



## Durham E-Theses

---

*The churches and the bomb = an analysis of recent church statements from Roman Catholics, Anglican, Lutherans and Quakers concerning nuclear weapons*

Holtam, Nicholas

### How to cite:

---

Holtam, Nicholas (1988) *The churches and the bomb = an analysis of recent church statements from Roman Catholics, Anglican, Lutherans and Quakers concerning nuclear weapons*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6423/>

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

The Churches and the Bomb -  
An analysis of recent Church statements from  
Roman Catholics, Anglican, Lutherans and Quakers  
concerning nuclear weapons.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

Nicholas Holtam

M.A. Thesis

Submitted to the University of Durham

November 1988.



17 JUL 1989

## Contents

Abstract		i
Preface		1
Chapter 1	The tradition of Christian Pacifism and the Just War	5
Chapter 2	Roman Catholicism	34
Chapter 3	Church of England	52
Chapter 4	Lutheran Churches	79
Chapter 5	The Religious Society of Friends	101
Chapter 6	A Theological Analysis of the Church statements on nuclear weapons	120
Chapter 7	Continuing the debate more fruitfully	147
Notes		166
Bibliography		200

Nicholas Holtam

"The Churches and the Bomb. An analysis of recent church statements from Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans and Quakers concerning nuclear weapons."

M.A.

1988

### Abstract

The issues raised by the possession and use of nuclear weapons have been considered by the churches in ways that have drawn on the traditions of both Christian pacifism and the just war. An historical survey of these traditions shows that both are attractive for different reasons, but neither offers a complete and totally coherent Christian response to the moral problems associated with 'conventional' or nuclear war.

In chapters 2-5 the recent statements concerning nuclear weapons of four churches are presented in turn: Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran and Quaker. Chapter 6 contains an analysis of these church statements using some key theological variables. The theological differences are to some extent disguised by the degree of practical consensus that has emerged

from the churches during the 1980s. A more critical relationship has developed between church and state. It is now appropriate for the Church to seek to be a community witnessing to the present possibilities of being God's peaceable kingdom as a sort of 'counter culture' within our world.

In chapter 7 an attempt is made to see how best the discussion in the churches can be moved on in a fruitful way. A key element of this is the discussion of the theology of power. There is an urgent need for the vision of alternatives to present realities. The church has often been seen as the sustainer of vision. However, our experience is of vision being available to people on the margins of society and the churches need to sit patiently with people on these margins in order to hear of more possible worlds than our current realpolitik allows.

The conclusion is therefore paradoxical. The church must be more of a distinctive community in order to be a witness to the world of God's peaceable kingdom. It must also sit with those on the margins of society, not necessarily in the churches, who have the capacity to offer vision to help liberate us from our nuclear crisis.

## Preface

A lively debate has been taking place within the Churches, as in society at large, about the significance of our reliance upon nuclear weapons to maintain order in our world. The volume of contributions from official Church bodies makes it possible to take this debate as an occasion to consider the different methodologies employed by the Churches in making moral decisions.

This study therefore considers the recent statements of four churches concerning nuclear weapons: Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans and the Religious Society of Friends ('Quakers'). These denominations have been chosen because of the differences that might be expected to exist between them both in the method and content of what they have to say concerning nuclear weapons. By taking a denominational approach it is hoped that methodological issues will become clear.

Unfortunately such an approach excludes one of the most substantial documents on nuclear weapons and disarmament, the report of the World Council of Churches Hearing on Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament held in Amsterdam in 1981<sup>(1)</sup>. It also excludes the subsequent statement made by the WCC at its 1983 Assembly in Vancouver<sup>(2)</sup>.

Given the denominational approach, the term 'church' may need some justification, particularly because the Religious Society



of Friends lacks some of the characteristics usually associated with the description 'church' and is normally typified as a 'sect' (3). However, one of the Society's basic regulatory texts is called Church Government (4) and the Society's response to the WCC's 'Lima Document' Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry is instructive of the Society's self-understanding:

The (Lima) text's use of the expression 'the eucharistic community' as a designation of the local Christian church implies that Quakers, along with the Salvation Army, are not part of the local Christian community. This saddens us. The designation carries the further suggestion that the most efficacious aspect of the Churches' witness to the world is their sacramental belief and practice. We do not see any justification for this in the New Testament or in the history of the Church. (5)

The Society's understanding of itself seems sufficient justification for the appropriateness of the characterisation of it as a 'Church' and for the inclusion of writings from the Society in this study.

Throughout its history the Christian churches have considered matters of war and peace mainly by using the traditions of pacifism and the just war as the framework for discussions. Certainly the Church statements considered in this study have been highly formed by these two traditions. Consequently this study begins (chapter one) with a historical survey of these



two traditions in order to show the character and potential of each tradition.

Chapters two-five are denominational studies of Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran and Quaker documents concerning nuclear weapons. Attention has been confined to documents produced in the 1980s except where earlier documents bear heavily upon the more recent discussions. The four Churches have produced very different sorts of statements about nuclear weapons with varying degrees of authority. It has therefore been impossible to standardise the form of presentation without damaging the integrity of the Churches and their statements. In each case care has been taken to draw on the most substantial texts available, to state sufficient of the theological background as to make the methodology intelligible and to summarise the basic content of the statements.

Chapters six and seven contain an analysis of the Church statements. Chapter six considers the most significant theological variables in a comparison of the statements. Chapter seven begins with the observation that the wider discussion of the Church statements has involved considerable controversy between individuals even though the Church statements themselves present a considerable degree of agreement. In this chapter the debate is examined in such a way as to discover how best to continue it more fruitfully.

Differences of method between the Churches are to some extent disguised by the broad measure of practical agreement that

emerges from their documents. No doubt it would have been possible to have chosen an issue on which there were greater divisions. However, the evidence is that an ecumenical consensus is beginning to emerge on matters of morality<sup>(6)</sup>. Unquestionably this is partly to do with the context in which the Churches are having to do their moral theology. An increasing gap is developing between Church and Society in such a way as to force the Churches to discover both what they have in common and what they hold as a distinctive gift for the sake of the world. However, it is to be hoped that this will not cause the Churches to retreat into their own private realms. There remains a sense in which the world must set the agenda for and the context of all serious theology.

## Chapter 1

### The Traditions of Christian Pacifism and the Just War

#### Introduction

Roland Bainton<sup>(1)</sup> has provided a widely accepted threefold typology of Christian attitudes to war. He distinguished pacifism, the just war and the crusade or holy war. Whilst others<sup>(2)</sup> have suggested that the pacifist and just war traditions are not as separable as Bainton's typology suggests, there is widespread agreement that it is these two traditions, not that of the crusade, that are useful in formulating Christian responses to the possession of nuclear weapons<sup>(3)</sup>.

Neither pacifism nor the just war tradition are unitary phenomena. Both have a significant range of meanings. However, the common core of pacifism can be described as, "a principled rejection of the violence of war"<sup>(4)</sup>. By contrast, just war theories accept the inevitability and occasional necessity of war, seeking to limit its occurrence by requiring that it be initiated only by a proper authority for a just cause, and to limit its effect by insisting that it be fought using just means<sup>(5)</sup>.

Apart from what is called "vocational pacifism" (for example, the pacifism of priests and others in holy orders) Peter Brock states that there is no known instance of conscientious objection to participation in war and no recorded advocacy of such objection before the Christian era<sup>(6)</sup>. Pacifism is therefore a very particular contribution of Christianity. Pacifists

in particular have seen the early years of the Church as a significant period of Christian history. It sometimes seems as though the original purity of the life of the Early Church has been lost and that Christianity has accommodated itself to the ways of the world, reworking the earlier just war tradition within a Christian context.

In this chapter we will consider the presence of pacifist and just war strands in the teaching of Jesus, and the Early Church; the development of pacifism within Christianity and criticisms of Christian pacifism; and the development of the just war tradition within Christianity and criticisms of the just war tradition.

### The teaching of Jesus

Jesus' attitude to civil authority and to the acceptability of armed resistance is notoriously ambiguous. Maybe the matter was not pressing at that time. No Jew could have been compelled to serve in the Roman legion and it was unlikely that any of Jesus' disciples would have been pressed into the army of Herod Antipas or his brother Philip or into the small number of the Temple police in Jerusalem<sup>(7)</sup>. In any case, Jesus' concern with the imminence of the end of time might be a good reason for his not having paid unambiguous attention to the matter. The various exegeses of 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's'<sup>(8)</sup> exemplify the ambiguity. Some have used this text to show that God and Caesar rule over two separate and incompatible kingdoms - you have to choose between them. Others have suggested that

God and Caesar rule in separate spheres of distinct but inter-related kingdoms. Some have argued that this is a text ruling out military service because it is not possible to serve two masters. Others, that it supports military service, which is the proper sphere of Caesar's activity<sup>(9)</sup>.

C J Cadoux has made two lists of the teaching of Jesus consistent and inconsistent with the lawfulness of war for Christians. Some texts could be placed in both Cadoux's lists. However, Cadoux claims that the evidence for Jesus' teaching being inconsistent with Christian participation in war is much the stronger and the cumulative character of the case means that no one text is decisive. Among the evidence listed by Cadoux in support of the claim that Jesus's teaching made war unlawful for Christians is:

- (1) The strengthening of the Old Testament command 'Thou shalt not kill' in Mt 5.21ff.
- (2) The teaching of non-resistance in the Sermon on the Mount, Mt 5.38-48.
- (3) The refusal of Jesus to advance his ideas by political or coercive means, eg the temptations, Mt 4.1-11 and Lk 4.1-14; his refusal to be made king by Galileans, Jn 6.1-15; he did not attempt to make Antipas release John the Baptist or seek to punish him for John's death, Mk 1.14f, 6.14-29 etc, Lk 3.19f, 13.31; the Passion narratives show Jesus not offering resistance.
- (4) Jesus contrasts his disciples to the rulers of the Gentiles who lord it over them and calls his disciples to a life of service, Mk 10.42-45, Mt 25-28.

(5) Three separate utterances -

- (a) the story of the woman caught in adultery and Jesus' prevention of her being stoned, Jn 8.1-11.
- (b) the Marcan apocalyptic which tells the disciples that they will be brought to trial when there are wars and rumours of wars and that those who can should flee to the mountains, Mk 13.2, 7-9, 14-20, ...
- (c) Jesus' response to the cutting off of the ear of the slave to the high priest, Mt 26.51ff, Lk 22. 50f, Jn 18.10f, 36.(10)

An alternative reading of the evidence suggests that it is too easy to slide from Jesus' call to non-violence to a call to avoid military service<sup>(11)</sup>. The two are not identical. Whilst accepting that a call to non-violence is at the heart of Jesus' teaching, Helgeland, Daly and Burns stressed the need to consider the social and political as well as textual context before considering how such a call would relate to our own day<sup>(12)</sup>. They suggested that love of the enemy is the appropriate response of Christians who at this time were weak in relation to powerful enemies. It was a missionary attitude, an appeal to bring the enemy into the Christian fold (cf. Rom 12.20, 21).

Helgeland, Daly and Burns claimed an objectivity for their study which they consider is missing from the one-sided presentation of the evidence characteristic of what they claim to have been pacifist dominated English-speaking scholarship<sup>(13)</sup>. It is therefore surprising that the decisive steps

of their argument about the New Testament evidence take place at the point at which they admit the biblical exegesis leaves them at an impasse:

We are not going against exegetical evidence, but simply going beyond what exegesis can clearly prove, one way or another, when we see non-resistance in these texts as applying specifically and concretely in the area of politics, especially insurrectional or revolutionary politics. Christians are not revolutionaries, but they do resist evil. The prohibition (against violence) is not a fundamental rejection of every type of resistance. In fact, as Tertullian put it, Christians are, precisely because they are Christians, factors of resistance in society. They resist injustice, driven by an aggressively missionary love that impels them by non-violent yet active means to try to bring all, including the persecuting enemy, into the fold of Christ. If this is so, it relativizes somewhat the N.T. call to non-violence and its modern political counterpart, pacifism. It locates the absolute, non-negotiable centre of the Christian message in the positive call to love and not in its negative counterpart and normal mode of realization, non-violence. This does not imply, for example, that the just war theory is equally well grounded in the N.T. as is non-violence. But it does suggest that one cannot a priori assume that any attempt to observe the love command which does not live up to the ideals

of non-violence is necessarily a betrayal of the gospel<sup>(14)</sup>.

Helgeland, Daly and Burns were unable to avoid the conclusion that non-violence was at the heart of Jesus' teaching, though they were unable to clarify the distinction that may be made between non-violence and non-resistance as varieties of pacifism. However, the crucial part of their argument concerns the use of Scripture not its content.

Finally, an alternative case that Jesus' teaching was not opposed to soldiering as such and did not condemn the use of force by the ruling authorities has been proposed by G E M Anscombe<sup>(15)</sup>. First, she suggested that there is no inherent conflict between the ethics of the Old Testament and the ethics of the New. Except for the stricter laws about marriage enacted by Christ, the New Testament's moral precepts are those of the Old Testament and its God is the God of Israel. Second, she complains that the evangelical counsels of the Sermon on the Mount were not meant to be turned into principles on which the whole of Christian ethics are built. To make her point she uses the evangelical counsel on poverty to show how unacceptable that becomes if it were turned into a precept forbidding property-owning. She also cites

St John's direction to soldiers; "do not blackmail people; be content with your pay"; and Christ's commendation of the centurion who compared his authority over his men to Christ's. On a pacifist view, this must be as much as if the madam in a



brothel had said: "I know what authority is, I tell this girl to do this and she does it ..." and Christ had commended her faith. A centurion was the first Gentile to be baptized; there is no suggestion that in the New Testament soldiering was regarded as incompatible with Christianity<sup>(16)</sup>.

Three positions concerning the teaching of Jesus as it affects Christian attitudes to war have been presented:

- (1) That Jesus' teaching was inconsistent with Christian participation in war.
- (2) That although Jesus taught non-violence, the absolute centre of the Christian message is the call to love, not to non-violence. Non-violence is the normal, but not the only, means of expressing this love.
- (3) That Jesus was neither opposed to soldiering nor the use of force by ruling authorities.

Clearly these positions are mutually contradictory. However, what matters for the continuing discussion is that all three positions have respectable support though the consensus among Biblical scholars is with positions (1) and (2). The later debate on Christian attitudes to war is considerably influenced by whichever of the three positions concerning the teaching of Jesus is preferred.

### The Early Church

According to John Ferguson<sup>(17)</sup> the evidence that Christians in the first centuries of the Christian era understood Jesus' teaching as outlawing participation in war is overwhelming.

Until at least the middle of the second century Christians did not serve as soldiers. To show that the practice of Christian love was understood to involve non-violence, Ferguson quoted the following from the first three centuries: Justin Martyr, Tatian the Syrian, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius Felix, Arnobius and Lactantius. According to Ferguson, their main concern was with the shedding of blood. Tertullian articulated the common understanding: "The Lord, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier."<sup>(18)</sup>

The testimony of early Christians was to non-violence, but the reason may have been less to do with fidelity to the gospel of non-violent love than the fear of idolatry. In reviewing the evidence, Helgeland, Daly and Burns pointed out that Tertullian's objections to military service were contained in On Idolatry and in his Treatise on the Crown and that both works were primarily concerned with idolatry<sup>(19)</sup>. They pointed out that even Origen, the most articulate of early Christian pacifists, admitted the need for civil order and the force that may be needed to maintain it. Helgeland, Daly and Burns continue:

Of significance for what later came to be the dominant Christian just war attitude is Origen's admission of the Christian's obligation to support "those who are fighting in a righteous cause". But because all Christians are "priests", it is not proper for them (no more than it is for pagan priests) to fight with anything but spiritual arms.

