

11 The Road to Jerusalem

They were on their way to Jerusalem.

Each of the gospels we call “synoptic” announces with foreboding Jesus’ eventual approach to Jerusalem. He had avoided Jerusalem throughout his two years or so of public teaching, for it was a place where the civil-religious authorities held tightest control, and where it would not be safe for anyone who was out of favour with them to show his face. And as those authorities had taken the trouble to send their representatives up to Galilee to investigate him, and as those representatives had concluded he was in league with demons, Jerusalem was not a place where Jesus could expect to be welcomed.

We have seen the conflict there was between him and the local leaders in Galilee. They had much to defend. The social and economic order, as far as it came under local, not Roman, control was their territory, and although there were factions and parties among them (Pharisees and Herodians), they were willing to unite against a newcomer whose new way of ordering things would leave them with nothing to fight over. They would not let him have the moral ground, for even wealthy and autocratic rulers have to appeal to some sense of value and rightness in their rule. People have to be persuaded that this is the way it ought to be; and when Jesus showed that, under the rule of God and a true understanding of God’s law, social and economic relations would be very different, he threatened Pharisees and Herodians both.

But at most it was small town stuff. It might have been more serious if Jesus had gone into Herod’s new cities of Tiberias and Sepphoris, but we’re not told that he ever did. He taught about the coming kingdom of God, the coming new order where God’s people could live under God’s rule, primarily in places where there was already a knowledge and recognition of God. He came to God’s people, not with word of an alien God or a new religion, but with news of God whom they already knew and claimed to serve.

It was never a “purely religious” message. For then as now, the social and economic order depended on a sense that ethics, values and God were all fundamentally “on board”. When Jesus said “Repent, for the kingdom of God is near” he was urging on the whole established order a renewal of values, a change in perceptions, a revolution in their understanding of God’s action in the world, which the established leaders were not prepared to countenance.

If he were now to move on from Galilee to Jerusalem, he would come up against more powerful people with even more to defend. The temple authorities, who commanded much respect (where the Romans could only force obedience) were there supremely on their own territory, wielding power enough to enrich themselves in spite of their subject status, and they would defend what they had. The leading priests were the heads of wealthy families and the High Priest’s authority was not to be challenged. Though the religious leaders were answerable, like all authorities, to Rome, they were answerable to no one else. Herod’s remit did not run there, for the city came directly under the Roman governor, and the Roman governor was usually resident in a Roman garrison town like Caesarea.

Jerusalem, already in those days, could claim to be the emotional, spiritual and psychological heart of Israel. The temple of Jerusalem was the only place where, by laws already hundreds of years old, it was permitted to offer sacrifice to God. That made the Jewish religion a uniquely centralised one, with a single place to meet God in, and so to maintain the incredible Jewish conviction that

Jesus Messiah

One alone was God, the One God who was their Lord, who had revealed himself to them. Jerusalem, the temple and the priestly clans could be proud of their heritage. What they preserved, and had preserved for many generations now was a truth that would long outlast the Roman Empire. In their rituals, in their care of the sacred writings, in their preservation of the best teaching, they maintained an order that was more important than the whole world-wide economic and military order of Rome and of Caesar. The temple they served was a house where God might truly glorify his Name.

And yet power had corrupted the priesthood, even such power as was left to them when Rome held ultimate sovereignty. Indeed, Roman sovereignty might have been the making of them. A priesthood adept at manipulating the delicate interplay of military clout, social order, popular respect or acceptance and economic activity, may have been better placed for a comfortable and influential existence than the rulers who had to maintain their own imposed powerful authority. Drawing on a multitude of traditions, practices and alliances, the leaders of the Jerusalem priesthood held considerable power, and it was not the first time that Jerusalem had been corrupted.

In Jerusalem, Jesus would be facing big powers, national leaders with larger and richer institutions to back them up, and to be defended at all costs as the basis of their power and of national pride. What was a village meeting compared to the Sanhedrin (the council of leaders) in Jerusalem, or the synagogue building of which Capernaum was so proud compared to the temple in Jerusalem?

And yet there was this paradox about the power of the priesthood. Based and focused as it was on the temple, and drawing all its authority from there, it followed that the further a priest went from Jerusalem, the less relevant he would be. By the very laws that had focused and preserved their power in Jerusalem, the priests had nothing to do in all the other towns and villages of Israel. Any priest living away from Jerusalem, would feel like an exile and would cherish his opportunities of returning there to take his part in the privileges of worship, in the holiest places where even Jews, if they were not priests, did not dare to go.

