afraid that Saul would kill him if Saul knew he was going to anoint a new king, so Samuel asked God how to do it. God told Samuel, "Take a heifer with you and say, 'I have come to sacrifice to the Lord.' And invite Jesse to the sacrifice,

and I will show you what you shall do” (1 Samuel 16:2b-3a). In other words, God directly told Samuel to deceive Saul by not telling him the whole truth, and Samuel did so in obedience to God.

Rahab, Gideon, Hushai, Bonhoeffer, Corrie ten Boom, Brother Andrew, and Samuel all used deception, but all used it as a tool to save life, and in obedience to what they believed God was calling them to do. They did it all out of love for others. The principle of love is what guides our ethical decisions including our use of deception. In conclusion, lying and concealment, as types of deception and as useful tools for intelligence gathering, can be used inappropriately, but when used in an effort to love our neighbor, deception can be the right thing to do.

Manipulation

The second type of deception is manipulation. William Hutchinson (2015) identifies manipulation as a type of deception stating, “Deception can be altruistic but often it is just a desire to inflict a worldview on people for some sort of advantage” (p. 106). Manipulation is a category of deception and its goal is to convince the enemy of a particular perception of reality that we wish him to believe. Propaganda is a form of manipulation commonly used in intelligence and war. Robert Bornstein (1989) defines propaganda as, “any attempt to manipulate attitudes and behaviors, directly or indirectly, via the presentation of material designed for that purpose” (p. 235). As such, it involves the presentation of images and words that invoke a feeling or make a statement meant to persuade a person or nation to agree with a predetermined idea. Oftentimes, people have negative emotions associated with the idea of propaganda, but used for good, it can

actually be a tool that allows us to make peace without sacrificing lives. Propaganda does not even necessarily have to involve lies; it can be entirely true, but intended to cause the target to believe or act in a certain way. For example, before we dropped the bombs on cities in Japan at the end of World War II, we dropped leaflets on the city telling them what we were going to do (Rothman, 2015). We were trying to influence the people to convince their government to cooperate and also give them an opportunity to escape the devastation that we were about to inflict. In propaganda, it is important to understand the power of words and images as well as several specific techniques and tools that can be used to develop a propaganda campaign.

Words. Propaganda is generally a combination of words and images, and it is important to understand the differences between these forms of communication in order to understand better how to use and interpret them. Biblically, we know that words are especially important. They are powerful. It is curious that God chose to use language to create the world. Jesus said, “Let there be light” and it was created. Jesus is referred to in John 1 as the Logos, or the Word of God. This name has special meaning when we consider the meaning of the word Logos in Greek. At the time John was writing his gospel, the word Logos carried the understanding of being “that which gave life and meaning to the universe” (Ligonier Ministries, 2017, para. 4). Jesus was therefore portrayed not just as an impersonal force but as a person who is the source of life and meaning in the universe. Language then is the method that God has given us to bring meaning to the universe. He is the Word, he spoke the universe into existence, and he gives us the gift of words in order to interpret the world around us and communicate with

Him and with humans, who are created in His image. Jay Winslow, a school teacher who speaks extensively on critical thinking and the power of words and images, explains that we would be unable to interpret the world apart from language. Language produces thought, which produces mind, which is how we think about everything (J. Winslow, personal communication, July 12, 2016). Think about describing an image. It is impossible to do so without using words. There may be an emotion that is tied to a picture, but even that cannot be described without the use of words. We need language. It is part of God's nature and therefore part of our nature since we are made in his image.

