

The Joint Commission on Peace

MEMBERS

| | Diocese |
|---|----------------|
| Dr. William H. Anderson, Jr. | North Carolina |
| The Rt. Rev. G. P. Mellick-Belshaw | New Jersey |
| Dr. J. Jefferson Bennett | Alabama |
| The Rev. Bruce H. Cooke | Virginia |
| Mary Nash Flagg | Maine |
| The Rev. Everett W. Francis | Bethlehem |
| The Rt. Rev. William C. Frey, <i>Chairman</i> | Colorado |
| Marion Huston | Ohio |
| Dr. Allan M. Parrent | Virginia |
| The Rev. Nathaniel W. Pierce | Idaho |
| The Rt. Rev. Richard M. Trelease, Jr. | Rio Grande |
| Dr. Paul L. Ward | Virginia |

The Joint Commission wishes to express its thanks to the Rev. Charles Cesaretti of the Executive Council staff who served as staff liaison, and to the Rev. Dr. Alan Geyer and the Rev. Robert Gessert who served as consultants.

REPORT

Foreword: To Make Peace

The 66th General Convention created the Joint Commission on Peace and charged it to present to the 67th General Convention "a comprehensive program for implementing the 1968 House of Bishops' Pastoral Letter as it pertains to peace and war." Those appointed to the Commission represented a broad spectrum of the Church's life and thought, including its thought on issues of war and peace.

Conscious that the strength of the 1962 statement was its grounding in biblical and theological principles, we intentionally began our work with an examination of the bases for a Christian understanding of peace and peacemaking. Any programmatic suggestions should be based on that foundation. We then investigated the international, national, and domestic implications of the arms race; the consequent dependence on military power; and the long-term effects of these on individuals, churches, nations, and the whole fabric of human society.

Whatever our original points of view, the members of the Commission discovered as we progressed that we could all find common ground in the bishops' statement of 1962. We were heartened more recently by the October, 1981, Pastoral from the House of Bishops which addressed the same concern with the same sense of urgency. The bishops therein stated that "massive nuclear overkill poised for instant use represents deadly insecurity for the super-powers, and for the whole world," and they committed themselves to a weekly act of prayer and fasting for the peace of the world.

One of the most encouraging things to us as a Commission was the discovery of how far we are from being alone in our sense of urgency about the task before us. In the brief time since the founding of our Commission, there has been an enormous multiplication of groups, both religious and secular, voicing concern about the continuing nuclear arms spiral, the threats to world peace and stability, the consequent erosion of human values

in our society, and our puzzling complacency in the face of these facts. Virtually every major Christian communion in the United States has raised its voice on these issues, and many have already implemented programs for peace study and action.

But our conclusions have been supported not only by Christian and other religious groups. We have found that some responsible military leaders are of a similar mind. We have also found ourselves sharing similar goals with organizations representing many of the physicians of our nation, atomic scientists, engineers, ranchers and cattlemen, environmentalists, and factory workers.

In all of this, it is hard to avoid the conviction that the Lord himself is stirring the hearts and minds of his people all over the world to perceive the dreadful consequences of a possible nuclear holocaust unless all of us everywhere learn that, in the words of the 1981 Pastoral Letter, "the real unit of security is the totality of the human family. The only security available to any nation is the security of all nations together." The bishops consequently pledged themselves to challenge repeatedly the leaders of this and other nations to "repudiate reliance on military threats in favor of the more demanding discipline of military restraint and negotiation for arms control." They then called upon their people to join them in this challenge. We see the convergence of all these developments as nothing less than a call to repentance—personal, ecclesiastical, national, and international.

In the face of what appears to be cosmic evil, a commitment to absolute pacifism may appear to be very attractive. For the majority of the members of our Commission, it also appears to be impossible. Violence so pervades our world that there appears to be no escape. One either participates actively, by violent words or deeds, or passively, by becoming an accomplice to violence through acquiescence when others are attacked. However, the very causes which seem to make absolute pacifism impossible make active peacemaking obligatory.

The Rt. Rev. William C. Frey, *Chairman*

INTRODUCTION: THE DILEMMA

"Because of the nature of the Christian faith, Christians have an imperative obligation to pray and work for peace among men and nations. Questions of war and peace are not remote and peripheral concerns for the committed Christian; they grow out of basic understandings of man and his destiny which are inherent in the Christian revelation." With these words the House of Bishops began their 1962 Pastoral Letter on war and peace. We do no less.

It is certainly true that, as citizens of the kingdom of God, Christians do have "an imperative obligation to pray and work for peace among men and nations." At the same time, Christians in the United States of America are citizens of a particular nation. We feel a strong sense of obligation to defend our country in what must be recognized as a tense and sometimes hostile world. In this dual citizenship lies our apparent dilemma.

On the one hand, there is our very human need for national security. This security seems to have become increasingly elusive in the contemporary world. It is currently being maintained precariously by nuclear weapons and delivery systems which grow more sophisticated and numerous each year, and by a military establishment which consumes large amounts of human, economic, and other finite resources.

On the other hand, all-out nuclear war is a real possibility at every moment. Were such a catastrophe to occur, civilization, and indeed perhaps most of earthly creation, could be incinerated. No realistic appraisal of international politics, the capabilities of

modern weapons, and human history can deny the real possibility of such an occurrence. Many think it illusory to believe that nuclear weapons can be in existence indefinitely without being used. Yet the Christian faith could never sanction the actions which would bring such a global holocaust or its incalculably evil consequences.

This dilemma of two obligations, arising from two citizenships, has been in some form a constant element of Christian political thought. It was addressed directly by Jesus and St. Paul. Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Hooker, Temple, and many others, have made significant contributions to this aspect of the Christian political tradition.

In our own era this dilemma is manifested sharply in the questions concerning war and peace in a nuclear age. For many years, however, we have tended to resolve these questions either by avoiding them or by ignoring the legitimate claims of one or the other of our loyalties. Some, for example, have placed their trust in "chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are strong" (*Isaiah 31:1*). Others have chosen to reflect more on life after death than on life after nuclear war, assuming either that nuclear war will never happen or that we will not survive it. *They may well be wrong on both counts.*

A large-scale nuclear war would plainly not be in our national interest, however that might be defined. Hence we believe it must be a major goal of all responsible and caring citizens of this nation to seek peace, including a lowering of mutually destructive capabilities through arms control and disarmament. The same goal is incumbent upon citizens of the Kingdom of God, who have "an imperative obligation to pray and work for peace among men and nations." It is in that confluence of goals and interests that our hope lies. *Responsible patriotism demands our involvement in the work for peace. Even more profoundly our Christian faith calls us to the same work.*

This report seeks to assist Episcopalians in thinking through and living out their "imperative obligation" as Christian citizens "to pray and work for peace among men and nations." It was mandated by the 1979 General Convention, which requested a proposed program to implement the 1962 House of Bishops Pastoral Letter on War and Peace. The Joint Commission on Peace, created to implement that task, has attempted to respond in the following way:

1. To explore some of the biblical, theological, and historical roots of this Christian imperative, seeking insight and guidance from the Christian tradition;
2. To identify some of the specific domestic and international implications of our contemporary situation, implications to which the Christian community is called to respond;
3. To challenge the Episcopal Church to make the necessary provisions to implement its peacemaking initiative.

SCRIPTURE, THEOLOGY, AND HISTORY: SOME GUIDANCE FROM THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

The Commission has chosen three specific areas for extended analysis. The first section examines the relation of the Christian to the state. What are our obligations to the secular authorities and how does our faith illuminate that aspect of life? When we affirm that civil authority is given by God, the creator, does that affirmation necessarily lead to uncritical obedience?