In the towns and the villages of the country, where, after all, most of the people lived out their lives, in the synagogues where people gathered to be the community of Israel, to pray and to hear the scriptures, to listen to teachers, to gossip, to settle arguments and to regulate their community affairs, other leaderships, which we have seen in action, had emerged or survived, holding responsibility for the civil life of Israel, for the week after week and year after year maintenance of social relationships throughout the land. The scribes, as scholars trained in writing and experts in the scriptures and laws of their society, carried their authority with them wherever they were consulted. The Pharisees earned respect in their communities through their meticulous and public observance of the laws of God. And there were, most probably, other men of substance and standing who did not need to fly the colours of any party. Landowners, heads of respected local families, with wealth and reputation behind them, they could claim as of right their status as leaders in the synagogue.

It is not surprising that Jesus' work was rooted in these communities. Here were the natural gatherings of the people of Israel for whom the kingdom of God was coming. Here were the ordinary everyday structures and doings, the loves, struggles, quarrels and injustices in which they were now called to repent, changing their ways for a new order under God. Here, people knew about patching clothes and putting wine into skins, they worried about burglars, and dinner parties and weddings were the highlights of life. Here in the villages of Galilee work and wealth were both of the land, where seed was sown and seen to grow, where the kingdom itself would take root and grow in a similar way, slowly but surely, and in the end spectacularly, changing their lives. And here there were many who came to him for healing and forgiveness, to be reassured about God and their relationship with him.

Jerusalem was a very different place, and if Jesus went there he would be confronting a different face of Israel. The city was not of strategic importance, economically or militarily, to Rome, except that it was of enormous importance to their Jewish subjects, culturally, emotionally, spiritually. As a place of incredible religious fervour, a place for emotions to boil over and a Jewish revolt against Roman power to explode, it had to be watched, and its leaders were always on notice to keep good order, a tight control that would subdue any nationalist feelings fermenting in the overheated atmosphere. Respected by the people, the Sanhedrin could be of use to the Roman authorities, who would in turn leave them in such respect and authority as they enjoyed. It all came to rest upon a delicate and dangerous balance between the aspirations of the people (so much encouraged by some of the stories in their tradition) and the practical realities of Roman rule. In short, the priests, scribes and Pharisees who held or administered power in Jerusalem were responsible for the religious fervour of their people and for keeping that fervour in check, assuring the Roman authorities that, whatever the people might dream, in practice there would be no disturbance of the Roman peace.

It was a very difficult balance to maintain, and it was not at all surprising if sceptical Roman governors made a point of being personally present in Jerusalem, with their soldiers, at the time of the greatest religious festivities.

*

*

*

After two years or more of ministry in his own country, Jesus was going to Jerusalem. The event in the wilderness had shown that Israel was indeed to be reconstituted, or perhaps for the first time to be constituted, as the people God had striven to make them in the time of Moses. No part of Israel could be left out. God's plans were for all of his people and the kingdom would be for Jerusalem too. Before his work was done, Jesus would have to go to Jerusalem and there too, show Israel the way that would at last fulfil the law and the will of God.

We have seen how he recognised the call for an ongoing leadership, how he came to understand, especially when the people of Galilee rallied to him in crowds and he fed them in the wilderness, that the twelve he had chosen to share his mission to Galilee would be leaders and teachers in Israel as Israel went forward into the new order that God was bringing about.

Since then, he had striven to teach them, to help them recognise the way of God, to understand the revelation they had received in him and to gain some understanding of the kingdom of God he proclaimed. If they were to lead, to be the "first" in the new kingdom, they would have to learn the way of God that Israel was finding so difficult. Above all, they would have to face and overcome the temptations that corrupt all authority, even God-given and rightful authority. He had warned them about the yeast of the Pharisees and Herod, the civil and political leaders in Galilee whose fondness for power and status, whose lust for wealth or need to control had turned their rule into oppression and exploitation. There was no guarantee that Jesus' disciples would not go the same way.