Origen envisioned a world in which war and the need for force would disappear in proportion to the spread of Christianity. Thus the dilemma of Celsus (if all became Christian, no one would be left to protect the emperor) would never materialize. Living in an empire largely at peace, it was possible for a Christian to argue this way. Some wars could be conceived of as necessary, even "righteous", but basically as non-Christian or sub-Christian activities from which Christians must abstain. (20)

Given the evidence it is difficult not to conclude that Helgeland, Daly and Burns were reading the just war theory into the witness of the Early Church. Certainly the Christian witness was shaped by the social and political context. The facts that throughout the first two centuries Christians were a politically weak minority and that Origen wrote in a period of relative peace are significant. It can also be admitted that the primary concern was a fear of idolatry. But none of this eliminates the point that pacifism was essential to the life of the Early Church.

Geoffrey Nuttall was a good deal more judicious in his weighing of the evidence. He attempted to show the strangeness of the early Christian world-view to twentieth century pacifists. The early Christians were aloof from the affairs of the world and their refusal to take part in war was mainly a refusal to take part in the life of the world or the activity of the State. Their popular Bible texts would not find much response from

modern pacifists. They stressed separation from the world in a bid to avoid evil. Their main fear was of idolatry, certainly, but that does not mean there were no other reasons for their pacifism<sup>(21)</sup>.

Christians are known to have been soldiers in AD 173<sup>(22)</sup>. However, in the most peaceful years of the Roman Empire soldiers may have functioned more like policemen. The shedding of blood was probably rare. Fourth century evidence from church orders in Egypt, but probably pertaining to an earlier age, describe a compromise by which soldiers who had been baptized should refuse to kill if commanded to do so<sup>(23)</sup>.

By the end of the third century there were Christians in positions of considerable power, not only soldiers but also magistrates and even the Emperor Diocletian's wife and daughter were said to have been Christians<sup>(24)</sup>. According to Eusebius, "the rulers in every church were honoured by all procurators and governors"<sup>(25)</sup>. A renewal of fighting saw Christian soldiers suffering martyrdom for their refusal to fight<sup>(26)</sup>. Diocletian's persecution, at the beginning of the fourth century, included the purging of the army of all Christians. Ferguson has suggested that this must mean there were few Christian soldiers because no commander would eliminate a large number of his troops<sup>(27)</sup> but it is doubtful that any estimate of the number of Christian soldiers can be given from this. The purge could simply have been because Christian soldiers now showed themselves to be ineffective because of their refusal to kill.

Again, the evidence is disputed<sup>(28)</sup>. For example, Eusebius' account of the martyrdom of St Marinus makes it clear that Marinus would have accepted his promotion to centurion had he not been challenged by a fellow soldier who accused him of being a Christian. Marinus himself seems to have managed the life of a soldier without contradiction of his Christianity. It was only when challenged about sacrificing to the emperors that he had to make his position clear by accepting execution out of loyalty to the Christian faith.

The fourth century saw an enormous transition. At the beginning of the century Diocletian purged the army of Christians. Near its end, Theodosius I purged the army of pagans. In this century the just war tradition entered Christianity and pacifism became the outlook of only a minority of Christians, a situation which has remained to the present day.

It seems impossible to settle the debate about whether or not Constantine really became a Christian<sup>(29)</sup>. Similarly it is not at all clear how much his adoption of Christianity actually effected. Fr Benson's judgement was that it was the greatest single disaster to overtake the Christian Church<sup>(30)</sup>, but much of the evidence points to Constantine capitalizing on the growing number of Christians in the Empire and recognizing them as a potentially unifying force. Whatever was the case, Constantine's adoption of Christianity had an enormous symbolic importance. The test was no longer how Christianity could maintain its rigorous moral demand and distinctness, to some

extent in opposition to the world, but how it could remain true to the gospel of Jesus within the world. Whereas the weight of the evidence from the Church before 312 indicates that non-violence was a mark of the Christian life, there is from then on a growing amount of evidence to show how war can be fought by Christians. The rapid process of accommodation between Church and State caused confusion for many Christians. Some joined utopian (heretical) sects, others retreated into monasticism in an attempt to be perfect in separation from the world, but most welcomed the opportunity to extend Christian influence into the political realm.

The just war tradition has its roots in Plato and Cicero and is therefore pre-Christian. Its use by Christians has made it easier for them to use the Old Testament in determining the ethics of war. Indeed Old Testament precepts such as 'an eye for an eye' function rather like just war doctrine by setting proportionate limits to punishment.

The earliest known Christians to have made use of the just war tradition were Ambrose of Milan (339-97) and Augustine of Hippo (354-430). Ambrose made a clear distinction between means and ends. It has been said that he was prepared to use the devil's weapons as a means of realizing the kingdom of God<sup>(31)</sup>. He accepted the necessity of going to war in a just cause and "when driven to it by wrongs received"<sup>(32)</sup>. Restraint must be shown in war after victory. Justice, which accords with nature, is binding even in war. Hence he excommunicated the emperor Theodosius until he had shown public penance for the

retaliatory murder of seven thousand Thessalonians after a rebellion had led to the killing of a number of army officers.

Augustine developed a clear theological basis for involvement in the affairs of the world. The earthly city has no abiding value except that it is the means by which we come to the eternal heavenly city. We are pilgrims on this earth and, though we must never love it for itself alone but always as the means to the eternal, we should be responsible citizens. It is best if wars are avoided by careful talking but it is possible for wars to be fought to bring about a relative peace. Indeed, this is war's only purpose, although real peace will not be attained in this passing age. The State exists to preserve order, without which the Gospel could not be spread. Augustine therefore laid stress on the importance of obedience to lawful authorities. In contrast to earlier exegetes, Augustine said that in cutting off the ear of the high priest's slave Malchus, In 18.10, Peter's offence was to act without the sanction of the constituted authority<sup>(33)</sup>. In this case Augustine seemed to regard Jesus as "the constituted authority", not the State. Similarly, he interpreted "turn the other cheek", Mt 5.39, as "an inward disposition" not a bodily act. He also used an argument from silence in noting that Jesus did not condemn the Roman centurion for being a soldier<sup>(34)</sup>.

The scattered writings of Ambrose and Augustine were almost all the Church had for many centuries as a basis for the just war doctrine.

The development of pacifism within Christianity

Since the fourth century at the latest, pacifism has been the witness of only a minority of Christians. It has however recurred consistently within the life of the Church, though for different reasons at different times. Geoffrey Nuttall, in a series of lectures designed to take "soundings" of Christian pacifism at different periods in history, provides a very interesting summary of the different reasons why Christians have become pacifists<sup>(35)</sup>.

The pacifism of the Middle Ages (principally connected with Wycliffe and the Lollards in England and with Huss and the founders of the Moravian Church in Bohemia) was not rooted in the fear of idolatry. In circumstances very different from those of the early Christians soldiers were not expected to perform heathen rites or swear allegiance to a heathen emperor or deity. Instead, because of the rediscovery of the Bible and its translation into the vernacular, pacifism was based on the narrowing down of faithful discipleship to obedience to the Law of Christ, of which pacifism was understood to be an essential element. The Sermon on the Mount was of enormous importance as a key Biblical text. According to Nuttall, the pacifism of this period is therefore characterised by obedience to the Biblical Law of Christ.

In the Reformation, the Anabaptists maintained a strongly pacifist understanding of Christianity. They received considerable persecution for their stance on baptism and for the separation of the Church from the State. It is therefore not



surprising that it was the conviction that the suffering Church shares in the suffering of Christ, rather than the strict adherence to the Sermon on the Mount, which dominated their theology. Menno Simons, from whom the Mennonites descend, wrote:

True Christians know of no vengeance, however they may be wronged; ... They do not cry for vengeance, as the world does, but with Christ they pray, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' (36)

Geoffrey Nuttall characterised the pacifism of this period as, 'The Ministry of Suffering'.

Like many earlier pacifist movements, the English Quakers were formed after a period of considerable violence and turmoil. They gathered around George Fox from 1649. Though thoroughly grounded in Scripture, they were also influenced by the effects of the Renaissance and the humanist arguments for the universality of reason in all human beings. The Quakers based their pacifism fundamentally on the dignity and respect due to all people because the Spirit of God, or the Light of Christ, that of God, is to be found in every person. 'The dignity of man' therefore provided the most substantial basis for their pacifism.

Finally, Nuttall considered the pacifism of Christians in the twentieth century and suggested that it is the thought of redemption which is central to much contemporary pacifist writing. Having quoted from the writings of a number of prominent pacifists, Nuttall wrote personally and movingly:

Christian pacifism is a form of witness to the outgoing, seeking, serving, giving, forgiving, winning, rescuing, saving, redeeming love of God; and an opening of ourselves to this that we may be used of God as His channels, instruments, means. Nor is this outgoing, redeeming love of God to be found in other religions: it is His seeking and saving which is a distinguishing mark of Jesus Christ. Moreover, because as Christians we believe in the resurrection of Jesus, this is not simply an intellectual statement of a historic fact. We believe that through the Holy Spirit God still seeks and saves: still imbues the lives of the disciples of Jesus with His redeeming power, enabling us both ourselves to live, and also to help in the redemption of others, in a way not possible for those who, through ignorance, carelessness or wilfulness, close their hearts' doors to His redeeming love. (37)

This brief historical survey clearly shows that Christians may be pacifists for a variety of reasons. One consequence is that just as there are various motives so there are various types of pacifism. John Yoder stressed that pacifism is "a wide gamut of varying, sometimes even contradictory, views" (38). He identified twenty-five varieties of religious pacifism, distinguishing between them mostly by their different motives. A thoroughgoing typology is also provided by Peter Brock (39), but perhaps it is sufficient to hint at the diversity by making a simple threefold distinction. The Church of England report

The Church and the Bomb, under the influence of the Quaker member of the Working Party Sydney Bailey<sup>(40)</sup>, distinguished between pacifists of principle who believe that nothing less than the renunciation of all coercive force will ever be able to bring about peace; prudential pacifists who judge that non-violence is the prudent and therefore moral course to take; and selective pacifists who think that some sorts of violence and some sorts of circumstances make the use of violence wrong<sup>(41)</sup>. The variety of motives and the specific meaning of these different forms of pacifism are significant and a matter not often grasped by critics of pacifism.

#### Some criticisms of Christian pacifism

In the highly influential article to which we have already referred, G E M Anscombe offered a thorough critique of pacifism from a position within just war theory from which she condemned the possibility of nuclear warfare<sup>(42)</sup>. She said that in any society it is necessary for the rulers to exercise violent coercive power to restrain the wickedness of both internal and external enemies of the State. To think otherwise is tantamount to saying that the flesh is evil. Humans are made to live in society and society without coercive power is impossible<sup>(43)</sup>. This is not to say that war is good; quite the opposite. Human nature is such that most wars have been mere wickedness on both sides.

Just as an individual will constantly think himself in the right, whatever he does, and yet there is still such a thing as being in the right, so nations will constantly think themselves to be in the right -

and yet there is still such a thing as their being in the right.(44)

Thus in any conflict it is not necessarily wrong to strike the first blow. All that matters in determining the morality of such an act is, who is in the right?

Anscombe's argument does not touch all pacifists. Most would accept that the rulers of society have to exercise coercive force. Some would accept that there will be occasions when that force should be violent. What troubles all pacifists is the case of war. Here the individual loses control over his/her actions, is caught up in a conflict for which he/she may not feel responsible, taking orders from someone about whom to kill. Barrie Paskins and Michael Dockerill point out that the beliefs that make him a pacifist may be: that killing human beings is a deeply problematic proceeding; that in doing such things which are deeply problematic one should be very sure about what one is doing; that no one participating in war is capable of such assurance; and that therefore such participation is wrong.(45)

G E M Anscombe's second criticism of pacifism was that it has had a very damaging influence well beyond its own adherents. The pacifist, by selective reading of the New Testament, has given misleading support to the common view that Christianity is an ideal and beautiful religion, impracticable except for a few rare characters. It preaches a God of love whom there is no reason to fear; it marks an

escape from the conception presented in the Old Testament, of a vindictive and jealous God who will terribly punish his enemies.(46)

Whereas, according to Anscombe, the truth about Christianity is that it is a severe and practicable religion. The essential moral precept of the Old Testament is not that no one shall be killed but that the innocent shall not be killed. It is murder, not killing as such, that is forbidden. Pacifism has corrupted this vital distinction. It

teaches people to make no distinction between the shedding of innocent blood and the shedding of any human blood. And in this way pacifism has corrupted enormous numbers of people who will not act according to its tenets. They become convinced that a number of things are wicked which are not; hence, seeking no way of avoiding "wickedness" they set no limits to it.(47)

She even puts part of the blame for obliteration bombing in the Second World War on the influence of pacifism in making people blind to this distinction between the murder of the innocent and the killing of the guilty.

The use of the Bible has already emerged as a significant issue of conflict between pacifists and those in the just war tradition. Whilst noting the strength of Anscombe's argument, she assumed a singleness of character in pacifism which is not the case. Roger Ruston has suggested that no Christian pacifist worthy of the name is content with using a moral absolute against killing as the foundation for his/her beliefs.

Rather, pacifism is part of a wider view of such issues as the theological status of political authority, the significance of Christ's victory on the cross, the role of the Church in witnessing to that victory, and the direction of salvation history<sup>(48)</sup>.

A further criticism of pacifism is that it offers an individual morality from which no social or political morality could be built. This is very much like Reinhold Niebuhr's criticism of the pure love ethic. Whilst Niebuhr admitted the 'moral perfectionism' of the teaching of Jesus he continued to argue that a social ethic could never be built from a pure love ethic. Hence he insisted that at the social level the Christian's concern must be with politics not ethics<sup>(49)</sup>.

Increasingly this argument looks insecure. Roger Ruston has pointed to the exploration of life-story and narrative in recent Christian ethics and to the ways in which notable pacifists were rooted in supportive communities and understood themselves in the midst of events offering a different sort of political engagement with the world<sup>(50)</sup>. The work of John Yoder and Stanley Hauerwas has made it look credible for pacifists to claim that there is no unbridgeable divide between their individual and social ethics<sup>(51)</sup>. Pacifism is not merely the idealism of individuals, pursued at the expense of society's good. It may provide an alternative social ethic.

Having considered some of the main criticisms of pacifism the case against can be said to be 'not proven'<sup>(52)</sup>.

The development of the just war tradition within Christianity

As can be seen from the brief survey of some theologians of the Early Church, the social and political context of Christians was highly formative of their attitudes to war. The context provided by the breakdown of the Carolingian Empire in the tenth century was quite different from that which went before. War among feuding nobles was almost endemic. In Aquitaine a movement began to limit the fighting by stressing the sacredness of Christian lives and the immunity of non-combatants. Various local councils of the Church anathematized those who robbed churches or who stole beasts from peasants or who attacked unarmed clerks. Violent men were excommunicated<sup>(53)</sup>. This "Peace of God" movement spread throughout Europe.

About a hundred years later the monastery at Cluny set limits to the days on which it was permissible for its neighbours to fight by initiating the "Truce of God". Inevitably, this was never consistently observed for any length of time<sup>(54)</sup>. In 1139 the Second Lateran Council established a weekly truce from sunset on Wednesday to sunrise on Monday and for the whole of Advent<sup>(55)</sup>. It also banned crossbows, bows and arrows and siege machines. The scandal was primarily that Christians were killing Christians. In 1054 the Council of Narbonne decreed: "No Christian should kill another Christian: whoever does so sheds the blood of Christ."<sup>(56)</sup>.