Words are powerful. In fact, one of the characters in G.K. Chesterton's (2016) *The Ball and the Cross* states, "What is the good of words if they aren't important enough to quarrel over? Why do we choose one word more than another if there isn't any difference between them? ... The Church and the heresies always used to fight about words, because they are the only thing worth fighting about" (p. 40). Differences between words can be the difference between life and death, and the choice between two words can change the course of history. Proverbs 18:21 states, "Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and those who love it will eat its fruits." Matthew 12 says, "For out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks...for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned" (Matthew 12:34a, 37). Finally, Hebrews 4:12 states, "For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and of spirit, of joints and of marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart." The goal of propaganda is to change someone's perception of reality, and to convince them to agree with our perception of reality. Since

language is the method by which we communicate reality, understanding the power of words is important because the choice of words can be the difference between effective and ineffective use of propaganda.

Images. Additionally, it is said that an image is worth a thousand words. It is hard to interpret an image without words because one image can mean a hundred different things. Without words, we lose precision, but we gain an emotional tie that we cannot get simply from words. In this way, images are important as well. An image is essentially a representation of a specific reality. God created man in His image; we are created with His character traits. Although distorted by the fall, our image is still a reflection of His. We are created as a representation of His ultimate perfect reality. In this way, we can see that images, in the sense that they are representations of reality, are powerful. In propaganda used by the intelligence community, images can be used to help convince an enemy of the truth of our perception of reality and the error of his own perception of it. Combined, words and images provide us with a power both emotional and intellectual that helps us influence people. When we add the power of images, we see that propaganda can be a powerful tool that allows us to influence enemies and potentially convince them to change their minds without having to sacrifice lives.

For example, current anti-smoking commercials show how previous smoking commercials tried to show people smoking as being cool and having more fun, but then they show what it actually looks like: a man in the hospital, sick with cancer because of his choices. The goal of these commercials is to graphically show what the result of smoking is, and therefore convince people to quit. Is sickness the end result for all

smokers? Perhaps not, but for many it is. Though this commercial is graphic, it is meant to make a point through a strategic use of words and images.

Another example of a positive use of propaganda was its role in promoting the American Revolution. In an article in the Huffington Post, Nancy Snow (2010) argues that one of the major catalysts of the American Revolution was, in fact, propaganda. She states, “To our ears and our minds, propaganda is the ultimate in deception. It is a tool of corrupt governments seeking to deceive people.... But propaganda is actually a free-value term” (para. 3). We consider the American Revolution to be a good thing, and it was sparked by the propaganda of people such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine.

The word *propaganda* has a lot of negative emotions associated with it. People see it as an underhanded method of mind control. There is a lot of fear associated with the use of propaganda, and people who develop it are often seen in a negative light. But propaganda is simply the strategic use of words and images for persuasion. In fact, if we can persuade our enemy to agree with us, we may even be able to avoid war. It is worth understanding propaganda techniques so that we can both avoid being persuaded by enemy propaganda, and understand how to effectively use it to make peace.

Interpreting propaganda. We have discussed how we can use propaganda to influence the enemy, but how should we go about interpreting the propaganda that we are recipients of? Acts 17:11 states, “Now the Bereans were of more noble character than the Thessalonians, for they received the message with great eagerness and examined the Scriptures every day to see if what Paul said was true.” We need to learn to think critically about the messages that we receive. Philip Boardman (1978) states, “The

propagandist seeks to persuade people and, as rhetoricians discovered very early, people are more easily moved by emotional appeals than by rational arguments. A slogan, by paring syntactic structures to the bones, forces the reader or listener to make decisions on the basis not of facts or arguments, but of simplistic emotional appeals” (p. 78). We have such difficulty sorting through the propaganda messages that are placed in front of us because we do not choose to take time to ask questions and think through what those messages convey. Therefore, instead of being able to critically think through propaganda, we are afraid of it and the underlying messages that it may carry.

A war using propaganda is a war of ideas; it is essentially a war of worldviews. Ideas have consequences, and in our efforts to change the enemy’s mind, we must change those ideas. It is essential for us to understand our own worldview and also the worldviews of our targets to be able to effectively use propaganda to influence our enemy, and to recognize and combat his efforts to influence us.