They must know that power and authority in the kingdom of God consist in the humble service of others, the ability to understand and to minister to the needs of others. But they were slow learners. He had heard them once when they were making their way back to Capernaum, arguing on the way about their respective roles. They were already jostling for position, discussing as they went along which of them had the greater claims and could expect to play the greatest part in the new kingdom. On that occasion he had told them: "Anyone who wants to be first, will have to take the bottom place as everyone's servant." To emphasise the point, he called in a little child and stood him there, putting his arms around him. They were to make themselves the servants of children. The highest

Jesus Messiah

post in the new kingdom would be that of pre-school teacher. “Whoever accepts one of these children in my name accepts me – and not only me, but the one who sent me.”¹

Another time² some people started bringing their children to him for blessings and the disciples tried to keep them away while Jesus attended to more important matters. But Jesus was angry and rebuked them: “Let the children come. The kingdom of heaven belongs to them. I tell you no one will even enter the kingdom until they learn to welcome it like a little child.” The incident is often quoted in a sentimental way. We are taught that we have to be child-like but not childish, but there are different ideas about what that means. For my part, I think it is most important to remember that childhood did not figure in Jesus’ society as a time of innocent and carefree play. It was simply the time before you were a productive member of the family unit, when you were too little and too inexperienced to pull your weight. You were dependent on the others and you had no power. And this was the model that Jesus proposed for all citizens of the kingdom of God.

*

*

*

When Jesus at last moved towards Jerusalem, he did so with caution. He went first to parts of Judea on the far side of the Jordan, where he carried on his work teaching the gathered crowds about the coming kingdom of God. He was dealing with major issues in social and political life, giving, in answer to a question from the Pharisees, his firm teaching on divorce; and in answer to a question from the rich man, his even stronger teaching on wealth (which we discussed in the previous chapter).

The question of wealth had been a particularly hard one. Peter and Andrew and the others might not have been wealthy before – but neither were they poor. They were fishermen, but it would seem that their fishing was a productive little family business. The father of James and John employed other fishermen in his boats.³ They had given up something to follow Jesus and the discomforts of their life trekking around Galilee and the Decapolis with very little resources were indeed a sacrifice. If Jesus was now saying there was no wealth as reward ahead, if the leaders in the new kingdom were not to be made comfortable with money, what was their reward to be?

Jesus said, “You can be sure of this: no one who has given up house, family, children or land for my sake, and for the sake of the good news, will fail to receive a hundred times over what they have given up: houses, family, children, land – not without persecution - in this present world. And in the world to come they will have eternal life. (Mark 10: 29 – 30)

It is about this present world, where they will find themselves endowed – perhaps in ways they cannot yet imagine – with houses, families, children and lands, with everything that represents security, belonging and a future in this world; only they will not escape the hostility of the world as well, and its persecution. All that is what the kingdom of God will be for them – and in the world to come it will be eternal life.

We’re probably not as startled as we ought to be by this last promise. We take it for granted that Jesus’ teaching and his promises are always about another and future world, about heaven as a world beyond death. Only they were not – and Mark’s gospel has not mentioned “eternal life” until this point. The good news of Jesus was not just about a life after death, which many Israelites had come to believe in and hope for before his time. It was about the kingdom of God coming, breaking upon this world and radically changing it, to make it a place where the just and generous rule of God would operate.

¹ Mark 9:37 ² Mark 10: 13 - 16 ³ Mark 1: 19 – 20

And now Jesus speaks of a larger, wider dimension: of eternal life in an age to come. But one idea follows the other seamlessly. It's not as if the "age to come" – and much less any "world to come" or "other world" – is the real point of the gospel, distinct from the coming of the kingdom of God in this world and history where we are. Jesus speaks of the one as he speaks of the other. The gospel points us to the age of eternal life to come, but only as it points us to the sharp reality of the kingdom of God coming here in this world and time, with all its rewards, challenges and pains. Those who may look forward to "eternal life in the age to come" are those who have welcomed the reality of the kingdom in this present time, who have left all for the sake of the good news of that kingdom, to receive all from God, even in this present time.