At about the time that a strong internal jurisdiction was beginning to develop within Christendom, unity was promoted by

the identification of an external enemy. Urban II's call for Christian men to stop fighting each other and go to recapture the Holy Land probably helped the establishment of internal peace. Certainly the beginning of the Crusades removed many of the most violent men from Europe<sup>(57)</sup>.

Although the principles of just war theory can be seen to have been operative in these early Mediaeval attempts to limit the destructiveness of war, no systematic account of just war principles exists before that provided by Gratian in the twelfth century. Like Augustine, Gratian's main concern was the justification of the use of force. Military service was not a sin provided it was not done for gain or plunder and was on behalf of a legitimate authority, such as a prince, and had episcopal permission. For Gratian, war was like the judicial process: the proper authorities must carry out their proper tasks and, according to various papal decrees, the proper tasks of princes included the coercion of heretics and Crusades against the infidels<sup>(58)</sup>. In this Gratian was primarily concerned with what later became known as 'jus ad bellum', the justification for going to war. Even so, the beginnings of a doctrine of just means, later known as 'jus in bello', justice in war, was also present in his works.

For the most part there is little discussion of the morality of war by the Scholastic theologians. War seems to have been regarded as inevitable and, to that extent, just<sup>(59)</sup>. However, both canonists and theologians were gradually classifying the major principles of just war theory. By the end of the Middle



Ages the just war tradition had solidified into a general cultural consensus on the justification and proper limits of the use of force. Sydney Bailey summarises its content at the time of the Reformation as follows:

- (1) War can be decided upon only by the legitimate authorities.
- (2) War may be resorted to only after a specific fault and if the purpose is to make reparation for injury or to restore what has been wrongfully seized.
- (3) The intention must be the advancement of good or the avoidance of evil.
- (4) In a war other than one strictly in self-defence, there must be a reasonable prospect of victory.
- (5) Every effort must have been made to resolve differences by peaceful means before resorting to the use of force.
- (6) The innocent shall be immune from direct attack.
- (7) The amount of force used shall not be disproportionate<sup>(60)</sup>.

Just war theory has retained this shape to the present day though, like pacifism, it has a variety of forms<sup>(61)</sup>, thereby offering flexibility in different circumstances. Consequently, like pacifism, it is extremely unlikely that criticisms will damage the just war tradition as a whole.

Some criticisms of the just war tradition

The apparently clear concepts used in the just war tradition can appear to become devoid of content when applied to cases. For example, how is it established that all other ways of settling the dispute have been exhausted and that war is a last resort? This point gained notoriety in 1982 during the war between Britain and Argentina over the Falkland Islands, some saying that diplomatic channels were by no means exhausted, others that there was no alternative but to go to war. In addition, both Argentina and Britain claimed the war was for a just cause, the restoration of land that had been invaded. G E M Anscombe only half answers the criticism about the difficulty of application to particular cases when she quotes Dr Johnson that the fact of twilight does not mean it is impossible to distinguish between night and day<sup>(62)</sup>.

As well as the apparent practical uselessness of the principles of the just war tradition there is an assumption that wars will be fought with cool heads. The level of rationality required by strategists and tacticians appears to represent an impossible ideal of self-discipline and restraint. The evidence of what happens is not encouraging in this respect<sup>(63)</sup>. Nevertheless, the just war tradition has continued to be valued and used. It requires flexibility rather than literalism in its application. According to John Courtney Murray:

The whole Catholic doctrine of war is hardly more than a Grenzmoral, an effort to establish on a

minimal basis of reason a form of action, the making of war, that remains fundamentally irrational.<sup>(64)</sup>

The just war tradition became widely accepted as a moral response to the problem of war by a reasonable consensus of opinion. This makes it susceptible to Alasdair MacIntyre's observation that rational moral discourse has broken down in our culture and that all that is possible is the emotive statement of belief. What characterises contemporary moral debate is its interminability<sup>(65)</sup>. The proponent of a particular point of view can only seek to convince people by the passion and conviction with which he states his case. Various attempts have been made to restate the place of reason in moral debate<sup>(66)</sup>. John Finnis has demonstrated the incisive qualities of reason in his review of David Fisher's Morality and the Bomb: an Ethical Assessment of Nuclear Deterrence<sup>(67)</sup>. Even so, it is extremely difficult to refute the main thrust of MacIntyre's thesis simply because it accurately describes the way in which moral debate currently takes place. The just war tradition finds it difficult to cope with MacIntyre's thesis because it relies upon there being a reasonable consensus.

Whereas pacifism may or may not be argued for on natural law grounds, the just war tradition is usually seen as standing within the tradition of natural law<sup>(68)</sup>. It is therefore also susceptible to many other criticisms made of natural law theory. First there is the difficulty of deciding which facts are appropriate in providing a description of the case. According to James Finn<sup>(69)</sup>, John Courtney Murray observed one

could start an investigation of war in three places. Considered in isolation each will lead to a distortion. In the contemporary world, a discussion which begins with modern weapons technology will be likely to lead to relative Christian pacifism. One which begins with a consideration of Communism as a dominant fact in the present historical situation will be likely to lead to support for a 'holy' or pre-emptive war. One that examines the present mode of international organisation will be likely to lead to the argument that war, having lost its legality, is also invalid. The selection of appropriate facts therefore determines the argument.

The second problem with natural law is that the form of the description may influence the outcome of the moral argument. For example, Paskins and Dockrill suggest that Bainton's threefold typology of Christian attitudes to war (pacifism, just war, crusade) implicitly suggests that the just war is the mean between two extremes. They suggest that the presentation of what Bainton thinks is a neutral description predisposes people to find the just war tradition most acceptable<sup>(70)</sup>.

Third, the longstanding problem remains, how can you get values from facts, an ought from an is? MacIntyre's description of the breakdown of a moral consensus in part plays upon the apparent inability of people to derive the same values from agreed facts. However, the ought/is disjunction does not mean that there are no occasions when values can be recognised in facts.

Whilst each of these points is a telling criticism of the natural law tradition, none has proved to be decisive. Natural law continues to have a significant place in moral debate and the just war tradition within it.

Some Christians have been critical of the just war tradition because it is not distinctively Christian. Originating in pre-Christian times, it was shaped by the social mores of the world in which it was developed and has become part of international law. It is therefore accused of accommodating Christianity too readily to the ways of the world. However, this criticism is really an argument for a different theological basis to Christian ethics. Those Christians who make substantial use of natural law in their moral reasoning do not expect Christian ethics to be radically different from the ethics of all reasonable people of goodwill. God makes Himself known to us in creation by means of our reason, not solely by His revelation.

A final criticism of the just war tradition arises specifically in the context of a world with nuclear weapons. Some have suggested that any use of nuclear weapons would be unjust, being indiscriminate and disproportionate. Questions might also be asked about who is a legitimate authority with such a war in prospect. Reinhold Niebuhr, after the Second World War, thought that we lived

in a tragic era between two ages, one dead, the other waiting to be born. The age of absolute national sovereignty is over; but the age of international

order under political instruments, powerful enough to regulate the relations of nations and to compose their competing desires, is not yet born.<sup>(71)</sup>

Between these ages it is not clear who might be a legitimate authority to sanction a nuclear war. Michael Mahon suggests that the authority should reside with the prospective victims. For him, the whole matter is too important to be left to governments. The mass movements in Europe and the United States clearly indicate that the potential victims want to make the use of nuclear weapons illegitimate<sup>(72)</sup>.

Nevertheless, just war theory continues to be used in the discussion by those who might be identified as selective nuclear pacifists, eschewing the use of nuclear weapons (not weapons in general) on just war criteria<sup>(73)</sup>; by those who think that the limited use of nuclear weapons may be legitimate on just war criteria<sup>(74)</sup>; and by those who wish to develop a theory of just deterrence<sup>(75)</sup>. It is enough to note that the just war tradition is perceived at least by some, to have continuing relevance in our nuclear age.

### Conclusions

The pacifist and just war traditions have been the frameworks within which Christians have considered their attitudes to war. Neither tradition is a unitary phenomenon. Both exhibit considerable diversity and flexibility. They share the presumption that Christians are opposed to war in general. The just war tradition seeks to limit the effects of war given its inevitability in a fallen world.

In our nuclear age it is not obvious that the just war tradition should continue to be the dominant framework for Christians to think about war. Nuclear weapons appear to breach the principles of proportion and discrimination in such dramatic ways as to question the continuing validity of the just war tradition. Attention also needs to be given to the question of who is a legitimate authority to unleash such devastation upon humanity?

However, the just war tradition survives because of the claim that in our age weapons are held for defensive and not offensive purposes. The use of the just war tradition has shifted significantly. Only a few people attempt to show how a nuclear war could itself be just. A lively debate exists over whether nuclear deterrence could be just. Consequently the just war continues to be the main way in which the Churches think about nuclear weapons. At the WCC Hearings in 1981 the Moderator (John Habgood) observed that they were presented with a choice between using the pacifist and just war traditions<sup>(76)</sup>. There seemed little doubt that they should use that of the just war. This is what has happened in the majority of Church debates.

## Chapter 2

### Roman Catholicism

The fostering of peace and the promotion of the international community is the subject of a chapter in part II of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World ("Gaudium et Spes") the last of the Conciliar documents of Vatican II. This is the main text drawn on by Roman Catholics to establish the teaching of the Church on the subject of nuclear weapons. The other major document frequently referred to is the Papal Encyclical Pacem in Terris promulgated by John XXIII in 1963. Papal teaching has been given elucidation by a wide range of statements and letters collected in Peace and Disarmament: Documents of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church (WCC 1982). These are the source documents for this chapter. After using them to establish the theological basis from which Roman Catholics speak about nuclear weapons we will look at the practical convergences and divergences that have appeared in the more recent statements about nuclear weapons made by some of the Episcopal Conferences.

The consideration of only recent Roman Catholic Church statements fails to indicate the extent of the revolution that has taken place in this century in Roman Catholic teaching about war and peace. The decisive shift seems to have come with the Second World War and a consequent distrust in the rational capabilities of governments and of international law as checks to war<sup>(1)</sup>. The reacceptance of Christian pacifism



into the Church's teaching was made explicit by John XXIII and given shape and momentum by Vatican II. It has now become a major element in the Church's teaching, part of what some would describe as a renewed theology of peace rooted in the gospels<sup>(2)</sup>.

### Theological basis

It is abundantly clear that the notion of peace in Papal teaching is deeply rooted in the Bible. Peace is based on truth and a love which goes beyond justice<sup>(3)</sup>. In Pacem in Terris John XXIII worked at his theme of peace in terms of truth, justice, active solidarity and liberty. The language of both rights and duties was central to the way he presented his message. This language is hardly Biblical, though Roman Catholics make a strong case that it is an appropriate way of presenting the Gospel today.

### Hope

Peace on earth flows from love of one's neighbour. It "symbolizes and derives from the peace of Christ who proceeds from God the Father"<sup>(4)</sup>. It is both present possibility and future hope:

... the Church ... has not lost hope. The Church intends to propose to our age over and over again, in season and out of season, the apostle's message: 'Behold, now is the day of salvation'.<sup>(5)</sup>

The cast of this is Augustinian. Hope exists in the present, but only because of an ultimate reality that exists in the

heavenly city.

Far from diminishing our concern to develop this earth, the expectancy of a new earth should spur us on, for it is here that the body of the new human family grows, foreshadowing in some way the age which is to come. That is why, although we must be careful to distinguish earthly progress from the increase of the kingdom of Christ, such progress is of vital concern to the kingdom of God, insofar as it can contribute to the ordering of human society.<sup>(6)</sup>

#### Doctrine of Man

At Vatican II the bishops perceived that the question, 'What is man?' is one of the fundamental questions asked today<sup>(7)</sup>. So, within the Documents of Vatican II, the doctrine of man has particular importance. Man has an essential dignity because he is made in the image of God. He has a capacity to reason. There is an underlying assumption that humans are naturally ordered towards a common end, that they can perceive and work for a common good. Consequently, Roman Catholics are frequently encouraged to work with all people of good will. In all this there is a basic optimism about humankind, as if people should always be taken at their best. Humanity, created and fallen, has also been redeemed.

Roman Catholics can claim a high degree of realism, in this because of the way this doctrine of man relates to what has been said about hope and the two cities.

Insofar as men are sinners, the threat of war hangs

over them and will so continue until the coming of Christ; but insofar as they can vanquish sin by coming together in charity, violence itself will be vanquished ...<sup>(8)</sup>

Because human experience and revelation are complementary and harmonious<sup>(9)</sup> reason and revelation work hand in hand in constructing moral arguments. Consequently, great weight has been given to the just war tradition. Its principles pervade the Roman Catholic treatment of war. Wars must be conducted by a legitimate authority only as a last resort and in self-defence. The means must always be kept proportionate to the ends and there should be clear discrimination between combatants and non-combatants<sup>(10)</sup>. It is of great importance to the later debate that the Fathers of the Council noted that a moral dilemma is raised by nuclear deterrence, using weapons to maintain the 'peace', but they do not attempt to resolve it beyond a condemnation of the arms race<sup>(11)</sup>. Those in military service should regard themselves as "custodians of the security and freedom of their fellow-countrymen"<sup>(12)</sup>. Those who forego the use of violence are admired so long as their doing so does not harm the rights and duties of others in the community<sup>(13)</sup>. The bishops thought it just that provision is made for conscientious objection. This is a marked development of the teaching of Pius XII who said in 1957 that,

A Catholic citizen may not appeal to his conscience as grounds for refusing to serve and fulfil duties fixed by the law if the decision to undertake military operations is reached by freely elected

leaders and there is express danger of unjust attack.(14)

### Moral authority

Roman Catholics accept Conciliar and Papal teaching as having considerable authority. Nevertheless they are not infallible and always the moral decision must be made by the individual in good conscience. Conscience is understood to be God-given and universal.

His conscience is man's secret core, and his sanctuary. There he is alone with God whose voice echoes in his depths ... Through loyalty to conscience Christians are joined to other men in the search for truth and for the right solution to so many moral problems which arise both in the life of individuals and from social relationships. Hence, the more a correct conscience prevails, the more do persons and groups turn aside from blind choice and try to be guided by the objective standards of moral conduct. Yet it often happens that conscience goes astray through ignorance which it is unable to avoid, without thereby losing its dignity. This cannot be said of the man who takes little trouble to find out what is true and good, or when conscience is by degrees almost blinded through the habit of committing sin.(15)

This is not a very adequate account of conscience in that people conscientiously disagree as to what God is making known

to them. If conscience errs to such an extent, either it is not much use as the locus of moral authority or it does not provide objective moral truth. Either way the teaching of the Church will gain higher priority than the quotation seems to imply. In 1986 the treatment of Father Charles Curran, an American moral theologian, indicated exactly this. In describing Father Curran as 'not suited and not qualified' to teach Catholic theology, Cardinal Ratzinger (head of the Roman Curia's Doctrinal Office) said "the faithful are not required to obey only the infallible teachings" (always matters of doctrine, never of morality), "but also to submit to the intelligence and will of the Supreme Pontiff or the College of Bishops ... in matters of faith or morals ..."(16).