In conclusion, propaganda in itself is not evil, though it can be used for evil purposes. We can use the power of words and images to make peace with our enemies hopefully without the need to sacrifice as many lives. Hebrews 12:14 says, “Strive for peace with everyone, and for the holiness without which no one will see the Lord.” Used as a technique for persuasion, propaganda can be a valuable tool in our efforts to make peace. There are many specific techniques that can be employed in propaganda efforts, and though some people have negative impressions of it, it can be used for good. Ultimately, the goal of our efforts is to convince our enemy of what is true and to end conflict with as little loss of life as possible.

Deception as a Part of Life

Ultimately, deception is a part of life in a fallen world. William Hutchinson (2015) compares the human brain to a computer processor and explains how deception is a part of life, simply as a result of the fact that we are fallible in our decision-making process. In other words, we often deceive ourselves. He states:

Deception is an intrinsic part of all life; it aids in survival. In society, humans practice deception in subtle and complex ways, and as they live in an information bubble where the data that comes into their system are imperfect. Thus, decisions made are also imperfect. Humans, like all living things, have constrained sensors as well as processors that are programmed to expect the expected and therefore can be deceived and can be fooled by illusions that they consciously know are incorrect. (p. 97)

James warns us of the vulnerability of our own hearts toward deception in James 1:14-15, which says, “But each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire. Then desire when it has conceived gives birth to sin, and sin when it is fully grown brings forth death.” We are deceived not only by the actions of others and their attempts to deceive us, but also by our own conscious decision to be deceived even when we consciously know better. This is why deception is most effective when it contains a bit of truth and targets the things that we already believe. In a fallen world, we will constantly be faced with the challenges of deception, both as we are deceived by others and as we are deceived by our own hearts. However, if we remain in communion with

God, following him and what we believe He has called us to do, we will have the ability to navigate the challenges of right and wrong.

Technology

As we have seen, deception is a difficult ethical challenge, yet it is augmented by still another challenge that acts as a force multiplier (i.e. a factor that increases the effectiveness of an action) in these areas: technology, and specifically cyberspace. The modern world is surrounded with the results of modern technological advancement in ways we do not even realize. With continuing technological innovation in cyberspace, almost everyone, especially in the West, is connected and dependent in some way upon computer technology. In many ways, our lives are structured around one's and zero's, the building blocks of our critical infrastructure and our social and personal lives. From electricity to communications, cell phones to computers, our lives revolve around computer programming. Innovative technology always provides opportunities, opportunities for good or for evil, often for both.

Our human nature has always been tempted by technology. Technology gives us opportunities, but also brings into the picture hundreds of new ethical challenges, and augments the same old challenges. Is it appropriate to spy on private citizens and their property? Is using cyberspace to inflict physical damage appropriate? What about stealing intellectual property and innovations? Once again, I will not discuss specific situations, but rather technology's effect on deception and the general principles that should guide us in evaluating ethically challenging technological dilemmas.

Paul Chamberlain (2005), writing about moral persuasion, discusses technology and the challenges that come with it. Whenever a new technology is developed, it leads us to ask: How should it be used? New technology always brings with it opportunities to be used for both good and evil. He states, "Any time we *can* do something, we are suddenly forced to ask whether we *ought* to do it" (p. 34). With the emergence of so many incredible technologies, we are forced to face ethical questions that we could not have imagined several years ago. These technologies are not necessarily bad, but we have to sort through a great deal of confusion related to them.

From nearly the beginning of the world, we have struggled with being tempted by the opportunities technology brings. In Genesis 11, we read of the newly developing human civilization. The human race had evidently invented new technology: bricks in the place of stone and tar in place of mortar. This technology brought with it the potential for good and for evil, opportunities and temptations, the potential to control or to be controlled. But, just as Adam and Eve chose the false sparkle and glitter of power over and against submission to God, the people in Babel chose selfish power. Instead of using their technology to glorify God and help their fellow men, they chose to assert their independence by building a tower to heaven and making a name for themselves. Their words, "Come let us make" echo God's words in creation, "let us make man in our image" (Gen 1:26). The people of Babel were asserting their independence by acting like gods. They succumbed to the danger of using technology to build their own kingdom instead of His.