The second section looks at the opportunities for Christians, who are also citizens, to live out the gospel message in realistic ways in the cause for peace. How might we properly love our political "enemies"?

Finally, the third section reviews some of the relevant insights on questions of war and peace gained from the involvement of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church historically and up to the present, and suggests where the same Spirit challenges us in our own time.

A. God, the Church, and the State

How does one reconcile what at times appear to be the conflicting responsibilities of our dual citizenship? Jesus faced this issue in his own time when he was asked: "Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not?" (see *Matthew 22:15-22*; also *Mark 12:13-17* and *Luke 20:20-26*). Caesar was the leader of an occupying foreign nation despised by many Jews. This question, addressed to Jesus by a disciple of the Pharisees, invites a Yes or No answer, perhaps with some explanation. We often overlook the fact that Jesus never answers the question directly. We often assume that Jesus answers Yes, although none of the three gospel accounts report this. Rather, Jesus replies as follows: "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" (*Matthew 22:21*).

Jesus' answer, of course, raises another question: What indeed belongs to Caesar and what belongs to God? Given the format of the story, it is tempting to assume that money belongs to Caesar, whose image is on the money, and therefore that one should pay taxes unquestioningly. No less an authority than St. Paul seems to commend this view: "Pay your taxes, therefore, for those who constantly attend to this task are God's agents" (*Romans 13:6*).

Surely, however, there is something which does not seem entirely sufficient about this view, something that was clear to many of our ancestors at the time of the American Revolution and that is known by many Christians in our own day. A clue to a fuller understanding is to be found in the stewardship message conveyed during the Every Member Canvass in a parish.

During that annual effort the faithful are called upon to reflect on God and on God's many gifts to every person, especially the gift of his Son, and then to respond with good stewardship of our financial resources. To the best of our ability we are to place God at the center of his decision-making process. Allocating financial and other resources, therefore, can be and at its best will be a witness to God's presence in our lives. This challenge to place God at the center touches every decision of both stewardship and citizenship, including investment policies and paying one's taxes.

Can such an affirmation, which grows out of the theology of stewardship, be reconciled with Jesus' answer to the disciple of the Pharisees? If the emphasis is placed on the word *and*, it becomes clear that this is precisely what Jesus is saying: "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's *and* to God the things that are God's." This means that, in every act of rendering to the state, we are simultaneously called to render obedience to God himself. The obligation to "render to God" both mandates and limits the obligation to "render to Caesar." God is the Lord of *all* of life, including political life. Just as Caesar's image is on the coin, God's image is on us. This fundamental fact of Christian existence should shape *all* of our actions.

This interpretation forms a foundation for support of the state where it is perceived to be fulfilling its God-ordained function of providing and maintaining a just and ordered society, and for criticism and correction when it is not. As we know from Christian history, this may conceivably lead even to civil disobedience when Caesar's directives clearly violate our best sense of God's intention for the state, or when they are directly contrary to our vision of what citizenship in the kingdom of God is all about. An alternative is to acquiesce to Caesar and forget about rendering to God, an act which would deny our

baptismal covenant. Indeed, in his very death on the cross our Lord was rendering to Caesar *and* to God simultaneously. The cross is the supreme example of this teaching put into practice.

All this becomes only clearer when we turn to Romans 13:1-7. A reading of that passage today might lead one to believe that the creation of the incredibly destructive power of nuclear weapons is indeed the will of God, "for the authorities are ministers of God" (*Romans 13:6*). Yet, the context in which Romans 13:1-7 is situated is sometimes neglected. Obedience to Caesar, while certainly affirmed, is conditioned by the great teachings which lie at the center of the Christian faith: "Repay no one evil for evil . . . live peaceably with all. . . . Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord" (*Romans 12*). "You shall not kill. . . . You shall love your neighbor as yourself. Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (*Romans 13:9-10*). The constant human temptation is to see two separate worlds: the secular, which includes the state, where we affirm one set of values; and the sacred where we affirm another. The incarnation abolished this separation permanently for the Christian community.

The task, then, before the committed Christian is to support the state when it performs its God-given tasks and to seek to reform it when it fails in those tasks. The following well-known prayer for the Church is entirely appropriate for government:

Where it is corrupt, purify it;
where it is in error, direct it;
where in anything it is remiss, reform it.
Where it is right, strengthen it;
where it is in want, provide for it;
where it is divided, reunite it.

The prayers offered every Sunday in churches throughout this land for our own government and public officials are not simply a courteous gesture. Rather they are a reflection of a fundamental understanding of the classical Christian tradition: government is called to prepare for the coming of the kingdom of God through the proper execution of its own special but limited role just as much as is the community of faith. Justice and peace among peoples and nations are major biblical themes. For Christians they are therefore imperative obligations with direct political implications.

At the beginning the dilemma appeared to be in the form of conflicting obligations resulting from dual citizenship: citizenship in the United States and citizenship in the kingdom of God. That apparent dilemma is one of the results of divorcing the state from its responsibilities to be an agent of God's kingdom and of severing the Christian faith from its political implications. Once those relationships are reaffirmed by the Christian community, then the challenge to embody the gospel in our personal and corporate dealings with and on behalf of the state becomes part of our imperative obligation.

B. Incarnating the Gospel: Love Your Enemies

How does the New Testament, and its implications for personal moral behavior, relate to the world of the state, war, and power politics? In any modern democracy worthy of the name, the government is only one part of the apparatus of political decision-making. Another essential part of the political process is the supporting attitudes and electoral choices of citizens which strongly influence, and at times may even reverse, the decisions of governments. Christians facing the complex issues of war and peace, whether as citizens or as public servants, cannot forget or ignore the Christian conviction that God is Lord and Father of all people everywhere.

Yet Jesus' call to "Love your enemies" is a commandment that strikes many

Christians as impractical in the international arena, or as too extreme for everyday life. Most Christians have tried to love some personal enemy. But applying the gospel injunction toward our nation's enemies is another matter. Like the Christian faith itself, it has not so much been tried and found wanting as it has been found difficult and not tried. In a crisis we are likely to think only that we must stand with and protect our own kind.

Jesus fully understood the difficulty. He chose the enmity between Jews and Samaritans for his illustration of what it means to love one's neighbor. Once in his ministry he went outside Palestine, into what is now Lebanon. There a Syro-Phoenician woman asked him to heal her daughter. According to both Matthew and Mark his first response was a direct rebuff, using the Semitic insult-word: *dogs*. In our day an Israeli crossing that same border, or equally an Arab crossing in the opposite direction, might feel like responding in exactly this way to a request for help. Every culture tells its members whom they can safely scorn.

It is tempting to trivialize certain passages in the Sermon on the Mount. "Love your enemies, and pray for your persecutors" (*Matthew 6:44, NEB*) is not only easy to recite; it can also be interpreted to mean that including "enemies" in formal prayers is all that is called for. But prayer to almighty God is no mere verbal exercise or courteous gesture. It implies, assumes, and requires action consonant with the prayer. For the prophets, to know God is to do justice. Similarly for Luke, to love our enemies involves the integration of action and speech with prayer:

*do good to those who hate you;
bless those who curse you;
pray for those who treat you spitefully.*

The difficulty of the command seems huge. Indeed, these words of Jesus have often been explained away as impossible demands for us in our world. But careful Bible study shows that when they were spoken they were intended and accepted as possible in the new age that had dawned and by virtue of new life in the kingdom of God. "Love your enemies" announced a new goal because new life, and the energy for it, are being made available.