### Role of the Church

The Roman Catholic Church has a very clear understanding of its role in the moral debate. Its primary concern is to witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ:

The Church, while she helps the world and receives much from it, has one purpose: that God's kingdom may come and the salvation of mankind be accomplished.(17)

Often the Christian view of things will itself in certain circumstances incline [some believers] to some definite solution, while other believers, no less justifiably, assess the same situation differently. If divergent answers are too readily linked with the Gospel ... we should remember that no

one has the right in these cases to claim the authority of the Church for its own views. Those who differ should try to find enlightenment in sincere discussion conducted charitably and with the common good in the forefront of their minds.(18)

The Gospel demands that connections are made between the earthly and the heavenly cities, is not tied to any one political system or culture and lay people have the responsibility of working out the implications of the Gospel in their own lives. Therefore the Church is primarily concerned with the underlying religious questions that face humankind. This is why the first section of "Gaudium et Spes" states the doctrinal principles which the Fathers of the Council then applied to some urgent moral problems. Certainly the Church must try to read and interpret "the signs of the times" but always it must do so in a way that points to the deeper and underlying issues. Consequently, it is possible to see the Church's concern as radical because it attempts to identify and speak to humankind's deepest needs.

### Nuclear weapons

Nuclear weapons are considered along with other weapons of mass destruction. Three underlying issues are dealt with repeatedly in Papal teaching relating to the possession and the potential use of nuclear weapons. First, there is deep concern at the misdirection of human energy. Humankind has got its priorities wrong and there needs to be a reorientation. The gifts God has given us are being misused and not harnessed to peaceful ends.

In the first radio broadcast after his election, Pope John XXIII addressed the rulers of the nations:

Why are the powers of human ingenuity and material resources so often directed to the production of weapons - grim instruments of death - rather than to the advancement of prosperity among the various classes whose citizens live in want?<sup>(19)</sup> (John XXIII, 29th October 1958)

Second, there is concern to counter the sort of fatalism that seems to grip people in the face of the political processes in a way that might lead to the use of nuclear weapons. Exhortations encourage people to work for peace with all their energy<sup>(20)</sup>. People must be enabled to take the greatest possible responsibility for the world in which they live.

Third, it is recognised that the essential prerequisite to any peacemaking is the removal of fear and mistrust as a major factor governing relations between nations.

It is a common impression, derived from the simple observation of facts, that the principle foundation on which the present state of relative calm rests is fear. Each of the groups into which the human family is divided tolerates the existence of the other, because it does not wish itself to perish. By thus avoiding a fatal risk, the two groups do not live together, they co-exist. It is not a state of war, but neither is it peace: it is a cold calm. Each of the two groups smarts under the fear of the other's

military and economic power. In both of them there is a grave apprehension of the catastrophic effect of the latest weapons.(21)

It is therefore of great importance that Christians seek to break down these barriers of mistrust.

These are the repeated ingredients of Papal teaching on all weapons of mass destruction in the period 1945-82. The emphasis laid on each point varies, mainly in response to shifting political events and technological change. For example, during the years of the Cold War the need to break down fear and mistrust was particularly stressed. In the years of greater detente the misdirection of human energy and resources became dominant. In other words, there is a noticeable response to the changing "signs of the times", the Vatican II phrase used to indicate the Thomist principle that circumstances alter cases.

#### Statements made by Episcopal Conferences

Some of the statements issued by Episcopal Conferences on nuclear weapons have been criticized because the bishops overstepped their area of competence by making prudential judgements which identified one particular policy too closely with the Gospel. For example, the United States Roman Catholic bishops noted for themselves that they were doing this(22) and Michael Novak, among many others, criticizes them heavily for it(23). It is therefore interesting to note that "Gaudium et Spes" itself moves very freely from points of underlying principle to something close to the prudential judgements which



made the US Bishops' Letter so controversial. The major difference seems to be that the Fathers of Vatican II did not prescribe the political options quite as tightly as the US bishops were later to do.

Two examples will make this clear. First, the point of principle that there is a misdirection of human energy in making weapons of mass destruction leads to a scathing attack on the arms race. It is crucial that we begin to deal more concertedly with the injustice that leads to human discord and eventually to wars<sup>(24)</sup>.

"... the arms race is one of the greatest curses on the human race and the harm it inflicts on the poor is more than can be endured. And there is every reason to fear that if it continues it will bring forth those lethal disasters which are already in preparation. Warned by the possibilities of the catastrophes that man has created, let us profit by the respite we now enjoy, thanks to divine favour, to take stock of our responsibilities and find ways of resolving controversies in a manner worthy of human beings."<sup>(25)</sup>

Second, the need to establish a universally acknowledged public authority with the effective power to ensure security for all, regard for justice, and respect for law is stated time and again. This is not intended to undermine what has already been done in this area but it is to say that the breaking down of barriers of mistrust between people must gain institutional

form in agencies of international co-operation. In both these examples the Fathers of Vatican II are beginning to move into the area of prudential judgements and it is difficult not to see the more recent statements of Episcopal Conferences as natural developments of this process.

There is a significant difference of method between the US Bishops' Pastoral Letter and the other statements of Episcopal Conferences. The US Letter was produced after two drafts were put out for discussion and careful use was made of academic theologians. The result is a document with a well integrated use of the Bible<sup>(26)</sup> which reflects the widely noted changes that have taken place in Roman Catholic social thinking since Vatican II by which Church pronouncements have become more "prophetic"<sup>(27)</sup> or "evangelical"<sup>(28)</sup>. It is difficult to find the right word, but what is being noted is that the social teachings of the Church no longer appear solely in the philosophical, legal form of the natural law tradition, but have taken on a much more proclamatory form, announcing the truths of the Gospel. John Langan, commenting in 1982 on the second draft of the US Bishops' Letter, observed that the bishops had a choice of method. They could have used the natural law tradition. Langan identified the strengths of this as being its capacity to handle complex intellectual and moral problems; its capacity to communicate the Church's vision in terms the world can understand because of its dependence on reason; and its provision of a framework and language in which the Church can learn from the secular world.

Alternatively, the bishops could have chosen

a prophetic word of salvation addressed to the world in the name of the Lord, a word which recognizes the urgency of the contemporary situation and which affirms the absoluteness of God's demand upon us ... [This approach] is closer to biblical precedents and is therefore attractive for ecumenical reasons and because it accords with the desire of Catholic theology to recover its biblical roots. (29)

In their final version of the Letter the bishops tried to combine these approaches. In theory, this should not have made much difference because of the Roman Catholic assumption that a basic harmony exists between reason and revelation. In practice it did. What they produced was perceived to be a radical departure from previous Roman Catholic official documents because it sought to combine the just war and evangelical pacifist traditions. In the US Bishops' Pastoral Letter, the Church challenged itself and society with God's message of peace which demands a response. The division between Church and Society is sharp. This was in marked contrast to the French Bishops' Letter, admittedly a much slighter document and seemingly heavily dependent on that produced by the West German bishops, which had no explicit treatment of the Bible or Church history and was little more than a rational discussion of what were considered to be the facts of our nuclear circumstances. Langan's point was that the US bishops were producing a Letter which would be intellectually vulnerable in terms of the tradition of natural

law because it did not meet the usual criteria of reasoned argument. He himself appeared more excited by the possibilities of this alternative. His warning, however, proved correct, and various commentators have referred to the greater "political realism" of the European statements<sup>(30)</sup>.

In the same article, Langan also noted that the US bishops had to decide how to cope with the

more tentative, contextualist, and consequentialist way in which the more influential Catholic theologians are writing today ... the bishops encounter fundamental conflicts between the desire to offer moral guidance that can be helpful in the concrete but complex historical situation and the desire to offer teaching that is clear and convincing to all Christians. There is also a conflict between the desire to respect the responsible judgement of free citizens and the desire to insist on what they regard as essential to the survival and integrity of the Christian community.<sup>(31)</sup>

This has been a problem for all the bishops in producing their statements and this reflects the widespread difficulty of moving from statements of moral principle to a statement of practice<sup>(32)</sup>.

The propriety of nuclear deterrence, not dealt with at Vatican II, admits of some variation between the Episcopal Conferences. None tried to justify it as more than a temporary

expedient, one step on the way to arms reduction. Those taking this position made use of the principle of double effect to distinguish between the possession and use of nuclear weapons. They said that in our present circumstances a policy of deterrence is the lesser of two evils. For France, the possession of nuclear weapons was said to protect them, a relatively weak State, from the strong and it prevented the possibility of nuclear blackmail<sup>(33)</sup>. These last points could be claimed to be the case for NATO as well which is why the British Cardinal Hume asked for a "no first use" policy. The US bishops gave their government's "present deterrence posture" a much more critical evaluation. Specifically they opposed:

- (1) The addition of weapons which are likely to be vulnerable to attack, yet also a 'prompt hard-target kill' capability that threatens to make the other side's retaliatory forces vulnerable. Such weapons may seem to be useful primarily in a first strike ...
- (2) The willingness to foster strategic planning which seeks a nuclear war fighting capability that goes beyond the limited function of deterrence outlined in this Letter.
- (3) Proposals which have the effect of lowering the nuclear threshold and blurring the difference between nuclear and conventional weapons.<sup>(34)</sup>

It is typical of this US Letter that the Government's policy was analysed in detail to see if it was actually achieving or was likely to achieve the stated ends.

Differences between the various Episcopal Conference statements have been claimed to be rooted in their analysis of political

contexts and ideologies. For example, according to James Schall,

... the French and German bishops paid more attention to the nature of the ideology found in the forces opposing democratic societies than did the US bishops, though the latter didn't ignore the point either. Likewise the [French and West German] bishops analyzed more thoroughly the political context in which weapons exist and threaten rather than the physical weapons themselves, which seems to have been more the focus of the US document.(35)

The point is fair, but it is worth trying to explain. The US bishops refer to their Pastoral Letter on Marxism published in 1980(36). They did not intend to repeat the exercise of that Letter, though they were clearly open to finding common ground with Marxists. Second, it is possible that the US bishops feel the need to counter the paranoia about Communism which is more widespread in the States than in Western Europe.

Finally, the Episcopal statements also contain some differences of emphasis because of the local concerns and perspectives. For example, the bishops of the GDR appeal for Peace Studies to be taught in schools instead of Defence Studies.

With anxiety we observe how military categories of thought are becoming increasingly integral to school curricula and professional training.(37)

They also stress the rights and duties of parents in the education of their children in a way that the documents from

Western countries do not. Although there is an attempt to educate the State about its duties, there is an acceptance of the need for parents to take the religious and moral education of their children into their own hands.

Having said all this, because Roman Catholic moral teaching stands in a very clear tradition and because all analyses by the hierarchy are produced in subordination to and in consultation with the Holy See, there is a remarkable consistency between the various statements concerning nuclear weapons. All the documents express considerable scepticism about the possibility of a just nuclear war, point to the madness of the arms race, the misdirection of human energy and the need to remove fear as a dominant factor in international relations. Even on the controversial matter of nuclear deterrence there is a substantial measure of agreement. Brian Wicker has identified unanimity on six propositions:

- (A) The only legitimate purpose of nuclear deterrence is to prevent war. It is therefore immoral to procure or deploy more weapons or firepower than are needed simply to deter a potential aggressor from starting a war. Any quest for 'superiority' is forbidden.
- (B) There must be no intention directly to attack whole cities or large population areas.
- (C) Because of the immediate dangers of the arms race, any deterrence policy must itself help to promote disarmament now, certainly not to make it more difficult.
- (D) Nuclear deterrence is not a stable or secure means for the establishment of security for any nation. Therefore, it

can be tolerated, if at all, only as a short-term temporary expedient providing an interlude during which the potential leaders must set about achieving genuine disarmament.

- (E) Any policy for security, including nuclear deterrence, must be compatible with, and indeed promote, international trust, human rights and co-operation - on which alone secure peace can be built.
- (F) Nevertheless, "in current conditions 'deterrence' based on balance not as an end in itself but as a step on the way to progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable. Nonetheless, in order to ensure peace, it is indispensable not to be satisfied with this minimum, which is always susceptible to the real danger of explosion."  
(John Paul II)(38)

In addition the statements of the Episcopal Conferences showed considerable unanimity about the sort of response required of every individual Christian. There are calls for the renewal of individuals to the life of prayer, including penance and fasting. There is a need to develop a broadly based attitude of reverence for life. The US bishops remind their people of Paul VI's call:

If you wish peace, defend life.(39)

They make an explicit link between an attitude of reverence for life in opposition to war and in defending the defenceless unborn(40). This is common in Roman Catholic Church statements. There are also repeated calls for strong parish education programmes which help Christians to move from the



discussion of peace to active work as peacemakers. This practical support and encouragement of individuals at a local level is extraordinarily important in helping people overcome feelings of despair and fatalism. It is a recognition of the essential link between the inner peace that is the gift of Christ to individuals and that external peace which needs to be built into the social order so that we may glimpse the possibilities of God's kingdom in the here and now.

## Chapter 3

### Church of England

#### Introduction

The main document produced by the Church of England in recent years about nuclear weapons is the report of a Working Party chaired by John Austin Baker, the Bishop of Salisbury, The Church and the Bomb: Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience (London: CIO/Hodder and Stoughton, 1982). Because the recommendations of this report were rejected by the General Synod and because of the nature of Anglicanism with its emphasis on the authority of the individual more than on the authority of the Church, it is essential to refer to the wider debate that surrounds this report.

In 1986 a further Working Party was established to carry forward the work done in connection with The Church and the Bomb. Chaired by Richard Harries, the Bishop of Oxford, its report was published in 1988 under the title Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age (Church House Publishing, 1988) and will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

#### Theological basis

In 1948 the Church of England responded to the British Council of Churches' report The Era of Atomic Power (London: SCM, 1946) with a report entitled The Church and the Atom (London: Church Assembly, 1948). It attempted to consider its subject in the light of, "the distinctive approach of Anglican thought and theology" (p.6.). This is in marked contrast to the self-

conscious ecumenism of the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party. This group of six plus a secretary included a Roman Catholic, a Quaker and a philosopher without Christian denominational commitment specialising in War Studies. Such a group could not have had a shared tradition of theological ethics<sup>(1)</sup>. Indeed, Gordon Dunstan, an Anglican but not a member, has suggested that there may not be a specifically Christian contribution to the discussion about the morality of nuclear weapons<sup>(2)</sup>. What matters is the clear consideration of the facts and the moral implications of those facts. For Dunstan, the theological contribution is in providing the framework to handle contradictions, refusing to simplify, reduce or become partisan. The overall framework is focussed in a doctrine of man both sinful and redeemed which makes it possible

to walk between a facile optimism - a belief that all things are possible to us once we have perfected the systems, whether it be a weapons system or an instrument for world government - and a numbing despair, the assumption that the worst must happen, so that there is nothing we can do about it.<sup>(3)</sup>

The theological stance in this is implicit. John Habgood, having quoted this passage from Dunstan's article, goes on to make explicit the Christian beliefs that underly it:

... the prime Christian contribution to ethics is in the indicative rather than the imperative mood. In terms of the principles by which people should live and societies order themselves, Christians have little to say that could not be said by any reasonable person of goodwill. It is Christian

belief about the kind of place the world is, about the depth of human sinfulness and the possibilities of divine grace, about judgement and hope, incarnation and salvation, God's concern for all and his care for each, about human freedom and divine purpose - it is beliefs such as these which make the difference, and provide the context within which the intractable realities of social and political life can be tackled with wisdom and integrity.<sup>(4)</sup>

Such an approach clearly relates to the natural law tradition, which is both philosophical and theological. As was noted in relation to the Roman Catholic documents, this tradition has the capacity to handle complex intellectual moral problems, it can communicate the Church's vision in terms the world can understand and it provides a framework and a language in which the Church can learn from the secular world<sup>(5)</sup>. It is therefore attractive ground for such a diverse group as the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party to occupy, particularly when producing a report for an Established Church seeking to speak both to Church and Nation. Their main concern was with the factual aspects of the problems surrounding nuclear weapons<sup>(6)</sup>.