As demonstrated in the previous example, in speaking of new technology, we must recognize that no technology can ever be neutral. As Neil Postman (1992) writes, "embedded in every tool is an ideological bias, a predisposition to construct the world as one thing rather than another, to value one thing over another, to amplify one sense or skill or attitude more loudly than another" (p. 13). He describes how conflict arises whenever a new technology is developed because not only does it compete for time, money, and attention, but also for dominance over the worldview of the old technology. An old saying states that to a man with a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Postman extends this analogy saying that to a man with a computer, everything looks like data. "New technologies alter the structure of our interests: the things we think about. They alter the character of our symbols: the things we think with. And they alter the nature of community: the arena in which thoughts develop" (p. 20). Technologies change our worldview in ways we do not even recognize.

Cyberspace

So let us take a moment to discuss the worldview and values that are promoted by the invention and advent of cyberspace, one of the most significant technological innovations of the recent past. Nathan Pegors, faculty of theology at Worldview Academy, suggests several questions to consider when determining how to glorify God through a new technology. First, what is the claim? Or, what is the benefit of a new technology? Second, we must clarify: What are the values that the technology promotes? And third, regarding control: What uses are appropriate? (Pegors, personal

communication, October 4, 2014). So let us examine the realm of cyberspace through these three questions.

There are many benefits of cyberspace, but perhaps two of the most valuable are connection and information both of which are situations in which deception is relevant. Connections can be formed and cultivated that would have been impossible without the rise of the Internet. Networking creates opportunities for people to find jobs and create partnerships that would have been very difficult prior to the invention of the Internet. Connections with foreigners can be developed, making the world feel smaller and helping us to understand and learn about other cultures and mindsets. Additionally, with just the click of a button, we can see our family and friends via Skype, something the creators of the *Jetsons* (a TV show that aired from the 1960s to the 1980s) could only imagine just a few decades ago. The quantity of available information has skyrocketed and these massive quantities of information literally at our fingertips allow us to learn all kinds of new skills. The Internet has created opportunities for people to learn and work from home, giving us more flexibility and providing convenience. Advances in programming have been applied to robotic technology in industry, medicine, and the military to save lives and aid and protect people. Truly, the benefits of cyberspace have been immeasurable.

Specifically in the area of strategic intelligence, cyberspace has changed our world in how we collect information and conduct espionage. Former CIA officer James Gosler (as cited in Wallace & Melton, 2006) states, "Clandestine photography is rapidly yielding to sophisticated technical operations that exploit these networks. Spies with

authorized access to these networks - an insider - can exfiltrate more than one million pages of sensitive material inside a microelectronic memory device easily concealed within a watch, an ink pen, or even a hearing aid" (p. 444). In many ways, it is easier to hack into a computer system and steal documents than to actually steal physical documents. This has significantly changed our methods of collection. Additionally, clandestine surveillance is more easily conducted. For example, hackers have the ability to turn on the webcam on a person's computer, allowing them to view the user. Tracking devices and surveillance cameras can be controlled by computers. Robots and unmanned aerial vehicles are also valuable in this area specifically in the military for surveillance of battle areas and enemy encampments and units.

The fact is that the advent of cyberspace has significantly aided the encryptor and made counterintelligence significantly more difficult. Wallace & Melton (2006) state, "The options for covert communications using digital technology appear endless and remain a persistent problem for counterintelligence" (p. 455). Using deception is easier now than ever before. People can easily impersonate others on the internet and countering this is difficult. Additionally, the connections that we have through the internet aid propagandists. It is much easier to influence people's opinions when a picture or video can be shared and go viral with just the click of a few buttons. Terrorists have learned how to use this tool to create fear and spread the evidence of their atrocities all over the world. They have mastered the ability to lie to and manipulate people causing fear.