So we are not to assume that we are to love our enemies only when we can rationalize that the enmity is over something of secondary importance, or only when our enemies persecute us personally—but no one else. The cases that matter most for world peace, after all, are those in which we believe with some reason that those whom we consider enemies threaten death or crippling loss to those for whom we are responsible, or that they attack essential features of the society that gives us freedom and life.

Can God's forgiving love empower us in any practical sense to love enemies in such cases? Jesus' encounters with the Syro-Phoenician woman (*Mt. 15:12-28; Mk. 7:24-30*), the Roman soldier (*Lk. 7:1-10*), and the centurion at the cross (*Mt. 27:54; Mk. 15:39; Lk. 23:47*) are suggestive. If we first depersonalize or dehumanize our enemies, even unconsciously, it becomes easier to do them evil. Those who deliberately use violence almost always treat their victims as things rather than as human beings. To deal out destruction impersonally from a distance, from a speeding car or plane, keeps this dehumanization undisturbed.

The Syro-Phoenician woman's response to Jesus asked for person-to-person respect with shocking aptness: "Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' tables." And Jesus, turning full circle from the dehumanizing metaphor, replied, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt."

In Jesus' world it was surely the Roman soldier who epitomized the national enemy.

Yet immediately after the Sermon on the Plain (*Lk. 6:17-49*), Luke places the story of Jesus' ready response to a Roman officer's request for healing a servant, and the story ends with Jesus' praise of the Roman's faith. Finally, the crowning and poignant testimony to Jesus on the cross, found in all three synoptic gospels, comes from a centurion of the occupying forces. Similarly, the book of Acts tells us that it was a centurion's conversion, confirmed by an outpouring of the Holy Spirit, that persuaded Peter's associates to welcome Gentiles into their Christian community.

Here in these examples is a readiness to recognize individuals among national enemies and interact with them. Surely a first, specific, and essential step in loving our enemies is to be sensitive to their individualities and not to be blinded by our own group's emotions.

Returning to the "Love your enemies" passage itself, the second injunction there is even more difficult: to make sure, when doing good, to do good to enemies as well as friends. God sends his rain on the just and unjust alike, and in this respect we are to imitate him. In our unprecedently violent century, a memorable example of this even-handedness was the act of a French pastor's wife who invited to dinner the two Vichy officers who had come to arrest her husband. The full story is related in Philip Hallie's *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed*. Her action typified the unhesitating way in which her whole village of Le Chambon for four years resisted evil by rescuing Jews in the face of Nazi power while at the same time doing good to individual enemies. When later asked, "How could you bring yourself to sit down to eat with these men?" her answer was, "What are you talking about? It was dinnertime; they were standing in my way; we were all hungry. The food was ready."

In the complexities of war some have found themselves like the pastor's wife, opposing the evil in their nation's enemies while doing good to individual enemies as if to friends. To look clearly at individual differences among enemies, and to seize chances for acts of charity, may even at times mean better service to one's own nation.

Loving our enemies may also mean resisting self-interest and evil in our own nation's policies. The modern Christian can take inspiration from those prophets of the Old Testament who by word and deed prepared the way for the coming of our Savior. They felt that they had a responsibility in the shaping of national policy. They spoke out against corruption and injustice in their own land even when external threat was sharpest. They proclaimed God's rule over all nations and saw that sovereignty expressed in the defeat and scattering of their own nation as judgment on its sins. In God's good time his sovereignty would be expressed equally in the restoration of their nation. The prophets in effect were obeying a command that would be made explicit in the Sermon on the Mount: remove the wooden beam from your own eye before you try to get others to remove the speck from theirs.

An essential step in loving our enemies, then, is to look for and work to correct those of our own nation's misdeeds that may contribute to the breakdown between them and us. This is part of our ongoing task of reconciliation as it applies to political life. When modern war breaks out, genuinely patriotic criticism is too often swamped by a tide of uncritical war emotions. In the face of such events, the Hebrew prophets stand as a mighty example of faithful response.

Finally, the prophets' insistence that God's role in human affairs is preeminent combines with the New Testament gospel that God is the loving Father of all people. Christians are to resist all impulses to trust in their nation's power to dominate others. Scripture casts a penetrating light on the follies of trusting in military strength alone for security.

To love our nation's enemies is today as difficult as it is urgent. Nevertheless, to avoid

dehumanizing stereotypes, to see to it that what peacetime good we do is done impartially, to champion justice self-critically on our side of any growing hostilities, and even in hostilities to continue doing good to those who may hate us, these are specific and concrete actions clearly expected of us according to scripture. They do not measure up to the sacrificial love Christians may hope to show to enemies in isolated, purely person-to-person relations. Nor do they rule out the sometimes necessary use of organized force in the service of justice and peace. But they do describe an attitude, a perspective, an intentionality which should inform our actions toward "enemies," even in the midst of conflict when the possibilities for peace and reconciliation seem most remote.

Paul, in his words leading to Romans 13, is not unmindful of the limits of human possibilities for achieving peace in this world: "If possible, so far as it lies with you, live at peace with all men." These words also recognize that peace, humanly speaking, depends on two parties. There are times in human history when peace seems impossible, both in personal relations and in international relations. The injunction to "Love your enemies" and the call to seek reconciliation are no less imperative in either situation of hostility, personal or corporate. But the ways in which faithful responses to these commands may be and have been expressed historically vary considerably. This is because the way love is expressed and the way reconciliation is sought are of necessity shaped by the arena of life in which we seek to express and seek them. There is no area of life in which love is more difficult to translate into relevant action, and reconciliation more elusive, than the arena of international politics. There is also no area of life in which both are more urgent.

C. War and the Christian Tradition

Historically, the dilemmas of "rendering unto Caesar" and "loving our enemies" have proved to be the most perplexing for Christians when they must face the question of the use of military force by the state against its enemies, and the question of Christian participation in such conflict. When the state, the corporate entity which has been equipped in a unique way with power to maintain order and justice in this world, engages in the overt use of military force, what is the Christian to do? Christians in every age have had to deal with this fundamental moral problem, trying to find an answer for *their* time in history to the question: In the light of our understanding of God's nature and his will for humankind, what is our perspective on war and the participation of Christians in war? Can a disciple of the Prince of Peace justifiably engage in the use of military force? The church's experience through the centuries can illuminate the thinking of present-day Christians as they face the question in a new and dangerous historical context.

Many in the early church did not recognize this issue as a major moral dilemma because the early church was in effect pacifist in its orientation, a position taken in response to its understanding of its recent experience with Jesus and the implications in their time of his teaching. Many in the contemporary church likewise do not recognize the question as posing a major moral dilemma, but often this is because the question isn't even seriously raised in the context of the Christian community. This may be because of an attitude of unquestioning obedience to the state, whereby the church automatically defers to what the political authorities command. Or it may be because of a narrowly circumscribed view of the relevance of the Christian faith which excludes it from consideration in such "secular" matters. Such capitulation, or such compartmentalization of Christian faith was never legitimate and today it is indefensible. In our contemporary world, where technology has made instant and cataclysmic destruction possible, and where counter-violence is justified as a means to liberation from the violence of oppression, the question of Christians and war must be addressed yet again, for *our* time in history.

Historically the Christian tradition has, at various times, advocated pacifism, the just or justifiable war, and the crusade or holy war as legitimate Christian perspectives on war. Only the first two are recognized today as defensible Christian perspectives. The pacifist position has always been and continues to be recognized and honored as a viable and demanding interpretation of the implications of Christian faith. It has not been the prevailing view of the Christian community on war since the fourth century, however, and it has never been the dominant perspective of the Anglican tradition. On the other hand, it is not to be discounted simply for these reasons, any more than our liturgy has discounted the liturgical practices of the early church.