This approach to morality is consistent with the tradition of Anglican moral theology which retains, and in the seventeenth century to some extent recovered, the classical features of Aquinas<sup>(7)</sup>. But to say this is not to exhaust the Anglican tradition. Kevin Kelly, a Roman Catholic, writing about Anglican Carolines and their understanding of conscience,

subtitles his book, 'A study in Seventeenth Century English Protestant Moral Theology'<sup>(8)</sup>. He shows that these Anglicans were not strictly Thomist in language and method; do not associate their casuistical divinity exclusively with the confessional; and place less emphasis on the respect due to authorities than on the education of conscience so that every individual could become his own casuist in ordinary affairs. Thomas Wood<sup>(9)</sup> observes that moral theology became of interest in the Caroline period because of the need people felt to work out the implications of the doctrinal controversies that preoccupied their predecessors. The structure of this is the same as of Paul's letter to the Romans in which he expounds the great doctrines of justification and grace and then continues in Romans 12.1: "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship." Here the Christian way of life is a consequence of right belief. However, any attempt to move directly from doctrine to ethics is fraught with difficulty. In the twentieth century, the Social Gospel Movement became discredited because of the ease with which it was possible to develop different ethical conclusions from the same doctrinal base<sup>(10)</sup>.

The authors of The Church and the Bomb did not make much use of this more overtly theological approach available to them from within the Anglican tradition. There is no real discussion of doctrine and the Biblical section is highly selective, making greatest use of the Wisdom literature which, of all the Biblical material, best fits the tone of the report. Right

reason is the essential tool of the Working Party's debate and there is little uniquely theological about it. Their approach is pragmatic.

A very interesting parallel is described by John Habgood who chaired the World Council of Churches' International Hearing on Nuclear Weapons in 1981. They asked four theologians to speak at the first main sitting in the hope that they would provide some Christian guidelines within which subsequent reflection might take place. Such theology as emerged was fragmentary and in the course of the Hearing only two coherent approaches emerged, the just war tradition and pacifism. It was apparent that the theologians found it difficult to make a particular contribution to the debate<sup>(11)</sup>.

#### The role of the Church

As for the Roman Catholic bishops, a major problem facing the members of the Working Party which produced The Church and the Bomb was how specific they should be in their recommendations for public policy. Since 1937 one means by which Anglicans have done social theology has been by the use of 'middle axioms'. William Temple was widely influential in his use of these, though the phrase was first coined by J H Oldham when he wrote:

Such broad assertions that Christians are bound to obey the law of love or strive for social justice do not go far towards helping the individual to know what he ought to do in particular cases. On the other hand, there is no way by which he can be

relieved of the responsibility of decisions in concrete situations. To give him precise instructions to be literally carried out is to rob him of his moral responsibility as a person. It is not the function of the clergy to tell the laity how to act in public affairs but to confront them with the Christian demand and to encourage them to discover its application for themselves. Hence between purely ethical statements of the ethical demands of the gospel and the decisions that have to be made in concrete situations there is need for what may be described as middle axioms. It is these that give relevance and point to the Christian ethic. They are attempts to define the directions in which, in a particular state or society, Christian faith must express itself. They are not binding for all time, but are provisional definitions of behaviour required of Christians at a given period in given circumstances.(12)

Ronald Preston gives as examples of middle axioms the French Revolution's liberty, equality and fraternity; William Temple's freedom, social fellowship and service; and R H Tawney's equality(13). In each case the middle axioms function not as the middle step in a logical argument moving from a general first principle to some practical act, but as anchors or compasses, tools which will help us read our circumstances without prescribing only one set of actions in response. The use of middle axioms requires the individual's sound judgement.

(T)hey combine insights from the Christian faith with some analysis of 'what is going on' today which involves empirical investigation and judgement on the significant trends, and on the direction in which policies should move.(14)

In recommendations 18-20 the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party were much more specific than the use of middle axioms would have required. Their aim was to move beyond rhetoric and to show where they unanimously found the logic of their arguments leading them, although they acknowledged that their recommendations would not command universal assent(15). Three of the Working Party have commented as to why they adopted this course of action. Sydney Bailey had been a member of an earlier working party set up by the Anglican Board for Social Responsibility and had "quietly withdrawn" because it did not say enough about nuclear weapons. By implication he wanted the group which produced The Church and the Bomb to be more specific(16). John Elford was concerned that the Working Party should speak about the means as well as the ends of their statements of policy(17). The Bishop of Salisbury stressed the importance of going beyond ethical principles to practical recommendations on the grounds that this was an appropriate way of stimulating debate. He was looking for a discussion that had real consequences, particularly because of mutual balanced force deterrence.

Mutual balanced force deterrence is said to be 'stable' while suggestions of even modest unilateral reductions are dismissed as 'seriously de-



stabilising'. This is almost the exact reverse of the truth.(18)

The decision to present only one set of policy recommendations in recommendations 18-20 provoked very considerable criticism. John Habgood thought the report an example of Anglican sanity at its best but went on to warn:

I am not at all sure that the Church as a corporate body would be wise to identify itself too closely with a particular political programme. It is not that Churches have no right to make political judgements. Sometimes they have to. In a case of this complexity the problem is that decision-making must depend on a host of subtle factors which those not directly engaged in the business of politics have difficulty in estimating.(19)

Ronald Preston claimed that by proposing specific political policies the report did not do enough to prevent the debate becoming falsely polarised between unilateralism and multilateralism, the Church simply echoing the secular debate(20).

#### The Church and the Bomb

The publication of The Church and the Bomb did a great deal to raise the level of public debate about the morality of nuclear weapons. It provided a clear description of current nuclear weapons and of military strategy. It presented the mainstream Christian tradition as it has handled issues of war and peace and related this to the nuclear debate. It discussed and

evaluated various policy options for peace and presented the one the Working Party thought most likely to achieve most towards it.

The shape of the report's conclusions is commendably clear. The use of nuclear weapons could never be justified because of their disproportionate and indiscriminate effects. Even the development of highly sophisticated battlefield weapons is unlikely to change this judgement. The Working Party could not justify the continuing effect of radiation and in any case thought it likely that any nuclear war would escalate rapidly to a major confrontation. They were sceptical about the claim that nuclear deterrence had kept the peace since the Second World War and pointed both to the quality of that peace as experienced by states locked into a 'balance of terror' and to the large number of wars that had taken place in that period. They also pointed out that a policy of deterrence did not require nuclear parity and were highly critical of the arms race. The growing belief that nuclear wars might be winnable led them to the conclusion that the philosophy of nuclear deterrence was becoming more unstable and ought to be abandoned. They argued that Britain renouncing its independent nuclear deterrent would help reduce the pressure towards nuclear proliferation and, by reducing the number of independent centres that needed to be taken into account, would simplify a little the highly complex arms limitation talks. Such a safe, controlled and modest action could have the effect of breaking the log-jam and stimulating general disarmament. The reasons for all their recommendations about the possession

of nuclear weapons (as opposed to their use) was therefore prudential, matters of judgement about the facts.

Other important issues were raised in the report which never received proper attention in discussion. The Working Party voiced a concern that the decision-making about nuclear weapons was being done by a small sub-group of the Cabinet. In order to increase public accountability and to improve the quality of the public debate by making more information available, they recommended that decision-making on defence and disarmament should be done more in Parliament than at present.

The need for better education of the public was stressed as was the importance of using accurate language so as not to reinforce prejudice and so dehumanize ourselves and our opponents. The role of the media in educating and forming public opinion was noted. A discriminating support of the United Nations was among a number of recommendations that encouraged the development of internationalism. In specific recommendations to the Churches the Working Party wanted to see greater use made of the international fellowship that gives Christians an opportunity to listen to people across international boundaries. Christians must pray, preach and practise peace and help people to realise that true peace is a gift of God.

#### The General Synod debate

Graham Leonard, the Bishop of London, as Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility, introduced the three sections of the

debate. At the outset, he appealed to the Synod to conduct the debate in a way that reflected an understanding that everyone present wanted the best for mankind. Disagreements would be about how to achieve it. He carefully distanced himself and the Board from the Working Party's report.

His criticisms centred on five issues<sup>(21)</sup>. First, he pointed to the fact that we are faced with a choice between pacifism, understood as non-resistance, and some sort of deterrence. The Working Party might have felt aggrieved by this. They had taken the trouble to describe the varieties of pacifism, which the Bishop of London seems to have misunderstood as a unitary phenomenon. They had also tried to show how the policy proposed by them created a range of political options, that it was not a pacifist report, nor did it support deterrence.

Second, he developed arguments to show how the report was deficient in the way it considered the use of political power. There is a need for a restraining hand in an imperfect world. It would be wrong for us to give up nuclear weapons because that would leave the world's nuclear weapons in unscrupulous hands. The Working Party's proposals could not be implemented by anyone seriously involved in the political task:

We are addressing those who have the responsibility for making such decisions on behalf of our country, decisions which have to be made in the light of the situation which actually confronts us, and I believe we have to be very realistic about this; and it is, I believe, lacking in Christian responsibility to urge

courses upon people which we know in fact are not practical suggestions for them.

Third, he criticized the neglect of any consideration of biblical apocalyptic, but appeared to be unsure what the positive contribution of this literature might be.

Fourth, he criticized the Working Party for, in effect, regarding itself too highly:

It elevates its opinion that the possession and use of nuclear weapons is wrong to such a position as to override all other moral considerations.

Fifth, he pointed to some examples of confusion within the report. Of particular note is his observation that the distinction between good and evil is blurred and that the report has too benign an estimate of Soviet intentions. This point relates very closely to what he said about an inadequate consideration of the exercise of restraining power.

The Bishop of London recognised the urgency of our need to be peacemakers in a nuclear age, wanted to value the many things that had already been achieved, and called on H M Government and NATO to reduce their dependence on nuclear weapons and strengthen international treaties, especially as they apply to the possession and use of nuclear weapons. In the reporting of the debate the Bishop of London's position was identified as being in line with the Government's policy<sup>(22)</sup>.

John Austin Baker, the Bishop of Salisbury, proposed an amendment which provided an opportunity for a vote to be taken on the specific recommendations of the report:

That this Synod recognising

- (a) the urgency of the task of making and preserving peace; and
- (b) the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present international situation,

calls upon H M Government, together with our allies in NATO,

- (a) to announce the UK's intention of carrying out, in consultation with its allies, a phased disengagement of the UK from active association with any form of nuclear weaponry, involving:
  - (i) bringing to an end the Polaris strategic nuclear system, and cancelling the order for the proposed Trident replacement;
  - (ii) discontinuing all nuclear weapons wholly or mainly of British manufacture;
  - (iii) negotiating Britain's withdrawal from the manning of nuclear weapons systems manufactured by others;
  - (iv) negotiating an end to agreements for the present or future deployment of nuclear weapons systems on British soil;
- (b) to invite other governments to make positive responses to the British initiative by

comparable measures either of renunciation or restraint;

- (c) to continue to prosecute vigorously disarmament negotiations of all kinds; and
- (d) to devote resources to positive programmes for the building of peace and the fostering of international confidence along the lines indicated in the remaining Recommendations of The Church and the Bomb (namely nos 2-17 and 21-22). (23)

In his speech, the Bishop of Salisbury chose not to repeat what had already been said either in the debate or in the report, but attempted to clear up important misconceptions and clarify some of the practical issues. First, mutual nuclear deterrence is not a stable condition and is becoming less so. Increasing numbers of weapons increases the possibility of accident, and increasing accuracy makes 'first-strike' use more likely.

Second, deterrence does not demand parity. What is needed is a capacity to inflict a level of damage that an enemy is not prepared to sustain, to be able to deliver it to the target, which means it must be invulnerable to a first-strike. Both East and West possess many more weapons than a policy of deterrence requires. It is possible for either side to pursue unilateral disarmament on a considerable scale without jeopardising the policy of deterrence. He pointed to the need for a powerful independent initiative without NATO and the EEC.

His amendment was defeated 338 votes to 100. The vote was reported to have been a relief to the Government.

In a very powerful speech Hugh Montefiore, the Bishop of Birmingham<sup>(24)</sup>, clarified the Church's role. Christianity was not tied to any ideology, nor should it seek to determine defence strategy. It should not engage in sterile, political arguments, but should offer a creative lead out of our impasse by opening up the real moral issues. He noted that New Testament ethics were only concerned with personal action and distinguished clearly between this and the action of the State. He accepted deterrence as a positive duty of the State, making no distinction of principle between policemen and nuclear weapons. However, deterrence required that weapons were clearly for defensive purposes. NATO should therefore adopt a 'no first use' policy.

The Bishop of Birmingham was then able to sketch the principle of double effect to justify the real possibility of nuclear retaliation in the event of deterrence failing. He thought the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party's proposals had the effect of letting us shelter under the American nuclear umbrella whilst disclaiming moral responsibility. He was also concerned about the consequences of phasing out USA nuclear weapons in the UK, thinking it likely this would give further ground to 'the hawks' in the US. He stressed the need to find confidence-building measures to encourage international co-operation.



The full text of the Bishop of Birmingham's amendment was as follows:

That this Synod recognising

- (a) the urgency of the task of making and preserving peace; and
- (b) the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present international situation; and
- (c) that it is not the task of the Church to determine defence strategy but mindful of its duty to give a moral lead to the nation:
  - (i) affirms that it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government and her allies to maintain adequate forces to guard against nuclear blackmail and to deter nuclear and non-nuclear aggressors;
  - (ii) asserts that the tactics and strategies of this country and her NATO allies should be seen to be unmistakably defensive in respect of the countries of the Warsaw Pact;
  - (iii) judges that even a small-scale first use of nuclear weapons could never be morally justified in view of the high risk that this would lead to full-scale nuclear warfare;
  - (iv) believes that there is a moral obligation on all countries (including the members of

NATO) publicly to forswear the first use of nuclear weapons in any form;

- (v) bearing in mind that many in Europe live in fear of nuclear catastrophe and that nuclear parity is not essential to deterrence, calls on Her Majesty's Government to take immediate steps in conjunction with her allies to further the principles embodied in this motion so as to reduce progressively NATO's dependence on nuclear weapons and to decrease nuclear arsenals throughout the world.(25)

The Bishop of Birmingham's amendment was carried 275 to 222 and then passed as the main motion 387 to 49 with 29 abstentions. Curiously, the way in which this amendment was reported stressed the common ground with the Government's policy and minimised the fundamental disagreement that was introduced by the 'no first strike' proposal.

Each of the positions represented by the Bishops of London, Salisbury and Birmingham are to some extent incoherent. The Bishop of Birmingham's accepted amendment might be criticized in two important respects. First, subsequent discussion has questioned the acceptability to Christians of a policy which relies on massive nuclear retaliation. The principle of double effect seems to operate here rather like the 'hygienic words which invite complacency' which the Archbishop of Canterbury warned against in the Synod debate(26). The distinction

between possession and use, which has to be made by those who support a policy of nuclear deterrence, therefore has an inherent problem which might be described as incoherence. This explains why most Christians who support deterrence do not see it as a long-term option.

Second, the amendment lacks a vision of peace. In his speech the Bishop of Birmingham said, apparently without irony or any sense of self-contradiction,

so long as we continue to have mutual assured destruction as a result of nuclear missiles in submarines, the peace is kept ... (27)

There was a curious lack of discussion about the meaning of peace throughout the debate. Perhaps any willingness to explore differences was precluded by the Bishop of London's opening remarks which seemed to assume that everyone wanted the same thing.

As was noted above in chapter 1, it may be that a degree of incoherence is inevitable in any response to war. The moral issues will be decided by people opting for what seems to be the least incoherent position. This appears to be part of the Working Party's thinking<sup>(28)</sup>. Consequently, as John Habgood has noted,

Politicians who fly by the seat of their pants are likely to do better than those who stick rigidly to hard and fast principles.