If the disciples were reassured by Jesus' promise of reward and of life to come, they were puzzled by other things he was saying as they took the road to Jericho. This was the main road from the trans-Jordan to Jerusalem. He had told them that they were going up to Jerusalem, and he was trying to tell them what that would mean, for him, if not for them: rejection, humiliation, betrayal and death. It frightened some of them, but James and John at least had seen an opportunity and were building plans of their own. If Jesus was going to assert his authority at last and establish the kingdom of which he had spoken, perhaps becoming King in Jerusalem as David had been long before, it was time for them to make their bid for the top places. They concluded that the prize would go to the boldest and that they should make a joint approach to Jesus before anyone else got in. So they got him alone and asked for the two top seats – "one on your right hand and one on your left". They didn't dream what they were asking for. Jesus asked them if they could really go thru everything that was in store for him and boldly they assured him, "We can."

And they would. I think I hear a certain sadness in Jesus' reply as he assures them they will indeed go thru the sufferings that lie ahead of him, but he dismisses their obsession with status. "The places on my right hand and my left have been allotted. They are not mine to give."¹

The other ten were outraged that the brothers had tried to steal a march on them. If Jesus had hoped that his disciples were redy for the confrontation with Jerusalem and its systems of power, redy for the crunch that must soon come, he must have been bitterly disappointed. They were divided, jostling for position like a clamour of newly elected politicians, eager for status and power. Everything he had said and shown them about the children of the kingdom and his warnings about the yeast of the Pharisees and of Herod had washed over them and gone. If Jesus was about to take a decisive step, he would be doing so alone. There was no one with him who understood his message, or understood what Jerusalem would be – must be – for anyone who came with that message.

He had come to Jericho and was leaving there at last, with a large crowd following him. On the last stage of the journey to Jerusalem, there was still no sign that he had succeeded in showing anyone, even his closest disciples, what the kingdom was like. One final time, he did what he could do. A blind man named Bartimaeus was pushing into the crowd, shouting out: "Son of David, have pity on me!" Alredy a blind man was giving him the title that would lift him to glory or condem him as a fraud in Jerusalem. Jesus had not succeeded in enabling any of his followers to see what the kingdom of God really ment for them, but he could open the eyes of a blind man. The compassion that had moved him to take pity on the people was still the compassion that moved the power of God when they turned to him in faith:

Jesus said to the blind man: "Go. Your faith has healed you." and the man's sight came back at once. (Mark 10:52)

¹ Mark 10: 40

Jesus Messiah

Jesus was able to heal the blind man, but he had not been able to make his disciples see. They still could not see that the kingdom of God, which was about society, economics and politics was not about power as all the world expects to see and use power. They did not understand, and we have rarely understood since. Even Christian churches have for some generations now reversed the teaching of Jesus, claiming at once that it is not about politics and economics, and that it does legitimate power of the kind that Jesus repudiated.

Why was Jesus going to Jerusalem? If his mission was to reach out to people with the compassion of God, heal them of their ills, teach them a better way of living and relating to one another, gather and train disciples to carry his teaching further and generally to “save souls” he could do that much more effectively by staying away from Jerusalem. Who knows how many more years he might have been able to carry on the kind of ministry that many now proclaim as the very essence of evangelism? And who knows how much more he could have taught his disciples if he had taken more time?

Jesus had shown good sense in keeping away from Jerusalem, and there was no sense in his going there now, unless he did, in fact, mean to challenge the authorities and to set up his kingdom once and for all. But he had made no preparations at all for a successful coup. It is to the credit of his disciples that, if they were thinking still of an imminent takeover of power in the holy city, they were prepared to believe he could do it. They saw enough of the power of God in his words and deeds to trust that, however he moved, God would move with him and give him the victory. They believed in him. But, as Jesus’ warnings and subsequent events were to show, they did not understand, and he did not go to Jerusalem with their anticipations.

Why did he go to Jerusalem? It is a major question for Christian theology, but 2,000 years of practical and political considerations have hindered us from attending to the answers given in the gospels – given very clearly in Mark’s gospel. Some of the answers are political, but, embarrassed by the political, we try to avoid them and end up with an obfuscating gap in our theologies. By going to Jerusalem, Jesus was affirming the full political dimension of his mission. If his mission had been limited to a personal and relational one, affecting individual hearts and souls but not extending to their social and political structures, then going to Jerusalem, where everything was political, was the best way to wreck it. Even in up-country Galilee, he had been running into problems with the civil leadership – but in Jerusalem itself he could do nothing else. Jesus was abandoning his chance to continue ministering in a fruitful way to hundreds of needy souls, in order to go and tackle the ruling authorities in the very centre of power. And he went in spite of a realisation that in this he would be defeated.