In the first four centuries of the Christian era, most Christians would neither engage in Rome's military campaigns nor justify killing as a means to further the goals of the society in which they lived. This practice brought great criticism. The non-Christian, Celsus (178 A.D.) for example, reproached Christians by saying: "If all men were to do the same as you, there would be nothing to prevent the king from being left in utter solitude and desertion." Christian apologists like Justin Martyr (165 A.D.), however, wrote: "We who formerly murdered one another now not only do not make war on our enemies, but, that we may not lie or deceive our judges, we gladly die confessing Christ." Likewise, Clement of Alexandria (220 A.D.): "Various peoples incite the passions of war by martial music; Christians employ only the Word of God, the instrument of peace."

After 170 A.D. there are some reports of Christians in the Roman army, but there is evidence that they acted more as police than as soldiers. Martin of Tours (397 A.D.) remained in the Roman army for two years after his conversion, but when called upon to participate in battle, he resigned from military service, stating: "I am a soldier of Christ, I cannot fight." There is, on the other hand, evidence that some Christians resisted military service not so much on the pacifist issue as on the idolatry issue, i.e., because of the required oath of allegiance to the emperor which included emperor-worship, something monotheistic Christians could not do.

The Constantian settlement in 313 A.D. led to the gradual development and systematization over several centuries of the "just war" or "justifiable war" tradition. Beginning with Ambrose and Augustine, who brought together ideas from classical antiquity and the Judeo-Christian tradition, this perspective on questions of war and peace soon became and has remained the dominant perspective in most Christian communions, including the Anglican. (See Appendix A)

As Christianity gradually became an accepted and even preferred expression of religious faith, and as Christians began to increase in number and to find themselves in positions of civic responsibility, the Christian community found it necessary to clarify its biblical and theological understanding of the state as God's agent for maintaining peace, order, and justice in a world of conflict, disorder, and injustice. This meant also working out its understanding of the relation of Christians to the state and their role in carrying out that political function, a function which at times necessitates the use of coercive force. Out of this historical situation came the just war tradition which still informs the thinking of most Christian bodies. Christians ever since have debated whether this whole "Constantinian shift" marked the dawn of the church's sense of social responsibility or its fall into sin through a too-easy accommodation to the powers that be.

The just or justifiable war tradition recognizes that, given the Christian understanding of human nature and the reality of sin which resides both in human hearts and in human institutions, the use of coercive force may at times be morally justified as a lesser evil. Its purpose is not to bless wars or to declare them righteous. Rather, recognizing both the possibility of war and the morally questionable nature of all wars, its purpose is to hedge them about with restrictions, setting forth those criteria necessary before the recourse to war can be morally justified and seeking to limit the means that can

be morally employed in the actual conduct of even a justifiable war. The intent is to say that only within carefully specified limits and in view of the most compelling ends can Christians justify the use of military force or themselves legitimately participate in it.

This classical Christian tradition is based on at least three convictions: (1) given the possibility of war in this fallen world and given a Christian understanding of the nature and function of the state, criteria for declaring and conducting war cannot responsibly be left to the passions, prejudices, and whims of the moment; (2) while all war is evil, killing is not the only evil, and in certain circumstances participation in war can be understood as an extension of the obligation to protect the weak, to preserve life, to overcome injustice and oppression, and to express love for both the innocent neighbor and the enemy; (3) the church has some responsibility for the actions of the whole society, has some insights into moral truths established by God the Creator for the whole human community, and has some obligation to share such insight and truth with the broader society and its institutions by seeking to relate them in relevant ways to the conduct of public affairs. Without such understandings as these, the church has no basis on which it can carry on a dialogue with the state and the broader society on the conduct of public affairs in general and on the legitimate and illegitimate uses of force in particular. It will then be in danger of political irrelevance on the one hand or a too-easy accommodation to current political trends on the other.

As the Christian community engages in such dialogue from its own biblical and theological perspective, it may find itself both in support of and in opposition to specific governmental policies and actions which involve the use of military force or the preparation for such use. Payment vs. non-payment of taxes for military spending, and conscientious participation in vs. conscientious objection to war, are two examples of recurring questions in this area. Just as some American colonists refused to pay certain taxes, so today there are those who may refuse to pay taxes because of what they consider the inordinate amount of tax money going for military expenditures. Just as there have always been those who refused to kill on the basis of religious belief, so today there are those who would refuse to take up arms for the same reason. Some would refuse to kill under any circumstances; others would refuse to do so on the basis of particular circumstances which make the cause of their nation unjust in their eyes. If there can be just wars, then, according to the same criteria, there can be unjust wars.

If the church is to be in honest and informed dialogue with the state and the broader society on such fundamental public issues, and if it is to avoid the twin dangers of isolated irrelevance and a too-easy accommodation, it and its people, as has been already noted, must be free to support or oppose Caesar. This requires that the Christian community draw in the first instance on its own theological and ethical roots and not on the prevailing values of a given time and place in history. In this way Caesar will receive what he is due, but not what God is due as well. The classical just war tradition represents the church's attempt to spell out the broad implications of its theological and ethical insights on issues of war and peace, and to offer permanent criteria to guide the Christian community as it faces such issues.

In recent years, however, some fundamental questions have been raised about the continuing validity and usefulness of this classical Christian perspective. Some of the questions are perennial ones—has not this tradition in practice been a self-serving device, enabling *any* war to be justified? Given the absence of an international arbiter, can nations really be objective when they serve as judges in their own cause?

Other questions concern God's creation and human responsibility to preserve and care for it. For example, in light of the Christian conviction that humankind has been given dominion over the earth to tend it, develop it, and care for it as good stewards, where

are the destructive limits beyond which even the most justifiable of wars cannot legitimately be pursued? Does the just war tradition take account adequately of the impact of large-scale nuclear explosions, fire damage, and long-term contamination on the very natural order upon which we are all dependent?

This leads to probably the most difficult question now being raised about this traditional perspective on war. Can the just war criteria, especially the key principles of "discrimination" and "proportionality" in the conduct of war, have any continuing meaning in a nuclear era? Are such principles irrelevant where indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction are poised and ready for use, and where the prevailing strategy of "mutual assured destruction" (MAD) includes disproportionate nuclear retaliation on centers of population? Can nuclear war, and the ever-present possibility that conventional war may escalate into nuclear war, ever be a legitimate expression of the obligation to preserve life or to seek a love-inspired justice in and among nations? Can a Christian participate in a general nuclear war? In a limited nuclear war? In a war in which the use of nuclear weapons is a possibility? Can a Christian approve of even the possession of such weapons with the explicit or implicit intent to use them if necessary?

In addition to those Christians who would raise such questions on traditional pacifist grounds, an increasing number of non-pacifist Christians are asking the same questions. Some have arrived at a position of "nuclear pacifism" through the application of "just war" principles. Nuclear pacifists say basically that the advent of nuclear weapons marks a qualitative change in warfare. They conclude that an honest application of the traditional principles can only lead to the conclusion that nuclear war is intrinsically indiscriminate in its effects and an evil that is disproportionate to any conceivable good end. They therefore reject both nuclear war and all wars that may possibly escalate to nuclear war. Traditional pacifism and the realism of the just war tradition, they say, now both point to the same conclusion.

Other Christians, taking what might be called a "restricted just war" approach, would support wars which meet the traditional criteria, but would do so only so long as they remain conventional. They would see *any* resort to nuclear weapons, *any* crossing of the threshold from conventional to nuclear weapons, even those of limited capabilities, as morally unjustifiable. Some would make a moral distinction between possessing and publicly threatening to use nuclear weapons, as well as between threatening to use and actually using such weapons.