Continuing the debate

Writing in 1985, the Bishop of Salisbury identified three items which arose in the debate of The Church and the Bomb which needed more attention. First, following a point made by the then Archbishop of York, Stuart Blanch, a more subtle approach needed to be developed in relation to Biblical Apocalyptic in order to see what contribution it can make to the debate. Second, the questions which emerged about the theology of power, mostly developed from the thought of Reinhold Niebuhr, are worth pressing. It is right that the government be permitted to do things not allowed to individuals but what are the limits to this and how are the methods governments use modified by God's revelation in Christ? Third, he noted that the question of Christian pacifism, which the Working Party felt itself unable to deal with, won't go away. Interestingly, he reckoned that the issue could not be treated fairly unless there is some agreement about what Jesus saw as the relation of the Church to the world. The Bishop expressed frustration about the way many of the report's proposals did not get serious attention. The nineteen other recommendations in The Church and the Bomb sank without trace once the three politically controversial proposals were rejected. In recognition that the road to peace will be a long hard haul, the Bishop acknowledged the effort that will be required when he concluded,

We are going to have to commit a sacrificial proportion of prayer, toil and suffering to this cause for a long time to come. (30)

Peacemaking in a nuclear age

At the time of writing the final parts of this thesis the Working Party established under the chairmanship of Richard Harries, Bishop of Oxford, has just published its report, Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age (Church House Publishing: 1988). As yet there has been very little public discussion of it and it will not be discussed by the General Synod until November. What follows is therefore a review of the document rather than of the discussion surrounding it.

In the Preface the Chairman states that the Working Party's concern was with the political rather than the military and with theology rather than ethics<sup>(31)</sup>. In this they were clearly trying to develop the discussion that took place around The Church and the Bomb. There is an excellent discussion of the meanings of peace in which a helpful distinction is made between shalom, pax and inner peace. Shalom is that peace of God in which the whole creation flourishes. It is personal, social, political and environmental, embracing life in all its fullness. It is essentially connected with a future hope in which God's just rule will suffuse all things. Pax is that peaceful order which allows society to function. It might be defined as the absence of war, or as armed truce. Certainly it implies an element of coercive force. Pax is brought about by the necessary restraint of wickedness. At its highest there is a considerable element of consent and minimal coercion. Inner peace is that serenity which God can give to individuals, even in disturbed circumstances. In the opening chapter the relationship between these three kinds of peace is explored and

the need for each is affirmed. It is a pity that in later chapters the concern for the political and social means that the concept of 'inner peace' falls from the agenda. There is no discussion of peacemaking spirituality, something which has become very prominent in the years since 1983. It is a curious omission.

The chapter on Christian hope provides a context for stating that hope is not just in a future prospect.

It is that present transformation of human lives which is the strength and mainstay of Christian believing - and that strength is the work of the Spirit of God.(32)

The hope of 'a new heaven and a new earth' is the context for discussing the place of Biblical apocalyptic in the nuclear debate. The contribution of this literature is not thought to be great: the crucified God is not a God who wills the evil of a nuclear holocaust. Maybe this section has been too influenced by the misuse of Apocalyptic in the 1983 General Synod debate and the contributions of a number of theologians in the ensuing international discussion have not been developed (see chapter 6 below).

The crucial question of the relationship between Church, State and Patriotism is the subject of chapter three. The discussion is heavily influenced by Keith Clements' A Patriotism for Today: Dialogue with Dietrich Bonhoeffer (Bristol Baptist College, 1984). In this chapter the Working Party gets closest

to uncovering its assumptions about who they are writing for. They stress that despite religious pluralism in England and despite the new internationalism of Anglicanism (not a mention of English secularization) the Church of England still belongs to English society in significant ways. This is highly controversial. The generalisation can probably be agreed upon but it is how the Church of England belongs to English society that is crucial. The Working Party writes as if the Church of England has no deep-seated differences with the British Government. This is a remarkable assumption at the end of a decade which has seen the collapse of elected Parliamentary opposition and the emergence of Bishops in the House of Lords as a major source of discomfort to the Government.

The Working Party performed its task with the assumptions of realpolitik. The General Synod having voted decisively against the proposals of the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party, it appears that there is to be no further discussion of pacifism, not even pacifism based on just war principles. The political world of the late 1980s is very different from that of the early 1980s. Arms negotiation from strength has been seen to make progress, particularly with the remarkable agreement between the USA and USSR over intermediate range nuclear weapons. At last, the policy of deterrence is being shown to lead to significant arms reductions. The Working Party is surely right to applaud this.

However, the chapter on deterrence is remarkable for its failure to uncover the assumptions of the debate. The recent

agreements affect less than four per cent of the total nuclear arsenal. There is still a need for sustained moral pressure towards disarmament. Chapter 8 is headed 'Meanwhile Deterrence' which appears consonant with the ecumenical consensus that has emerged during the 1980s that deterrence is only acceptable as a short-term strategy to help us out of our nuclear nightmare. Yet the discussion is of arms reductions and improved East-West relations, not of vision of a transformed society which has moved beyond deterrence. The Bishop of Salisbury's speech to the General Synod in 1983 about the dangers of deterrence (see above) fell on deaf ears. So called 'political realism' has resulted in a lack of vision. A consideration of the motives of the superpowers involved in arms reductions might have helped unlock this discussion. It would be right to remind ourselves of Becket's warning about motives in T S Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*:

The last temptation is the greatest treason:

To do the right deed for the wrong reason. (33)

The Working Party has focussed on that part of the discussion generated by recommendations 18-20 of The Church and the Bomb. Consequently they have been caught with the same old discussions. Certainly by attending to theology and politics they have filled some gaps. Even then there are some curious omissions. Why is there no extended discussion of the theology of power? Considerable naivete is shown in the statement that,

The message of the cross is that evil cannot be defeated by the exercise of power. (34)

As it stands, this is surely wrong. What is the power of God,



the power of the cross? If the Working Party is making the same sort of point as used to be made by the Anglican pacifist Charles Raven<sup>(35)</sup>, then it sits rather uncomfortably with the rest of the report. Richard Harries has been a consistent advocate for the need to rework Reinhold Niebuhr<sup>o</sup>'s theology in the discussion of the use of power in our nuclear age. It is extraordinary, therefore, that a Working Party which he chaired should miss this opportunity.

Saddest of all is the Working Party's retreat into generalisations in the quest for unity. How can the Working Party be so pleased with the degree of consensus which it attained when that consensus rests on platitudes? Two examples will suffice. There is no clear statement of the degree of unanimity attained by the group. In the Preface the Chairman writes that,

The report is not such that every member of the group would go to the stake for every judgement in it but its main aim is a matter of urgency to us all.<sup>(36)</sup>

The main thrust appears to be that peacemaking in a nuclear age is an urgent task. Of course it is urgent to anyone prepared to give the matter headspace. An even more urgent question is why so many people do not give the matter headspace, a question that the Working Party does not seriously address. A consideration of spirituality for peacemakers and a greater attention to the significance of inner peace for pax and shalom might have helped here.

In the chapter on 'Church, State and Patriotism' it is said that

There can be agreement that there is a Christian case for commitment to and defence of the state in certain conditions, and an agreement about the dangers of mindless and uncritical loyalty, especially in a State whose obsession with security gradually destroys what it seeks to defend, and reproduces the very tyranny that it fears. (37)

Yes, but what does this actually mean in Britain in 1988? Is it a self-congratulatory slap on the back that as long as the Church of England is mildly critical of the Government all shall be well? Or is it a coded message to the Prime Minister that it is no longer acceptable for her to continue to say in an unqualified way that the first duty of any government is the defence of the nation? In the past the Church has frequently stressed that national defence is but one aspect of that pax which is necessary for human flourishing. The first duty of any government is therefore to create the conditions in which people can flourish. Defence is a subordinate rather than a primary principle. The particularities of this are not discussed in the Working Party's report. It is as if they have retreated to agreeable generalisations in the light of what happened to the supposedly too particular policy recommendations of The Church and the Bomb. This lack of courage is to be regretted. It is odd to want to quote Reinhold Niebuhr to Richard Harries again:

If a minister wants to be a man among men he need only stop creating a devotion to abstract ideals

which everyone accepts in theory and denies in practice, and to agonize about their validity and practicability in the social issues which he and others face in our present civilization. That immediately gives his ministry a touch of reality and potency ... (38)

Repeatedly the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party comment upon the importance to them of the process by which they wrote their report. Clearly they enjoyed working together even though they began from different starting points with different perspectives. They offer their model of work as something for others to follow. It is a pity, then, that they were not more self-conscious about the process. No attempt is made to describe it clearly. Was there more than presenting papers to each other, discussing them, and rewriting them in the light of the discussion<sup>(39)</sup>? There is no statement of the terms of reference given to the group, no reasons given for discussing this rather than that, no sustained effort to show the connections with previous Church of England discussion, little effort to indicate the work of other Churches. No one has bothered to identify who they are seeking to address, a question identified by Stanley Hauerwas as of enormous significance in the American context<sup>(40)</sup>. Only in the last chapter is there recognition of the need for the Church to talk to itself apart from the wider society in which it is set. This comes too little and too late.

Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age recognises too few of the underlying issues of the 1983 debate. It does not really 'carry forward' the work of that debate though it fills some gaps in that discussion very usefully. Its willingness not to go beyond unexceptionable generalisations is further evidence of the way the Church of England is trying to cope amidst changing Church-State relations. The Church appears to want to remain part of the Establishment, whilst maintaining a mildly (and ineffective) critical role.

## Chapter 4

### Lutheran Churches

#### Introduction

A considerable number of statements about nuclear weapons have been made by Lutheran Churches throughout the world. However, there has been only one substantial Lutheran document, "The Preservation, Promotion and Renewal of Peace: A Memorandum of the Evangelical Church in Germany" (EKD Bulletin (1981)). It therefore provides the main evidence for contemporary Lutheran attitudes to nuclear weapons in this section. A considerable number of smaller documents from the United States and Finland provide supporting evidence.

Historically Lutherans have had a very distinctive approach to theological ethics. That is why they have been included for consideration in this study even though they have only a small presence in the United Kingdom. Consequently it is necessary to outline the place of ethics within the theological enterprise. This will be done by considering first the work of Martin Luther and second the writings of Helmut Thielicke who was responsible for a mammoth reconstruction of Lutheran Theological Ethics after the Second World War. Only then will we turn to the Church statements.

#### Martin Luther (1483-1546)

The Reformation cannot be understood at all without some sense of the agony of Luther's interior battles in these years leading up to 1519 ... Luther looked,

with rare simplicity, into the face of the God he was told to serve, and hated what he saw.(1)

He hated what he saw because he saw a God who was righteous and who demanded righteousness from his people. Luther saw no way of attaining this so, inevitably, he was angry with God and angry with himself.

The confessional system of penance and absolution offered some comfort. If it was impossible not to do wrong then what mattered was to seek God's forgiveness. Since the third century the Western Church had had a legalistic view of repentance. Tertullian, who had a legalistic cast of mind, translated the Greek metanoia (repentance) into poenitentiam agere (perform a penance)(2). The Vulgate did the same thing. Thus it looked as if by confessing all their sins and by doing penance for them, a person could put themselves right with God.

Luther went to his confessor regularly, sometimes daily, for up to six hours at a time. Always, he came away and remembered things he had forgotten to confess. Staupitz, his confessor, is reported to have exclaimed,

Man, God is not angry with you. You are angry with God. Don't you know that God commands you to hope?(3)

It was Staupitz who drew Luther's attention to the meaning of metanoia, repentance in the sense of conversion, a complete turning around, a reorientation of one's whole personality to God. Luther came to see that just as the physician cannot cure

the disease scab by scab, so repentance cannot be performed by focussing on particular offences. The whole of human nature needs to be changed.

Christian hope does not reside within the individual person, but within the gracious activity of God who sent His son into the world to redeem humankind. Christ, who was sinless and who rose from the dead, is the bearer of salvation.

Here this rich and divine bridegroom Christ marries this poor, wicked harlot, redeems her from all her evil, and adorns her with all his goodness. Her sins cannot now destroy her, since they are laid upon Christ and swallowed up by him. And she has that righteousness in Christ, her husband, of which she may boast as of her own and which she can confidently display alongside her sins in the face of death and hell and say, "If I have sinned, yet my Christ, in whom I believe, has not sinned, and all his is mine and all mine is his", and the bride in the Song of Solomon says, "My beloved is mine and I am his.". This is what Paul means when he says in I Cor 15, "Thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ", that is, the victory over sin and death, as he also says there, "The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law.". (4)

In faithfulness to this belief in Christ, Luther condemned the philosophical ethics and casuistry of mediaeval Roman

Catholicism.

(I)t is clear that as the soul needs only the Word of God for its life and righteousness, so it is justified by faith alone and not any works; for if it could be justified by anything else, it would not need the Word, and consequently it would not need the faith.(5)

Good works will therefore achieve nothing, faith alone is the righteousness of a Christian.

This does not mean that ethics have no place in Luther's theology. He quotes an aphorism: "Good works do not make a good man, but a good man does good works; evil works do not make a wicked man, but a wicked man does evil works."(6). Although works cannot glorify God, they can be done to His glory(7). Ethics are therefore subordinate to the believer's faith in Christ: "He who fulfils the First Commandment has no difficulty in fulfilling all the rest."(8).

So a Christian ought to think:

Although I am an unworthy and condemned man, my God has given me in Christ all the riches of righteousness and salvation without any merit on my part, out of pure, free mercy, so that from now on I need nothing except faith which believes that this is true. Why should I not therefore freely, joyfully, with all my heart, and with an eager will do all things which I know are pleasing and acceptable to such a Father who has overwhelmed me with his



inestimable riches? I will therefore give myself as a Christ to my neighbour, just as Christ offered himself to me; I will do nothing in this life except what I see is necessary, profitable, and salutary to my neighbour, since through faith I have an abundance of all good things in Christ.<sup>(9)</sup>

In contrasting the Lutheran to the Roman Catholic position, Lutheran scholars emphasise that Christian ethics are based on the 'divine indicative' of God's grace rather than the 'divine imperative' of His law<sup>(10)</sup>.

Luther finds a Biblical foundation for his teaching on social ethics in the doctrine of the two kingdoms, one ruled by God, the other by Caesar<sup>(11)</sup>. God rules with both hands. The spiritual rule is His government of the right hand. This is an inward and spiritual government of the soul in which God cares for the redemption and eternal salvation of believers. With His left hand God rules the temporal order which he instituted to punish sin and maintain an external peace in the world. In this realm, God has entrusted secular rulers with power to exercise on His behalf. Their concern is only with people's external behaviour.

We must divide all the children of Adam into two classes; the first belonging to the kingdom of God, the second to the kingdom of the world. Those belonging to the kingdom of God are all true believers in Christ and are subject to Christ. For Christ is the king and Lord in the kingdom of God ...