Temptations

All these new capabilities present us with temptations: temptations to use technology for evil, to serve it as an idol, and to build our own kingdom. All of this can happen without our even realizing it. However, they can also be used for good. The same tools that can be used to generate fear and cause mass confusion can also be used to spread good ideologies across the world. For example, the gospel is much more easily spread to all parts of the world through internet resources and apps. Awareness of issues such as human rights and human trafficking has also increased because of the internet.

To clarify, we must dig a little deeper to discover the things that the cyber ideology values. Most importantly it values independence and autonomy. Like machines, people can operate independent of others and of God. In fact, as Postman (1992) states, "In a Technopoly [a culture monopolized by technology], we tend to believe that only through the autonomy of techniques (and machinery) can we achieve our goals" (p. 142). Valuing independence has not been so recent in America; it is rather a foundation to our country since our inception. But it is only increased by the opportunities that the Internet has created for us. Finally, and perhaps most dangerous, is that this ideology values science and technology, not just in and of itself, which would be profitable, but as the savior of all of the world's problems.

Finally, the last question, which asks what uses are appropriate, refers to what controls are appropriate to help us use technology in a Biblical way. Every situation is different, so it is impossible to make rules that will guide us in our decisions about ethical issues; however, the principles we have discussed should help us understand what it means to live as a Christian in the world of intelligence.

In the end, "technology *is* a friend" but it "does not invite a close examination of its own consequences" (Postman, 1992, p. xii). An understanding of the consequences of technology is necessary and important in order for us to navigate the difficult challenges that it brings. Technology amplifies the issues that we face relating to deception. Connection is a force multiplier because information can be spread much more easily affecting more people more quickly. In a sense, ideas can be thought of as similar to viruses in terms of how they spread. Similar to how the influenza virus spreads most quickly in confined areas such as airplanes, ideas are spread more easily through the connection that is a result of the internet. Quick connections can be beneficial, but connection also allows for lies to be spread more easily, hence the danger of technology and the challenge it brings to our ethical choices.

Conclusion

As in all of life, our goal is to glorify God in all we do, whatever that may involve. The answers to our ethical dilemmas involving deception and technology, can only be found in a relationship with the One who made all things. We have now explored the issues of deception, manipulation, and technology in light of the idea that love of our neighbor and a pursuit of God's truth should guide our decision-making. Having established the fact that love may require interference in ways that may be viewed as unethical then, how shall we determine when interference is proper and when it is not? Dr. Gordon Middleton, in a lecture in 2014, suggested four questions to ask when faced with an ethical dilemma. First, what is the government's objective? Is it a good objective, such as saving lives or stopping harm? The second question is: is it something

the government should be involved with? Even if the government's objective is good, it is possible that it is something the government should not be involved with, simply because it is not within its sphere of responsibility. The third question to ask is: Does it raise an ethical or moral problem? The answer to this question is most likely yes if one has come to the place of asking the questions, but it is possible that with some reflection one might realize that the ethical issue that seemed to be posed was really not an issue at all. Finally, if the government's objective is good, and it is something the government should be involved in and it raises an ethical issue, we may ask the fourth and final question: Is there a different way? There may be another way to solve the issue that does not involve an ethical dilemma. For example, in Daniel 1:8-17, the king asked Daniel and his friends to eat unclean food, which would violate their consciences. Daniel used his God-given creative abilities to find a way around the difficulty. Like Daniel, we can use our God-given abilities to be innovative in finding other ways that may be less ethically questionable.