Those who defend in any fashion the continuing validity of the justifiable war tradition recognize that no criteria are fully adequate, but believe that the church cannot responsibly give up the effort to place moral limits on any war that may realistically occur. All wars since 1945 have in fact been conventional. They would urge the church to focus not only on the limitation and eventual abolition of nuclear weapons, ultimately crucial as that is, but also on strategic planning concepts for the morally permissible conduct of war. They would focus, for example, on the immorality of strategies that contemplate massive area bombing or the intentional destruction of large population areas, in short on the strategy of 'mutual assured destruction' which reportedly is part of the current military posture of the United States.

There may be no easy resolution to this moral dilemma in its contemporary form. Responsible Christians may continue to differ on the relevance of their faith for particular policy issues. The Joint Commission on Peace believes, however, that the Christian tradition provides some clear guidance and direction on specific aspects of the moral debate, for our time in history, which can and should illuminate the reflection and action of all Christians on questions of war and peace.

On four of the key morally-relevant issues, we understand that guidance and

direction as follows:

1. The Role of the Church in Public Policy Debate

It is both the right and the responsibility of Christians and Christian bodies to participate in informed public policy debates and in opinion formation on all significant public issues, especially those related to the life and death questions of war, its justification, its conduct, and participation in it. This is certainly one way of rendering appropriately and simultaneously to both God and Caesar. It is also a way of seeking to define and implement that justice in the world which Christian love of neighbor is compelled to seek if it is to be more than sentimentality. God is Lord of all life, including political life, and a perspective informed by Christian faith cannot be legitimately excluded from the arena in which public policy is formulated.

2. The Locus of Security

Nations have a legitimate right and duty to provide adequately for the common defense and security of their peoples. Increased military power and the deployment of ever-new and more sophisticated weapons systems, however, do not necessarily bring increased security. In our technological age we must be aware of the temptation of the technological imperative which would allow technology and its possibilities to determine military policy and strategy instead of the reverse. Acceding to technological determinism tends to remove moral considerations from policy decisions and to fuel the "mad momentum" of the arms race which then takes on a life of its own. The result is greater insecurity for all concerned. Fascination with technology easily leads to a kind of worship of technology and a dependence on it for ultimate security. That is a modern form of the idolatry of which scripture speaks, an idolatry which places a false hope in a human creation which will destroy its worshipers as it attains mastery over them.

3. The Rationale for Deterrence

A strategy of nuclear deterrence is at best a necessary evil for the short term. It is naive to believe that nuclear arsenals can continue indefinitely to grow and to play a major role in the defense policies and postures of the nuclear powers without such weapons eventually being used. Such a dangerous and fragile situation demands that the highest national priority be given to seeking significant steps toward the control, reduction, and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. Christians who accept nuclear deterrence as morally defensible can do so legitimately only if at the same time they understand its primary purpose to be the buying of a little more time to work for other, more peaceful, less apocalyptic alternatives.

4. The Moral Limits of Nuclear Strategy

Strategies of deterrence that are based on the intentional and indiscriminate destruction of population centers are to be condemned and opposed as repugnant to the Christian faith and tradition. Such strategies go beyond the bounds of even the most severe interpretation of "love your enemies." The former U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, George Kennan, writing as a Christian and senior statesman, has warned against the immorality of making millions of civilians and non-combatants hostage for the behavior of their own governments. In an ultimate rejection of a strictly utilitarian ethic, i.e., an ethic based on whether such a policy will "work," Kennan writes: "I am skeptical of the meaning of 'victory' and 'defeat' in their relation to modern war between great countries. To my mind the defeat is war itself. In any case it seems to me that there are times when we have no choice but to follow the dictates of our conscience, to throw ourselves on God's mercy, and not ask too many questions." There are, in other words, moral limits to warfare. It is incumbent upon Christians to determine and make clear what those limits are and then, instead of spending too much time contemplating what to do if all else fails, to trust in God for the outcome of history and focus instead on the human task of seeing that all else does not fail.

II. DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

A. Domestic Implications

The 1962 Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops reminded the Episcopal Church that, for Christians, questions of war and peace are not remote and peripheral concerns. Rather, such concerns "grow out of basic understandings of man and his destiny which are inherent in the Christian revelation." Such an understanding of the implications of Christian faith calls us to a concern not only for peacemaking among the nations, but also for the quality of the social and corporate life of our national community, and for the impact on our social fabric of the nation's military policies, policies presumably designed to protect and enhance the common life. What is in fact the social impact of such policies, and how is that impact to be evaluated in light of those "basic understandings of man and his destiny" which are part of the Christian faith?

National security policy appears to be based increasingly on the assumption that our national well-being and security are promoted primarily through the further expansion of military force, with special attention given to our nuclear capability. Military policies based on that assumption, however, when not balanced by broader understandings of security, of human needs, of the real roots of national strength and a healthy social fabric, may well undermine the very well-being and security they were designed to promote. An adequate military defense capability is one thing. The diversion of unprecedented and increasingly higher amounts of money and resources into a search for an endlessly elusive "superiority" is quite another. Such action is both self-defeating and idolatrous. It is important that every Christian, indeed every citizen, seek to understand the impact made on the general welfare of this nation by a national security policy dominated by the search for military superiority and driven by a technological imperative that is in danger of assuming a life of its own, a life which would be untrammeled by either considerations of real defense needs or moral constraints.

First, any large increase in federal military expenditures under present circumstances is likely to have a destabilizing and strongly inflationary effect on an already unstable and inflation-prone economy. There are, of course, few things that rob the poor (and the not-so-poor) more cruelly than inflation. And there are few kinds of governmental expenditures that are more inherently inflationary than military expenditures, necessary as they may be in some measure. Missiles, planes, munitions, and tanks put money into the economy in the form of wages, but provide no products to absorb that money—a classic cause of inflation. They do not become part of the production and consumption process, but rather have a separate economic existence and are eventually either discarded as obsolescent or destroyed in war. They likewise do not contribute to the nation's standard of living. When the major portion of the nation's controllable expenditures goes to produce such goods it can only continue to have a degrading effect on the nation's general economic health, certainly a major consideration in any adequate understanding of national security or the general welfare.

Second, massive military expenditures divert from the national economy many of the irreplaceable and limited resources needed to provide for other basic human needs. This includes both natural and human resources, and in both cases raises fundamental questions of stewardship. Current national priorities cause our society to expend enormous human resources of intellect, skills, imagination and inventiveness on the development of increasingly complex and expensive military hardware. The impact of such priorities not only has led in a counterproductive manner to unnecessarily complex equipment which is increasingly difficult to operate and maintain. It has also denied the use of those human skills used in such endeavors to industrial and commercial research efforts which could increase productivity, develop new products, improve the quality of goods, provide items

needed throughout the world, and strengthen the nation's ability to compete in world markets. Such desirable but thwarted results are again not irrelevant in any sufficiently broad concept of national security and the general welfare.

In the light of both of these points, it is relevant to ask if the strong economies and currencies of West Germany and Japan are related to the restrictions on the size of their military forces imposed on them after World War II. Does the relatively smaller diversion of money and resources to their armed forces account in a significant way for the expanding civilian economies and strong currencies in those nations in recent years? The world status which they sought and failed to achieve by military might is one they seem now in the process of attaining by economic might. This is made possible, surely in part, by their relative freedom from the non-productive and inflationary burden of massive military expenditures.

A *third*, and closely related, consideration in evaluating the impact on our domestic society of this diversion of resources to military purposes is to ask what "other basic human needs" are in fact being neglected as a result. It is an undeniable fact that domestic programs such as those supporting education, increased employment, job training, social services, health care, nutrition, income security, environmental protection, land use planning, public transportation and other marks of a just and humane society have been cut, sometimes drastically, in favor of military expenditures which have at the same time been increased, sometimes drastically.