(T)hese people need no secular sword or law. And if all the world were composed of real Christians, that is, true believers, no prince, king, lord, sword or law would be needed ... . Since, however, no one is by nature Christian or pious, but everyone sinful and evil, God places the restraints of the law upon them all, so that they may not dare to give reign to their desires and commit outward, wicked deeds ... . If it were not so, seeing that the whole world is evil and that among thousands there is scarceful one Christian, men would devour one another, and no one could preserve wife and child, support himself and serve God; and thus the world would be reduced to chaos. For this reason these two kingdoms must be sharply distinguished and both be permitted to remain; the one to produce piety, the other to bring about external peace and prevent evil deeds; neither is sufficient in the world without the other. (12)

It is therefore proper for the Christian, exercising his functions in duty to the State, to use force and to go to war. Luther uses Scripture to support his case that the State has been instituted by God. Repeatedly he draws on Romans 13.1-4 and 1 Peter 2.13-14. Because of God's institution of the State,

the hand that wields this sword and kills with it is not man's hand but God's; and it is not man, but God, who hangs, tortures, beheads, kills and fights. (13)

Luther seems extraordinarily supportive of the State, at times almost unconditionally so. The ruling madman may be opposed for he cannot be reasoned with, but not so the tyrant. The tyrant still has a conscience and he may improve. By contrast, the mob was not to be encouraged much. The overwhelming need is to preserve order.

(I)t is better for the tyrants to wrong them a hundred times than for the mob to treat the tyrant unjustly but once. If injustice is to be suffered, then it is better for subjects to suffer it from their rulers than for rulers to suffer it from their subjects. The mob neither has any moderation nor even knows what moderation is. And every person in it has more than five tyrants hiding in him. Now it is better to suffer wrong from one tyrant, that is, from the ruler, than from unnumbered tyrants, that is, from the mob.(14)

Not surprisingly, Luther is aware of critics who accuse him of flattering the princes!(15)

Clearly there are problems with Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms. In particular, the separation of an ethic of pure love in the individual's private life from duty defined by the State in their public life is a very sharp dichotomy. A question remains as to whether the love ethic could transform social structures as well as individuals? There seems to be little place for criticism of the State nor for the role of the individual within it. Also, Luther's view of society was uncomplicated and static, not really adequate to the

complexities and turbulence of his own day, let alone later times.

Criticisms of Lutheran ethics were particularly sharply focussed in the twentieth century by events surrounding the Second World War. Some thought the inability of the vast majority of German Christians to provide an adequate critique of Nazism was, at least in part, the legacy of Lutheran social theology. It was a sensitivity to these criticisms, among others, that led Helmut Thielicke to his massive restatement of Lutheran Theological Ethics in the post-war period.

#### Helmut Thielicke

In a spate of lectures, papers, sermons and speeches given in the immediate post-war period, Helmut Thielicke addressed the fundamental ethical issues facing the German people. A systematic reworking of these themes was provided by his Theological Ethics<sup>(16)</sup>. In part, Thielicke's concern was to present Luther in a way that explains him better to his critics. More importantly, perhaps, was his attempt to develop a contemporary account of Lutheran Theological Ethics.

Thielicke's work points to two important lessons. The first about Luther in particular, is that Luther's works are so vast and varied that they contain considerable variety of judgement. It is important to be aware of the range of opinion expressed by Luther on various subjects in different times and places as well as to see how these opinions arise within the main developments of his thought. It is too easy to use Luther to

serve particular interests. For example, in the celebrations of 1983 marking the five hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, the East German State repainted a quotation from Luther above the town hall in Wittenberg: "Fear God, respect the powers that be, and spurn rebellion.". Alternative quotations might have been more disturbing: "When a Prince would be in the wrong, should his people follow him? Answer: No ... for one must obey God more than man."(17).

Second, Thieliicke's analysis of contemporary criticisms of Luther is a warning about the care needed in all honest criticism. He thought the contemporary criticisms of Luther were more accurate in their analysis of some aspects of contemporary German Lutheranism than they were of Luther(18). They were inaccurate about Luther because,

that which in Luther's teaching constitutes a real danger is treated as if it were an accomplished fact. The assigning of autonomy to the world is thus described as a 'theological disaster' rather than as a 'theological possibility' in Luther.(19)

Luther's support for the State based on passages such as Romans 13 is not without reservation. It is inevitable, given the fallenness of human nature, that the State exercises power to limit the effects of wickedness. But the State is provisional in that it exists between Fall and Judgement. Romans 13.12 provides a clear indication that the context of obedience to the State is eschatological: "the night is far gone, the day is at hand ...". According to Thieliicke,

statements concerning the State as the normative representative of the kingdom of the left hand finally issue in statements concerning the kingdom on the right hand, ie, statements on the immediacy of the Christian to the returning Christ<sup>(20)</sup>.

Further, Romans 12, the preceding passage, is an appeal to Christians to live the life of love including the blessing of persecutors. Thus the love commandment stands in tension with the order of the State and, again, the obedience due to the State is relativised<sup>(21)</sup>.

In addition, Paul's remarks about the State in Romans 13 and other passages need to be held in contrapuntal relation to Revelation 13 which provides an essential corrective to mis-interpretation. The great beast is a State which has become demonic because it has taken to itself all the functions of God by seeking to control every aspect of human life.

The authority of the State is therefore relative and limited. Christians should regard it as a minimal authority and Thielicke quotes Oscar Cullman: "Wherever the Christian can dispense with the State without threatening its existence, he should do so"<sup>(22)</sup>. For Luther, resistance to the State was permitted, in the limited sense of denying active obedience, whenever the State demanded actions contrary to God's commandments. Such resistance would be illegal within the terms of the State, but it would be legitimate<sup>(23)</sup>.

The circumstances of Luther's day and our own are very different and no simple transfer of his thinking can be made to the modern State, whether democratic or totalitarian. In a democracy, resistance in the limited sense defined above, is essential to the political process. It is both legal and legitimate. Consequently revolution could never be legitimate in a functioning democracy<sup>(24)</sup>. In a totalitarian State resistance will be illegal but may be legitimate. Under certain circumstances a revolution may be permissible: where it is a last resort, when a successor government is available and when such a revolution is legitimated by the people as a whole<sup>(25)</sup>. The difficulty of demonstrating these circumstances shows clearly the Lutheran presumption of the legitimacy of the State.

What is clear about either form of modern State is the inevitability of the exercise of power. For Thielicke, the problem is not the necessity of power but the man in power<sup>(26)</sup>. By dispersing power throughout the State and not focussing it on one individual or a small group of people, temptation is limited. But even where a distribution of power is guaranteed by constitutional means, social or economic concentrations of power may be hard to control. Thielicke says:

These latent upsurges of power are a sign that the problem of power does not have its roots in the institutional sphere and consequently cannot be solved by institutional means. The problem is man himself. It is man who undermines and overthrows all his institutions. Institutions are merely the "arms

of flesh" on which no reliance can be placed (II Chron 2:8; Jer 17:5). To trust in them notwithstanding is arrogantly to attempt some kind of self-redemption. Institutions progress, to be sure. They may even attain to the refined perfection of the welfare state. But man himself is always the same. (27)

In his discussion of "War in the atomic age" (28), Thieliicke begins by stating that atomic war would be suicidal. However,

'If atomic war is to be abolished, then that which makes it possible, namely, the questionable and dubious possessor of these weapons, should also be abolished.' ... Now "abolishing" him need not mean destroying him. It can mean simply doing away with the qualities which make him an object of mistrust. (29)

A central element to reducing the tension which leads to states possessing atomic weapons must therefore be the encouragement of trust between people. At a personal and individual level this can be done in such a way as the individual puts himself at risk in relation to a rival. Among states, such a disposition cannot even exist (30). Consequently, in the kingdom of the left hand, the State and justice must be armed in order to restrain and defend. The peace of this world is, therefore, very different to the peace of God. It is an anxious and servile fear not the peace of filial love (31).



It is possible to speak of an 'atomic peace', but only in the sense of peace in the kingdom of the left hand. Just as power in a democracy needs to be widely distributed in order to limit temptation, so in a world with atomic weapons it is best to disperse the power given by the possession of weapons as widely as possible. From the perspective of the 1980s it is curious that Thieliicke does not consider the effects of possessing atomic weapons on the internal workings of a democracy. This is a concern of the recent debate, particularly (but not only) among those of the political left. However, there were those of Thieliicke's day who saw the issue clearly. Among them the English Roman Catholic Ronald Knox. In a response to the bombing of Hiroshima in 1945 Knox wrote with extraordinary insight:

One thing I take to be quite certain about the Atomic Age - the police are going to have the best of the street fighting. Where the means of destruction are widely distributed and easy to come by, there is some chance of popular indignation dethroning the tyrant. But it is likely that our new fighting weapons ... will be jealously kept beyond the reach of the public. Nothing but a palace revolution will be possible, and the ordinary man, deprived of any opportunity to take an effective interest in the future of his country, will be driven in on himself; sometimes, let us dare to hope with salutary results. It was said of a man suffering from an unexpected illness, 'God stretched him on his back, to give him time to think'. Let us dismiss the ungracious image

of the world as a slave in a dungeon; let us call it, instead, a sick world that has gone into hospital. The doctors, some of them, have rather kill-or-cure methods; the nurses have not always a fortunate bedside manner, but anyhow, here we are, with time to think.<sup>(32)</sup>

If so conservative figure as Ronald Knox could see the problems for democracy posed by a State's possession of nuclear weapons it is curious that Thielicke should miss the point. Thielicke's position is also curious because of the now widespread desire to prevent nuclear proliferation due to the political instability it will cause<sup>(33)</sup>. Widely distributed atomic weapons is just about the last thing either of them wanted.

The fundamental aspects of Thielicke's discussion are theological. His concern is with people in relation to God and to each other. Nevertheless, within the kingdom of the left hand the choices to be made about the possession of nuclear weapons can only be a matter of political judgement and not of faith. The need here is for responsible people acting prudently. The Church will do damage to the discussion by offering ideals and absolutes. What is needed is political realism. The political choice is always between evils. No option will be unequivocally good and the search is always for the best available option.

In this area of political decision making the Church has two tasks. First, to preach and second, to counsel<sup>(34)</sup>. The

content of the preaching in our atomic world must be the greatness, the misery and the calling of man; the content of the covenant with Noah in which God promised that He would not destroy the world nor let it destroy itself as long as there are people who keep the covenant; the opposition to false absolutes and doctrinaire alternatives. The preaching of the Church is therefore radical, pointing to the underlying realities of the human condition.

By contrast, the counsel of the Church can deal only with symptoms and must be concerned with one question:

How the bellicose spirit of man, if it cannot be rooted out by the means of the law, can at least be kept in the incubation stage and prevented from becoming active. (35)

The content of the preaching of the Church will remain fundamentally the same. However, the precise content of the Church's counsel is bound to vary considerably according to circumstances. Inevitably, therefore, all the Lutheran documents on nuclear weapons dwell much more in this second area of concern and they can at first sight appear to be theological lightweights. However, by carefully stating the doctrine of the two kingdoms it has been possible to uncover the theological assumptions of the recent Lutheran documents concerning nuclear weapons. Their basic theological content is implicit in the outlook of the authors who produced them. In reality, the doctrine of the two kingdoms provides a more

coherent and systematic basis for Christian ethics than exists for either Roman Catholics or Anglicans.

### Recent Lutheran Church Statements

"The Preservation, Promotion and Renewal of Peace: A Memorandum of the Evangelical Church in Germany"<sup>(36)</sup> (henceforward EKD Memorandum) is among the most limited of Church documents reviewed for this study. This is in keeping with the other Lutheran documents considered during the preparation of this chapter<sup>(37)</sup>. It is divided into two sections. First, an analysis of the political context and of previous Church contributions to the debate. Second, a consideration of the particularly Christian orientation of the peace-making task and of the Church's contribution to this activity. The authors are aware of their limits and their aims:

The Commission for Public Responsibility of the EKD is well aware that it can only come up with suggestions and perspectives; it has raised open-ended questions for politicians and included expectations which it cannot fully satisfy. It was unable and unwilling to encourage those who restrict their sights to the military dimension of the subject by producing yet another position in the current, highly specialised discussion about military balance and the need for arms upgrading. However necessary this discussion may be, the Commission considered its task to be primarily that of stimulating a fresh and - it is to be hoped - continuing discussion of political responsibility for peace.<sup>(38)</sup>

The report was therefore intended to help Christians and others in their thinking about nuclear weapons. Its suggestions for action were aimed specifically at the Churches and Christians. To an Anglican, it is strikingly clear that the report knows who it is aimed at. It lives up to its promise in that the debate about the morality of a policy of nuclear deterrence is not the main focus of the discussion and the discussion of the document was therefore potentially less polarised than that of the US Roman Catholic Bishops and the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party.

The analysis of the political context suggests a deteriorating position as nuclear deterrence looks less and less stable. In 1981 relations between the USA and USSR were at a particularly low ebb and the USA had announced its intention to station Cruise Missiles in Western Europe. In addition, attention was drawn to other international conflicts, such as in the Middle East. The American debate over hostages in Iran was still fresh, the nuclear technology of the superpower having been unusable at this lower level of conflict. There was concern about the arms race, the level of international debt and development issues. Despite increased awareness of the need to negotiate disarmament no breakthrough had been achieved. In this context the peace movement in Western Europe was growing rapidly.

After noting the political efforts to safeguard peace since 1945 and previous statements made by the EKD attention was given to four groups within the Church representing different

positions on nuclear weapons. Their positions were individual consistent pacifism, peacemaking without weapons accompanied by negotiated disarmament, negotiated gradual disarmament, and maintaining peace with military safeguards whilst seeking a balanced negotiated disarmament.

These positions simply reflect the secular debate about nuclear weapons. The fascinating element of the EKD's Memorandum is the way in which it tried to hold the variety of positions together in some sort of fruitful tension. The EKD's "Heidelberger Theses" on War and Peace in the Atomic Age (1959) still have credibility in the way they stated this. The EKD Memorandum summarised the relevant points as follows:

The citizens of the western world face the dilemma 'of whether to protect the legal order of civic freedom by using nuclear arms or to surrender it without defence to their opponent' (Thesis 5). Opposing decisions of conscience taken in the face of nuclear weapons have to be understood as complementary. Their common basis must be the aim to avoid nuclear war and to establish world peace. 'Any way of acting which is not based on this aim seems impossible for a Christian' (Thesis 6). The opposing decisions have a common root, but are self-exclusive in content. Each of these decisions invokes precisely the risk that another attitude wants to avoid. 'It may be that the one can only follow his path because there is someone following another path.' (Thesis 6).

These insights lead to the following conclusion: 'The Church must recognise participation in the attempt to safeguard peace in freedom by the presence of nuclear weapons as still being a possible Christian way of acting' (Thesis 8)(39).

The acceptance of practical diversity is also a feature of Lutheran documents from the USA. Finland is not a nuclear state and the documents from its Lutheran Church address Church members more than the wider society. There is less willingness to accept diversity and a greater urgency in their declaration that:

The use of nuclear arms or the threatening with them has to be, all over the world, as soon as possible, proclaimed as a crime against humanity.(40)

Gunther Krusche, an East German Lutheran, in a paper read to the WCC Public Hearing on Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament in 1981(41) moved decisively away from an acceptance of diversity. He suggested that the inadvisability for Christians of using nuclear weapons is such that it could be considered a matter of status confessionis. For Christians to make use of nuclear weapons would be apostasy. In the discussion of his paper Krusche stated that his thinking was not just a statement of an individual's perspective. Perhaps the relationship of Church and State in the GDR makes more possible a distinctive and critical stance by the Church. However, there was no mention whatsoever of 'status confessionis' in the EKD Memorandum.

Because all the Lutheran documents are particularly concerned to address their Church members they have extremely interesting and often very imaginative proposals for action within the life of the Church. The EKD Memorandum was confident about the ultimate significance of that to which Christians witness:

The Church has the task of strengthening hope in faith in view of the fears breaking out everywhere about the state of the world. As Christians we do not close our eyes when peace is violated or threatened. We are, however, confident that the cases of violence which seem to contradict this hope will not have the last word. Only a hopeful person has time to seek consensus solutions to the problems disturbing us today. The preservation, promotion and renewal of peace is the response expected of Christians to the divine promise in Jesus Christ. We respond to God's gracious promise by witness in faith to his reconciliation with the world.<sup>(43)</sup>

God's kingdom is therefore a precondition of the action of Christians: the kingdom of peace is first an eschatological reality and an object of faith and only then an ethical task in the earthly realm<sup>(44)</sup>.