Clearly, Jesus did not believe that he had been sent only to convert hearts, as the bringer of a private or individual salvation to those who accepted it. Nor did he believe, as is sometimes asserted by Christians, that the challenge to and changing of political and social systems could only come after individual hearts had been changed, that souls had to be converted first, after which the right political and social structures would fall into place. He had not yet converted even his closest disciples and yet he was setting out to challenge his society’s political and social systems at the centre of their organisation and influence.

We can only make sense of Jesus’ actions, the juxtaposition of his final gesture of compassionate and powerful healing, the healing of blind Bartimaeus, with his resolute setting out for Jerusalem, if we see that, in his recognition of his mission, and in his compassionate understanding of human existence, the people he came to save were and always are people together, people in social and political identity. He could not, and we should not, separate the personal from the social from the political. They are all profound dimensions of the whole reality that is human life: interrelated,

interdependent, inter-identifying, all somehow imaging the nature of God, all somehow, in Israel's case, the object of God's unique and selecting love, and all, somehow, deeply hostile to God.

Jesus could have gone on for some time healing and teaching, but unless and until he addressed the social and political reality that was Israel he could not fulfil his mission; he would not really have come to them; he would not be their Messiah. He had to face those structures of social organisation, the interlinked systems of value, influence and power that defined them as a community and a nation, to challenge and change them, or he would not be bringing to them the rule of God.

Leaving behind his Galilean ministry, he was making his way to Jerusalem, by any standards of any period of history totally unprepared and unequipped for an assault on the nation's political fastness. The conclusion often drawn from this, and one that saves the church from many embarrassments, is that Jesus was renouncing any interest in the social-political sphere and was showing himself the ruler of an inner kingdom of the heart, Messiah in a private religious world to which all political structures were irrelevant. That conclusion not only ignores the meaning of Messiah, but falsifies the gospel and makes a nonsense, as I have said, of his going up to Jerusalem at all. If he had to show that political structures were irrelevant to his mission, he should have ignored Jerusalem altogether and carried on with his "spiritual" work in Galilee.

He went up to Jerusalem, where he would inevitably engage the highest Jewish authorities at the centre of their power. A political mission, whatever else it was as well. Jesus did not renounce the social or the political, the structures of the nation or the networks of influence by which social order was maintained; he came to engage with them where they were most visibly and tangibly operative: in Jerusalem. What he renounced, in going empty-handed into the heart of power, were the methods and the resources that power relied on, the justifications it asserted and the rewards it claimed. Jesus came, proclaiming the kingdom of God and renouncing, not politics but the power bases of politics, not social involvement but the posturing and status on which society is structured, not the public building of order and community but the methods commonly used to make communities not in the image of God's purpose but in the mould of the will of the powerful.

*

*

*

At last, Jesus came within sight of Bethphage and Bethany, villages on the outskirts of the city. From here on, he would be making his entry into Jerusalem, and he did not hesitate to make it clear what his claim was, how he would assert it and its full, political import. He would enter Jerusalem as its king. But to make it clear how different a meaning he gave to "king" he would enter the city riding on the back of a young donkey. Tho a king, it would be a very humble king that came to Jerusalem. In fact, it looks as if he had arranged it all beforehand thru contacts he had in the villages thereabouts. He was able to tell his disciples where they would find the donkey, and that the owners would let them take it, once they explained it was for him.

Crowds from the city and the surrounding villages were already gathering to welcome him. The famous rabbi, the prophet, or even the king was coming at last to Jerusalem! Riding a donkey on which his disciples had thrown their cloaks as a cover – a very minimum of pomp and significance and very far short of descent from the parapet of the temple – there was little sign of royal power. But it was enuf. He was both prompting and acknowledging the title with which the crowds acclaimed him, as they spread their cloaks on the road and strewed the way before him with branches they had cut from bushes in the fields around:

Hosanna, Saviour! Blessings on the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessings on the coming kingdom of our father David! (Mark 11;9)

Jesus Messiah

The muted triumph, but loud and lively in the mouths of his welcomers, of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, is inexplicable except as a willing demonstration by Jesus of a truly political claim: the arrival of a king and the beginning of a kingdom. To anyone with any idea of political realities it was laughable as an attempt to seize power, but it was a clear statement nonetheless, and in a city as volatile as Jerusalem, at such a dangerous time (for the Passover festival was approaching), any enthusiastic movement in the crowds was disturbing – and Jesus did come with an alarming reputation.