In the light of a traditional Christian understanding of the proper function of the political order, and in light of our own political tradition which recognizes public responsibility for "domestic tranquility" and "the general welfare," this increasing imbalance must be seriously questioned. Such questioning must take place not only on the basis of "the general welfare," but also on the basis of national security itself. Any adequate evaluation of that security must take into account the internal threats to a society in which inhumane social conditions are not sufficiently addressed and ameliorated by the relevant political structures. While Christians may differ over precise strategies by which such social conditions might best be addressed, there is without doubt a basic moral imperative, growing out of what the 1962 Pastoral called "basic understandings of man and his destiny which are inherent in the Christian revelation," that should cause us to question current national security policies and their contribution to the existence and/or intensification of some of our domestic social ills.

A *fourth* way in which military policy impinges on the broader society is in its impact on the family structure in general and on our young people in particular. That impact, either potentially or actually, may best be identified by a series of questions:

- What happens to the young person (and his family) who has formed a value system through his church and his parents which leads him to be a conscientious objector, either to war in general or to specific wars?
- What is the effect on a family when one of its members is categorized by society as a coward, a deserter, or as unpatriotic?
- What is the effect on a family when a member is scorned for having chosen to participate in a war which subsequently becomes unpopular with the society at large?
- Are we as a nation more willing to register our offspring than to register our guns?

We are required, as baptized members of the Christian community, to face and answer these and other questions realistically as we evaluate our nation's military policies and their impact.

A *fifth* way in which current defense policies affect domestic society is found in the debilitating impact on the human psyche and on human ethical sensibilities resulting from

public awareness about existing nuclear capabilities and strategies. The horror of a nuclear holocaust is universally acknowledged. It is not necessary here to do more than sample the mind-boggling facts and figures. The current estimate is that the United States and the Soviet Union together possess about 50,000 nuclear weapons. One B-52 bomber carries more explosive power than was used by all nations in World War II. One nuclear-powered submarine can destroy half the cities of the USSR with its multiple-warhead missiles. Yet the two major nuclear powers plan to produce several thousand more nuclear warheads over the next decade, along with a new generation of long-range missiles to deliver them.

In a report in the November, 1981, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, three thousand doctors, members of Physicians for Social Responsibility, warn: "A nuclear attack on America would be the final epidemic, a medical catastrophe for which there is no cure." A spokesman said that just 200 severe burn cases would saturate all the existing burn facilities in the nation. A nuclear war, however, might cause as many as 25 million such cases, and would at the same time kill or disable three-fourths of the nation's doctors and destroy half its hospitals. In short, medical assistance after a major nuclear exchange would be virtually nonexistent. The survival of any semblance of a civilized society as we know it is a myth.

Instead of a sense of security and comfort in the knowledge that we can kill each other many times over, there seems to be a growing sense on the part of many that we are more insecure and vulnerable than ever, that there is an increasing probability of nuclear war in the foreseeable future, and that we are helpless to do anything about it. This sense of helplessness and impotence in the face of human catastrophe on a massive scale has a debilitating and psychologically numbing effect which can manifest itself in a variety of ways, both within and without the Christian community—inaction, a turning inward in the pursuit of immediate self-gratification, social detachment and unconcern for others, nihilism, or self-destructive behavior through the use of drugs, gratuitous violence, and other society-destroying phenomena.

Perhaps even more debilitating, though more subtly so, is the long-term impact on ethical sensitivities of this nation's commitment to a strategic policy of mass destruction of millions of innocent human beings. The acceptance of such a standing strategic policy can, over a long period of time, lead to or foster the gradual ethical desensitization of an entire society. When our society becomes accustomed to the idea that, in its name, its representatives are prepared to launch weapons of mass destruction aimed intentionally at centers of heavy population, it can more easily become inured to and accepting of other dehumanizing social trends—e.g., the merchandizing of violence in the media; the irresponsible use of abortion as a means of birth control; easy resort to euthanasia; a growing pornography industry which exploits women, men, and children; the continuing failure to control guns which gives this nation the highest homicide rate in the world. The quality of a society, and thus its real security, may be eroded in the long run more by its failure to put politically appropriate moral limits on its own actual or planned conduct, conduct which it can control, than by the supposed but unknown future conduct of others which in the final analysis it cannot control.

B. International Implications

Any effort to understand and discuss the issue of peace in the international situation must first take due note of perspective. There are those who formulate their positions around one criterion: what is best for the United States is all that we can and should consider. For Christians, however, it is necessary to attempt to see the situation from God's perspective as well as our own. This means looking at the world lovingly,

THE BLUE BOOK

holistically, and without bias, as best we are able to do so, not from a narrowly self-centered stance. This can mean ultimately seeing even our own interests more truly.

For reasons rooted in Christian faith and theology, the Lambeth Conference of 1958 called upon the nations "to forego those policies of self-interest which deny the interests of others. We call on people of all faiths, and those who lead them, to work and pray persistently for the development of a community of peoples wherein, with whatever limitations of national sovereignty may be necessary, all shall live under the rule of law. Only in such a community can the present unequal division of resources be remedied and assistance brought to nations which are struggling with dire poverty and distress." In the twenty-four intervening years, the response to that call has not been overwhelming. Yet, the realities of modern life seem to be forcing us to face issues which we have previously chosen to evade.

There has been a growing awareness among the peoples of the earth that this planet is physically one unit, united by oceans, biosphere, climate, and air. Millions in many countries remember watching the moon walk in 1969. A nuclear explosion in China brings increased levels of radiation to many others. A volcanic eruption in the northwestern United States scatters ash in the northeast. Pollutants in the air produce acid rain in other geographical areas.

The world is also being technologically integrated, particularly in terms of resources, communication, and transportation. The oil embargo of 1974 was for many Americans a revelation that we are not capable of surviving as a nation independently of others. A royal marriage in London was seen by an estimated 700 million viewers in some 57 countries. Telex and air express across oceans are commonplace.

Finally, the world is more economically interdependent than ever before. The interest rate in U.S. banks, the strength or weakness of the German mark, and the economic policies of the Japanese all interact in a way quite beyond any single country's control.

There are many who still insist on seeing the world only through their own nation's eyes, evaluating situations in terms of self-interest alone, and formulating policies which are blatantly self-serving. Yet, the reality of a physically whole, technologically integrated, and economically interdependent world continues to grow. This evolving reality will continue to challenge other more limited perspectives.

Juxtaposed with this tension between perspectives is yet another assumption which still pervades many efforts to understand the world of international affairs. That assumption is that the stronger a nation is militarily, the more capable it is of enforcing its own wishes on the rest of the world community. Even a quick inspection of recent events, however, exposes the following anomalies about national power:

- The Polish people, in the face of enormous military strength, continue to resist and remain unconquered.
- In Iran, the weapon used to destroy a government holding all the cards of conventional military and police power, with much sophisticated material supplied by the U.S., was a general strike.
- Remote desert sheikdoms, without benefit of a single aircraft carrier among them, have the power today to make major nations sit up and take notice.
- The military might of the Soviet Union has been unable to pacify the primitive countryside of Afghanistan.
- In the Vietnam conflict, our possession of the most powerful military weapons did not enable us to win the victory.

It should be especially noted that in many of these situations religious faith was a significant force, for good or for ill.