Ultimately, however, the answers will sometimes not be clear and we must remember the conclusion that the preacher comes to at the end of Ecclesiastes, "The conclusion, when all has been heard, is: fear God and keep His commandments, because this applies to every person. For God will bring every act to judgment, everything which is hidden, whether it is good or evil" (Ecclesiastes 12:13-14). There is no absolute right answer to some of the difficult issues that face us in the intelligence field. But we know the One who is the Wisdom of God, Jesus Christ, as it says in 1 Corinthians 1:24, "but to those who are the called... Christ [is] the power of God and the wisdom of God." He has

promised us that "if any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all generously and without reproach, and it will be given to him" (James 1:5). We have the Wisdom of God within our hearts, and ultimately it is in communion with Him and in a willingness to listen to His Word and His Spirit that we can find answers to the difficult issues we will face. In having a mindset of dying to ourselves, we will find the fulfillment of the command to love our neighbor.

References

- Biography.com Editors. (2015). Corrie ten Boom Biography.com. Retrieved from <http://www.biography.com/people/corrie-ten-boom-21358155>
- Boardman, P. (1978). "Beware the semantic trap": Language and propaganda. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 35(1): 78-85. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42575308>
- Bonhoeffer, D. (1955). *Ethics*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Bonhoeffer, D. (2006). What does it mean to tell the truth? In Green, C. (Ed.), *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works, Volume 16, Conspiracy and Imprisonment* (p. 601-608). Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Bonhoeffer, D. (2009). Ethics as formation. In Green, C. (Ed.), *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works, Volume 6, Ethics* (p. 76-102). Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Bornstein, R. (1989). Subliminal techniques as propaganda tools: review and critique. *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 10(3): 231-262. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24859884>
- Chamberlain, P. (2005). *Talking about good and bad without getting ugly: a guide to moral persuasion*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Chesterton, G.K. (2016). *The ball and the cross*. Project Gutenberg EBook. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/5265/5265-h/5265-h.htm>
- Cole, D. (2008). Whether spies too can be saved. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 36(1): 125-154. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40014881>

- “Deceive” (n.d.). In the Oxford Dictionary online. Retrieved from
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/deceive>
- Gordon, J. (n.d.). Modern morality and ancient ethics. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/anci-mod/>
- Henry, M. (1985). *Matthew Henry’s commentary on the whole Bible*. (Vol. 2, Joshua to Esther). McLean, VA: MacDonald Publishing.
- Hutchinson, W. (2015). Deception in the cyber-world. *Intelligent Systems, Control and Automation: Science and Engineering* 78(1): 97-107. Retrieved from
<http://file.allitebooks.com/20151011/Cyber%20Security-%20Analytics,%20Technology%20and%20Automation.pdf#page=102>
- Lewis, C.S. (1952). *Mere Christianity*. New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- “Lie” (n.d.). In the Oxford Dictionary online. Retrieved from
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/lie>
- Ligonier Ministries. (2017). *Logos*. Retrieved from
<http://www.ligonier.org/learn/devotionals/logos/>
- Luther, M. (1931). Whether soldiers, too, can be saved. In *Works of Martin Luther Volume V* (p. 32-75). Philadelphia, PA: A.J. Holman Company
- Guinness, O. (2000). *Time for truth: living free in a world of lies, hype, & spin*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- “Manipulate” (n.d.) In the Oxford Dictionary online. Retrieved from
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/manipulate>

- Metaxas, E. (2010). *Bonhoeffer: pastor, martyr, prophet, spy*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Plant, S. (2004). *Bonhoeffer*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Rothman, L. (2015, December 14). See a leaflet dropped on Japanese cities right before World War II ended. *Time*. (n.p.) Retrieved from <http://time.com/4142857/wwii-leaflets-japan/>
- Snow, N. (2010, March 18). Positive propaganda. In the *Huffington Post*. (n.p.) Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nancy-snow/positive-propaganda_b_393843.html
- Stott, J. (2006). *Issues facing Christians today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Pioneers. (n.d.). *Word Study #169 – Deceive, deception, deceivers*. Retrieved from <https://pioneernt.wordpress.com/2012/12/05/word-study-169-deceive-deception-deceivers/>
- Wallace, R. & Melton, H. (2006). *Spycraft: The secret history of the CIA's spytechs from communism to al-Qaeda*. New York, NY: Plume