Entering Jerusalem, he went straight to the Temple and took in what he saw there. It was late in the day and he would do no more, for he had come with a challenge but he would not make his challenge under cover of darkness. He went back to Bethany, where he and his disciples were staying. The next day he returned to the Temple, specifically to the outer court, which had become a thriving market place. There were sheep and doves to be sold for the regular sacrifices that people were required to make on special occasions; donations to be taken; the services of a scribe or a lawyer or a priest to be negotiated; and money to be changed. No Jew would dream of using Roman money with its blasphemous image of the emperor for temple transactions. For buying and selling in the temple a special currency was available, Jewish coins without any offensive images on them. You changed your normal every-day-in-the-street Roman coin for this acceptable temple money, and with this you could carry out all your transactions in the Temple without offence to God. As always with money-changing, there was, I suppose, a built-in commission and profit for the changers.

It was a very busy and profitable place, especially in the run-up to festivals. There was so much coming and going in the outer court that people with goods to carry from A to B in Jerusalem, whose path would be shorter if they cut thru the temple, thought nothing of making its market a thoroughfare. Of course, all Jews held the Temple in deepest respect, but as churches and shrines have been discovering ever since, it's very easy to link deepest respect with largest profit. Of course, only the outermost court was used like this, a part of the Temple so far from sacred that even gentiles were allowed to come into it.

Jesus was outraged by what he saw. He would cause no disturbance at night, but when he came back the next day he let his anger flow. He drove out the people who were trading there. He threw over the tables of the money changers, no doubt spilling valuable coins all over the ground, and the chairs of the pigeon-sellers. He stopped people from carting their goods thru the temple as if it were an open street.

“Scripture says, ‘my house shall be a house of prayer for all the nations’ ” he told them, “but you have made it a den of thieves.”
(Mark 11:17)

Jesus was outraged that this place above all, the only part of the temple that well-disposed foreigners could enter to pray to God, had been turned into a busy money-spinner.

There are those Christians who assume without question that any noisy protest action, let alone any destructive one, is necessarily offensive to Christian principles and to the will of God. Jesus countenances only mild, peaceable actions, with respect for constituted authority ruling out the very idea of angry street protests. In reality, Jesus did not lack respect for the authority of those who presided in the temple, but he was both loud and violent in his protest against their abuse of authority in the way they ran its affairs. It was a serious matter, an issue for anger, and when anger was called for he did not hold back.

Nor will his followers. When people take to the streets in angry protest at the conspiracies of international trading powers, as they did in Seattle and Genoa,¹ it may well be a profoundly Christian decision to do so, a decision to accept the Messiah for real and to share his anger at institutional evil. A few years ago, a small group of women broke into the base where British Hawk jets were awaiting delivery to the Indonesian military, who were using them to bomb the people of occupied East Timor. They used hammers to disable and smash the weapons guidance systems – for they had researched their target carefully – and left videos in the cockpits showing the trauma of war in East Timor and explaining why they had taken this action. The “Ploughshares” group argued in court that they had responsibly directed their action against the means of waging genocidal war upon an innocent people, and were acquitted by an English jury. But whether they had been acquitted or not, their actions were totally in line with the actions of Jesus: anger directed with care and restraint against actual abuses, and a willingness to account for their actions.

Christians have been imprisoned in the United States for attacking nuclear installations, and in many countries at many times those who would be followers of Jesus the Messiah will have to stand even against their own nations, their own governments and rightly constituted authorities, in his name. If we bear witness to the kingdom Jesus proclaimed, sometimes it will be us in the Temple, roused by God’s own anger to protest and take action.

Jesus came to Jerusalem to challenge and change his society. And he began with a clear, demonstrative and even violent (tho the violence was restrained and carefully directed) protest. His was a protest against the misrule of Israel, the abuse of Israel’s status as a people belonging to God; against economic practices that were allowed to overrule their role of providing the gentile nations with a way to God. In coming to Jerusalem, Jesus had entered into the final conflict, the national or political conflict, where he would directly engage with the leaders of his society, winning and changing his people, or they would kill him.

¹ Protesting at the G8 meetings of the world’s leading economic powers.