In spite of these and other events, however, the conventional political wisdom of our times seems to encourage larger military expenditures as though international politics were simply a poker game among governments. That is outmoded and ultimately self-defeating political wisdom, neither wise nor politically astute. The continuation of life on this fragile earth, our island home, will require more and more cooperation by all nations. Among the continuing obstacles will be narrowly defined and self-defeating understandings of national sovereignty and national interest. Mutual threats backed by increasingly sophisticated weapons will never achieve security, as history proves over and over again. Yet the arms race continues, led by the two major powers and exacerbated by the indiscriminate sale of weaponry to other nations.

These contradictions present the Christian community with the opportunity to make an important positive contribution towards the goal of world peace. As an international community, we have some experience and insight into the process of mutual responsibility and interdependence, growing in part out of the efforts of mission-founded churches to stand fully on their own feet. We have learned in our Christian journey, most recently in observing the faithfulness of Christians in China, something of the true source of real security.

These lessons learned are talents which are not to be buried. They are to be added to through diligent attention to the interplay of idealisms and selfish politics in the actualities of situations abroad. Putting talents out at interest, in this complex world, means accepting well-calculated risks, though different risks, perhaps, than those currently being taken by prevailing military policies. Our goal must not be independence from the concerns of others, but rather interdependence in the needs of others.

"Can two walk together except they be agreed?" (*Amos 3:3*) Listening and understanding must precede walking together. A willingness to see the world from other perspectives, especially God's perspective, is essential for the necessary listening and understanding.

III. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the foregoing analysis, the Commission's major conclusion is that it is imperative to involve all the structures of the Episcopal Church so as to bring the issue of war and peace directly and actively into the central life of the Church. Therefore, it does *not* recommend the creation of a new Standing Commission nor a separate program within the Executive Council. We think such action is simply not enough. Rather, the goal is to recognize the fact that one of the great missions of every element of the Church—its liturgy, its music, its training for the priesthood, its educational programs, its evangelism, its presence through the laity in all the vocations of the common life, its social outreach—is to encourage and enable its baptized members to exercise their responsibility and commitment as followers of Christ to become peacemakers.

Specific recommendations follow.

1. That the General Convention recognize, affirm and commend those actions in congregations, dioceses, and provinces, and in the Executive Council, that have created and supported opportunities for constructive and informed dialogues on the whole issue of war and peace and the role of the Church as peacemaker. It should encourage other parts of the Church to do the same as central to their worship. It should in particular encourage the mutual reporting of successful ways of including in the dialogues persons with differing viewpoints, some of whom may in the past have felt constrained to be silent.
2. That the General Convention commend the indispensable work for peace already being done by Executive Council staff, commissions and other groups and programs

of the Church, including—for example—food for the hungry throughout the world, sustenance for the poor, and mission and ministry in depressed areas. It should encourage such groups to incorporate more explicit attention to the interrelations between the specific problems they address and the pervasive implications of the arms race.

3. That the General Convention encourage the selection, production and distribution of educational materials on the issues of war and peace, and that it direct the Executive Council to provide such resources for parishes and dioceses to conduct educational programs.

4. That the General Convention charge the Executive Council, its staff, and all standing commissions and committees of this Church to recognize and report on the specific role each can play in furthering the Church's work of peace.

5. That the General Convention authorize the reappointment of a Joint Commission on Peace for a three-year term, instructing it to collaborate with the other commissions, the dioceses, and the seminaries of the Church in developing greater awareness of the centrality of Christian peacemaking in their specific missions and responsibilities. The Convention should ask each commission to include in its three-year report a section reviewing its peace-related activities in the light of such responsibilities.

6. That the Convention should instruct the Joint Commission on Peace to report to the next General Convention on the Church's progress in peacemaking and its recommendations for future action.

AFTERWORD

The work of the Joint Commission on Peace has enabled us to see that the quest for peace is, in a very fundamental way, a spiritual activity, firmly rooted in the essence of the gospel and in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Biblically speaking, peacemaking is the one activity through which the divine image is most clearly seen. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

As a consequence we found ourselves led to proposals which may seem unusual to many. We found that we could not be content with the simple and predictable request that the Joint Commission on Peace be perpetuated as a Standing Commission. Rather we searched for methods by which the concerns raised by the issues of war and peace could be kept in constant focus throughout the fabric of our common life. We sought to find a mechanism to ensure that questions such as those that follow might be answered:

- What increased effort can be made by seminaries to equip our clergy better to understand and interpret the full implications of modern warfare as they minister to people who run the gamut from pacifists to nuclear pacifists, to senior officers in the military, to civic and political leaders, employees of the arms industries, and to the average citizen voter?
- What contributions can the Standing Liturgical Commission make toward bringing peacemaking nearer to the center of our corporate and private worship? What would the effect be, for example, if we were to pray specifically at every Eucharist for our enemies, personal and national?
- What new and informative materials on war and peace might be developed and/or promoted by the department of Christian Education for all Church members, young and old?
- What might follow if our Commission on Ecumenical Relations emphasized the

common denominator *peace* as it works with our brothers and sisters in Christ in seeking an interdenominational impact on the world?

- Is there any greater challenge to Human Affairs and Health to which that Commission might address itself? The very survival of humanity may depend on a giant movement toward the elimination of the instruments of chemical, biological, and nuclear war.
- Could the Standing Commission on World Mission find a new and exciting ministry in peacemaking to lead its agenda and give proper focus to our nation's world diplomacy?
- Is it not possible that a report from the Committee on the State of the Church, reviewing the importance of our commitment to the unity of the human family, might be more effective, and more apt to capture the attention of both Houses of Convention, than a similar review by a Joint Commission on Peace?
- Can the General Board of Examining Chaplains bring the issues of violence, war, and peace, more to the forefront in delineating standards for ordination in today's troubled and confused society?
- Can those groups charged with the oversight of our evangelism programs help us to discern the links between the gospel proclamation of peace with God through Jesus Christ, and the call to live in love and charity with our neighbors?

We feel that if the General Convention approves our suggestions, these and other such important questions will help us as a Church to give proper response to the demands of our age.

RESOLUTIONS

In fulfilling its task, the Joint Commission on Peace has been acutely aware of the many specific policy recommendations emanating from various groups concerned about the peace of the world. We considered adding several of them to our own list of resolutions, but decided instead to address ourselves to the task of providing a common foundation and framework as a basis upon which the Church might consider a variety of resolutions, both currently and in the future. We encourage other groups within the Church to bring before the Convention those issues which appear to be of most immediate concern, and we encourage the Convention to consider them on their merits.

Resolution #A—134.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 67th General Convention does hereby receive and accept the report of the Joint Committee on Peace created by the 66th General Convention of this Church and does commend the prayerful and careful study of the report by every member of this Church.

Resolution #A—135.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 67th General Convention does hereby establish a Joint Commission on Peace, the membership of which shall consist of three Bishops appointed by the Presiding Bishop, and three Presbyters or Deacons and six Lay Persons appointed by the President of the House of Deputies; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Peace shall, in collaboration with other Commissions of the Convention and Committees

THE BLUE BOOK

of the Executive Council, the Dioceses, and the Seminaries of the Church, develop a greater awareness of the centrality of peacemaking to their several missions and responsibilities; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Peace is directed to report to the next General Convention on the Church's progress in peacemaking and shall make such further recommendations on the matter as may be appropriate.

EXPLANATION: The 1979 General Convention created the Church's first Joint Commission on Peace for the interim between the 1979 Convention and the 1982 Convention. Joint Commissions serve between Conventions, whereas Standing Commissions are permanent bodies serving until disbanded by subsequent action of General Convention. This resolution recognizes, by implication, the worth of the work of the first Joint Commission, and would authorize the continuation of its endeavors, based upon the report filed by it and its recommendations for the future. That Commission was charged with the responsibility for presenting a "comprehensive program for implementing the 1962 House of Bishops Pastoral Letter as it pertains to peace and war to the 67th Convention of this Church for consideration and further action." It has done so and, by its charter, has concluded its mission.

The adoption of this resolution would assure implementation of the proposed plan for bringing peacemaking to the center of individual and corporate worship and service in the time to come. It would also require a report from the new Commission of the success or failure of the proposed program, and specific recommendations for the future, to the 1985 General Convention.

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| BUDGET CALCULATION: | Five meetings @ \$7,000 | \$35,000 |
| | Executive Committee meetings | 2,500 |
| | Liaison travel | 6,000 |
| | Resource people | 2,000 |
| | Office and supplies | 1,000 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | | \$46,500 |

Resolution #A—136.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That \$46,500 be appropriated for the work of the Joint Commission on Peace from the expense portion of the Budget for the General Convention of this Church for the next triennium.

Resolution #A—137.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this General Convention direct the Executive Council to enhance and extend the capacities of the Office of Public Issues so that "the new resolve of leadership in peacemaking" called for in the House of Bishops' 1981 Pastoral Letter may be implemented by

- (a) a nurturing of a peace concerns network in the various dioceses; and
- (b) by participating in ecumenical efforts with other religious groups, secular peacemaking groups and professional organizations; and
- (c) maintaining liaison with international organizations concerned with peace and justice; and
- (d) providing theological, pastoral and practical resources to further these concerns.

EXPLANATION: With the increased concern and resulting Churchwide activity surrounding the issues of war and peace, arms control, and related matters, it is readily apparent that there is a need for corresponding enhancement of the capacity of Executive Council to respond to occasions for support and coordination.

Resolution #A—138.

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, that Title V be amended by adding thereto a Canon 4 which shall read as follows:

CANON 4.

In the Event of Nuclear War

Sec. 1. *In the event of a widespread nuclear war in which the continental United States is a battleground, the surviving faithful are encouraged to continue in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers; to hold fast the eternal hope of the gospel of Jesus Christ; and to develop, in concert with other Christians, structures appropriate to their new circumstances.*

APPENDIX A

The Criteria of the “Just” or “Justifiable” War

The “just war” tradition of classical Christianity has evolved over many centuries. It is usually divided into two parts—the *jus ad bellum* principles which are intended to govern decisions concerning the moral justifiability of resorting to war, and the *jus in bello* principles which are intended to govern decisions concerning morally permissible conduct in fighting a war. The following are generally recognized just war principles, the first five being *jus ad bellum* principles and the remaining two being *jus in bello* principles:

1. War must be declared by legitimate authority.
2. There must be a justifiable cause, i.e., a morally valid initiating cause.
3. War must be entered into with a right intention, i.e., it must seek a morally justifiable end.
4. War must be a last resort, entered only when all other efforts to control or correct a recognized evil have been exhausted.
5. There should be a reasonable hope of success.
6. Force must be used with discrimination, discriminating especially between directly and intentionally attacking combatants or military objectives (permissible) and directly and intentionally attacking noncombatants or non-military targets (impermissible).
7. The amount of force used must be proportionate to the end sought, i.e., the value of the objective sought must outweigh the harm done in seeking it.

APPENDIX B

Statement of the Lambeth Conference, 1978

(NOTE: This statement was also adopted by the 66th General Convention in 1979.)

5. War and violence

1. Affirming again the statement of the Lambeth Conferences of 1930 (resolution 25), 1948, and 1968 that ‘war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ’, the Conference expresses its deep grief at the great suffering being endured in many parts of the world because of violence and oppression. We further declare that the use of the modern technology of war is the most striking example of corporate sin and the prostitution of God’s gifts.

2. We recognize that violence has many faces. There are some countries where the prevailing social order is so brutal, exploiting the poor for the sake of the privileged and trampling on people’s human rights, that it must be termed *violent*. There are others where a social order that appears relatively benevolent nevertheless exacts a high price in human misery from some sections of the population. There is the use of armed forces by governments, employed or held in threat against other nations or even against their own citizens. There is the worldwide misdirection of scarce resources to armaments rather than human need. There is the military action of victims of oppression who despair in achieving social justice by any other means. There is the mindless violence that erupts in some countries with what seems to be increasing frequency, to say nothing of organized crime and terrorism, and the resorting to violence as a form of entertainment on films and television.

3. Jesus, through his death and resurrection, has already won the victory over all evil. He made evident that self-giving love, obedience to the way of the Cross, is the way to reconciliation in all relationships and conflicts. Therefore the use of violence is ultimately contradictory to the gospel. Yet we acknowledge that Christians in the past have differed in their understanding of limits to the rightful use of force in human affairs, and that questions of national relationships and social justice are often complex ones. But in the face of the mounting incidence of violence today and its acceptance as a normal element in human affairs, we condemn the subjection, intimidation, and manipulation of people by the use of violence and the threat of violence and call Christian people everywhere:

- a. To re-examine as a matter of urgency their own attitude towards, and their complicity with, violence in its many forms.
- b. To take with the utmost seriousness the questions which the teaching of Jesus places against violence in human relationships and the use of armed force by those who would follow him, and the example of redemptive love which the Cross holds before all people.
- c. To engage themselves in non-violent action for justice and peace and to support others so engaged, recognizing that such action will be controversial and may be personally very costly.
- d. To commit themselves to informed, disciplined prayer not only for all victims of violence, especially for those who suffer for their obedience to the Man of the Cross, but also for those who inflict violence on others.
- e. To protest in whatever way possible at the escalation of the sale of armaments of war by the producing nations to the developing and dependent nations, and to support with every effort all international proposals and conferences designed to place limitations on, or arrange reductions in, the armaments of war of the nations of the world.

APPENDIX C

Statement of the Anglican Primates, 1981

Christian Attitudes to War in a Nuclear Age

The Church in former ages justified war in certain circumstances by recourse to the theory of the 'just war.' This theory was never intended to commend war, but to limit its frequency. There have always been Christians who repudiated any legitimizing of war. Today many others would join them, believing that the very conditions required for a just war themselves condemn not only the actual use of nuclear weapons, but also their possession as a deterrent.

Whilst regarding the legitimacy of such a unilateral pacifist position, not all of us believe that the Church corporately ever has adopted or is likely to adopt such a stance. This does not mean that we are either indifferent or uncommitted. We strongly identify with the Final Document of the United Nations Special Assembly Session on Disarmament of 1978, especially when it calls for a comprehensive nuclear test ban; a halt to conventional arms procurement and trade; the development of an alternative system of security to the accumulation of weaponry, and the mobilization of public opinion to counteract the armament race. We also strongly commend the proposal of Dr. Kurt Waldheim, the U.N. Secretary General, that all national governments set aside 0.1 percent of their defense budgets for disarmament research and education.

We pledge ourselves to work for multilateral disarmament, and to support those who

THE BLUE BOOK

seek, by education and other appropriate means, to influence those people and agencies who shape nuclear policy. In particular we believe that the SALT talks must be resumed and pursued with determination.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in a speech in Washington said: "We have made a great advance in technology without a corresponding advance in moral sense. We are capable of unbinding the forces which lie at the heart of creation and of destroying our civilization . . . It is vital that we see modern weapons of war for what they are—evidence of madness."

As Christians we recognize a demonic element in the complexity of our world, but we also affirm our belief in the good will and purpose and Providence of God for his whole creation. This requires us to work for a world characterized not by fear, but by mutual trust and justice.

"Mankind is confronted with a choice: We must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, or face annihilation."

—Final Document of U.N. Assembly on Disarmament