In their calling to be peacemakers Lutherans have stressed the need to develop peace education. The headings of this section in the EKD give some idea of the scope of this:

- (a) Peace as a Condition of Life in a Technological Age



- (b) Preventing the Normalisation of Nuclear Threat
- (c) Guidance on Coping with 'feeling threatened'  
with Awareness and Common Sense
- (d) Following the State's Fulfilment of its Peace  
Mandate with Constructive Criticism
- (e) Around a Spirit of Compromise
- (f) Preventing Public Demonstration of Violence
- (g) Using Learning Opportunities for Peace (45)

There is little explicit theology in this: it comes into what Thieliicke identified as the counsel of the Church. It does indicate the renewal of spirituality which is widely felt to be necessary as Christians seek to become peacemakers. The American documents tend to have a greater emphasis on the need to renew the study of scripture and the Church's worship.

One further theme emerges consistently in all the Lutheran documents. The Churches in their own life have the opportunity to witness to the possibilities of living as a community, even when there are considerable differences between the members of that community. The principle can be extended to give added significance to ecumenical dialogue and international contacts. Such developments can be extremely helpful confidence-building measures which assist others to see the possibilities for human co-operation.

### Conclusions

Although the Lutheran documents, on the whole, lack detailed and explicit Theology, the framework provided by Luther's

doctrine of the two kingdoms and Thielicke's distinction between preaching and counsel makes this very understandable. Because of this tradition of Lutheran social theology these documents are particularly clear about the moral distinction to be made between individuals and groups. Within the documents there is an acceptance of a range of prudential judgements, though with a common thread that our present circumstances are not acceptable and there must be movement in the reduction of nuclear armaments.

## Chapter 5

### The Religious Society of Friends

Unlike the other Churches considered in this study, there has been no lengthy official report or statement on nuclear weapons by the Society of Friends. From the time of their founder, George Fox, Friends have consistently opposed all war and the Peace Testimony has become central to Quaker practice. This has been witnessed to repeatedly in the minutes of London Yearly Meeting. In this respect the Society has the considerable advantage of being consistently in the one pacifist tradition.

It is typical of Quakerism that the evidence of how this testimony has been witnessed to lies primarily in the lives of individual Friends. In presenting the attitude of the Society to nuclear weapons we will consider first the teaching of George Fox and the witness to peace by early Friends, and then the faith and practice of Modern Quakers, particularly with regard to nuclear weapons.

#### George Fox and early Friends

Since boyhood George Fox had been on a religious search which caused him to consult clergy and dissenting ministers.

When all my hope in them and in all men was gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, Oh then, I heard a voice which said, 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can



speak to thy condition<sup>o</sup>, and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy.<sup>(1)</sup>

The essence of Fox's teaching was that in the power of God's spirit people did not need intermediaries to bring them to God. Rather, the Inner Light, was to be found in all people. Thus religious authorities were unnecessary and harmful. Fox had no place for priests, and little for professors. Even the Scriptures had a distinctly subordinate place. For Fox the primary question was

You will say, 'Christ saith this, and the apostles say this' - but what canst thou say?<sup>(2)</sup>

Thus Fox wanted himself and his followers to be known as 'Children of the Light'. However, after telling a magistrate to tremble at the word of the Lord, the magistrate's nickname for Fox's movement stuck: the Quakers.

The Inner Light meant that there was a fundamental dignity, possessed by all people and a basic equality between them. From the beginning, women had an equal place with men among Fox's followers and a tradition began of calling all people by their Christian name and surname, without regard to titles. Because of the Inner Light, which is to be found in all people, Fox exhorted his followers to

Walk cheerfully over the world, answering that of God in every one; whereby in them you may be a blessing, and make the witness of God in them bless you.<sup>(3)</sup>

This sounds a hopelessly optimistic account of human nature. Talk of the Inner Light and 'that of God in every one' appears to ignore our fallen nature. George Fox, however, had plenty of experience of human wickedness. After being beaten unconscious by a mob, Fox came to:

I lay a little still, and the power of the Lord sprang through me, and the eternal refreshings refreshed me, that I stood up again in the eternal power of God and stretched out my arms amongst them all, and said again with a loud voice, 'Strike again, here is my arms and my head and my cheeks.' (4)

It was not that Fox was naive about human nature but that he was convinced of an unshakeable truth that good will overcome evil.

I saw also that there was an ocean of darkness and death; but an infinite ocean of light and love, which flowed over the ocean of darkness. And in that also I saw the infinite love of God. (5)

As Rufus Jones said, "Nothing can overwhelm a man with a vision like that" (6)

From the beginning, Fox was not primarily interested in scholarship and the academic study of theology. He had a low opinion of professors and priests, at least in as much as they thought that by studying at Oxford or Cambridge they were equipped to be priests. The only valid test of a person's Christianity was whether they lived in the Spirit of Christ-like love, not what they said they believed (7). According to G M Trevelyan,

The finer essence of George Fox's queer teaching ... was surely this - that Christian qualities matter much more than Christian dogmas. (8)

The Quaker testimony against war was therefore not part of Fox's original preaching but a moral implication of it. In 1651, whilst imprisoned in Derby under the Blasphemy Act, Fox was invited to become a captain in the Commonwealth Army.

I told them that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars, and I knew from whence all wars did arise, from the lust according to James' doctrine (James 4.1) ... I told them I was come into the covenant of peace which was before wars and strifes were. (9)

Fox and the early Quakers were caught up in the "Lamb's War", in which the Holy Spirit would convert and transform all people to the peaceful ways of Christ. Many of the early Quakers had been soldiers and sailors. According to William Penn, "they were changed men: they were changed men themselves before they were about to change others" (10). But the evidence of these early years is that pacifism was a personal rather than a political option. Edward Burrough, the founder of Quakerism in London wrote favourably about the Commonwealth Army. In 1659 he wrote an Epistle to the Cromwellian garrison at Dunkirk in which he urged them to "set up their standards at the gates of Rome" and "avenge the blood of the guiltless through all the dominion of the Pope" (11). However, the behaviour of the army

deteriorated and Friends began to leave the army or be expelled from it in considerable numbers.

In an age of enormous political turmoil it was not surprising that the Quakers were viewed with suspicion. In 1661 Fox and eleven others wrote a declaration to Charles II in an attempt to clear the Quakers of accusations of plotting insurrection. Part of this declaration has been reproduced frequently and is the heart of the Quaker 'Peace Testimony':

All bloody principles and practices, we ... do utterly deny, with all outward wars and strifes and fightings with outward weapons, for any end or under any pretence whatsoever. And this is our testimony to the whole world ... that the spirit of Christ, which leads us into all Truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdom of this world.(12)

A contemporary said of George Fox, "Though the Bible were lost, it might be found in the mouth of George Fox"(13). Whilst Fox used a great deal of scripture in his arguments, the peace testimony, like all Quaker practice, is grounded in an intuitional sense of the wrongness of war and violence when held up to the Inner Light of Christ(14). In the "Lamb's War" Peter Brock notes that,

only inner spiritual weapons were consistent with the leadings of the Spirit. Unrighteousness must be cast down, but not with the weapons of unrighteousness.

The Quakers indeed, may be described as non-violent resisters rather than non-resisters in the Mennonite style. (15)

Peace meant following the way of love, and this could only begin in the hearts and minds of individuals. Eventually, through the conversion of many, society would be leavened.

Unlike the Anabaptists and Mennonites, the early Quakers expected the world to be converted by the Holy Spirit in the "Lamb's War". They did not think they would always remain a small outcast minority to the end of time. In the 1650s and '60s their growth was so rapid that they had some good cause for this optimism. It was only after 1689 that the "Lamb's War" was abandoned and their energies became more focussed on maintaining the righteousness of the Quaker community. According to Brock, "The apocalyptic visions of 'The First Publishers of Truth' were ... replaced by a growing emphasis on gradualism" (16). Barclay, Penn and Bellers all suggested ways of establishing harmony between nations without them having to accept Quaker ideals.

Again in contrast to Anabaptists and Mennonites, Quakers possessed a positive attitude to the State. It was never just an evil necessity. The early Friend, Isaac Pennington, gave a legitimate place within society to the Police, Army and Navy (17). They were inevitable given the current beliefs of men. But the Lord calls us to a better way and the State can aim for this as well as the individual. The Quaker testimony



is against war, not against all the possible uses of force. However, in Britain, it was not until the nineteenth century that the law allowed Quakers to take an active part in politics and government and it was only in the New World, particularly in Pennsylvania, that the problem of the Quaker Magistrate was posed.

It is worth noting the attitudes to paying war taxes among early Quakers, particularly because the issue is of concern to the Society today. Fox himself was willing to pay tax "in the mix", that is where the money to be used for war could not be separated out from the general taxation. This has been widely acceptable to Friends in later times.

About specific war taxes there has been less unanimity. In the early eighteenth century some weighty British Friends thought that all taxes should be paid. The purpose for which they were used was a matter for Caesar, the rulers of the state, not for the individual. However the position of Friends in the New World was different and in some places they were able to participate in Government<sup>(18)</sup>. Because of their conviction that "conduct is more convincing than language"<sup>(19)</sup>, Friends painstakingly explored the implications of their actions in an attempt to discover ways of conscientiously upholding their testimony against war.

In 1755 John Woolman and twenty other Friends in Pennsylvania opposed the raising of taxes in order to pursue war with the Indians. To some extent the dispute emphasised the division

that had taken place between the frequently nominal Quakers active in the Pennsylvanian legislature and the movement's spiritual leaders. However, Woolman himself saw it as an opportunity for the humbler members of the Society to set an example to the greater<sup>(20)</sup>.

In 1756 some Quakers in the Three Lower Counties of Pennsylvania (later, Delaware) were fined when they refused to muster in response to a new militia law. Throughout Pennsylvania, where they refused to pay taxes their goods were distrained. Because most Friends in fact paid, the tax refusers were likely to find that the collectors and constables with responsibility for distraining their goods were also Friends. Consequently there was considerable distress caused to both individuals and the Society. No resolution to the problem was found until peace came and quietened the controversy, if only for the time being<sup>(21)</sup>.

#### The faith and practice of modern Quakers

The Society's peace testimony has been given varied expression in different political and social contexts<sup>(22)</sup>. However, the Quakers have maintained a consistent opposition to all war and fighting. According to Adam Curle there are two dimensions to the task of peacemaking in today's Quaker Peace Testimony, both of which were present in Fox's declarations of 1651 and 1661:

The first is to transform unpeaceful into peaceful relations. The second is to work for conditions conducive to peace and unfavourable to violence.<sup>(23)</sup>

It is the combination of these two dimensions which causes

Peter Brock to describe modern Quakers as 'International Pacifists' (24). Their ethic of peace and peace-seeking is integrated with other concerns, such as justice between rich and poor. Integrational pacifists positively accept the role of government and the use of force by government. What they reject is the use of injurious force in international relations.

For modern Quakers, as for George Fox, peacemaking begins with the individual. The possession and threatened use of nuclear weapons are symptomatic of a deep and underlying spiritual malaise. It is as though people are asleep, oblivious to the empowering truth that the Inner Light is within them. According to Adam Curle,

... most of us are steeped in wrong ideas about ourselves. There is much we have to unlearn before we can accept the simple, life-giving truths. ... Thus the Light is hidden, the truth forgotten, the seed enclosed in a husk. (25)

Peace on a world scale can only come about by a change of heart on the part of countless individuals. A poster summarises their hope:

World peace will come through the will of ordinary people like yourself. (26)

In this, so called 'political realism' is explicitly rejected. The primary concern is the individual, not the group. Social ethics are the sum of individual ethics. The vision of peace is of wholeness and shalom, not merely of order and justice.

It is brought about through the inner peace of countless individuals.

Because peace is to do with the attitude of heart and mind in each individual a single issue, or cluster of issues such as those surrounding nuclear weapons, will only be regarded as symptomatic of much else. Adam Curle talks of 'the fire in the peat', tongues of flame bursting out of the ground. Underneath fire spreads inexorably, the tongues of flame being only symptomatic of a much bigger problem which is the crystallisation into institutional form of the poisons of greed, hatred and folly<sup>(27)</sup>. At this point, Curle's analysis is reminiscent of Reinhold Niebuhr's Moral Man and Immoral Society<sup>(28)</sup>. However, his prescription is radically different.

Although the ills of the world and their source, the fire in the peat, are far more widely recognised than before, their supporting institutions, the great corporations, the defence establishments, the bureaucracies, are immensely strong. It is hard for those involved in them to perceive things differently. Indeed we are all involved indirectly or to some extent, a fact that blurs even the clearest vision. The implication, I think, is that while we strive for disarmament, social justice, the abolition of torture, or the end of the arms trade (we can't do everything), we must also prepare inwardly. In particular we must liberate ourselves from attachment to the systems and ideas that maintain what we

oppose, remembering that we cannot serve both God and Mammon. (29)

According to Wolf Mendl the Quaker witness to the peace testimony has been made by both visionaries and realists, prophets and reconcilers<sup>(30)</sup>. In his terms, a prophet is someone with a vision of the ideal who is attentive to its fulfilment. A reconciler is someone for whom the emphasis of their attention is focussed on concrete particulars. Both are important in the history of the Society and whether a person tends to be one or the other is largely a matter of temperament. The Society's formal statements have tended to reflect the prophetic character. Mendl suggests that one reason for this is that it is easier for the Society to agree on a description of the ideal than on the means of realising it. Consequently, it is left to individuals and groups to explore ways in which to fulfil the promise of the vision. A number of examples, reflecting the variety of approaches among the Friends, will be considered below. For convenience, this will be done under two headings, Education and Service.

### Education

A Quaker poster quotes Martin Luther King: "Unarmed Truth is the most powerful thing in the Universe"<sup>(31)</sup>. Friends have given a great deal of energy to telling people what they perceive to be the Truth of our nuclear predicament. Pamphlets, vigils and demonstrations are all part of the Quaker armoury. They tell of the consequences of a nuclear explosion and of the inability of doctors to respond to the medical

crisis that would ensue. They present imaginative projects and activities for individuals and groups. They reprint talks and articles that deserve a wider audience than they originally received. To some extent, Friends House provides an alternative press because there is a suspicion of a conspiracy of silence on the part of the Establishment. Perhaps more than anything else, the pamphlets, vigils and demonstrations are a way of keeping the rumour alive that there are alternatives. By presenting the facts and extending the range of possibilities, the Quakers have attempted to enliven people's imaginations and counteract the drowsiness of the sleepwalkers.

Friends have also been generous in their support of peace education in a more academic context. They have provided financial support for a large number of studies (including this one) which failed to find support elsewhere. Most notably, they provided the inspiration and a good deal of the money necessary to establish a Chair of Peace Studies at Bradford University in 1970. It is not merely a linguistic trick to establish a Peace Studies Department instead of the alternative War Studies. It is a shift of perspective which makes it more possible to consider the full range of the meanings of peace rather than its limited meaning of an absence of war.

Perhaps it is education of a less formal kind when Friends witness to the humanity of people widely perceived to be wicked or inhuman. Two examples illustrate the significance of this. The women encamped at Greenham Common Cruise Missile base have experienced considerable hostility from some local residents.

They have been shouted and spat at and some local shops have refused to serve them. In response, Newbury Friends Meeting House opened their facilities to the campers, making it possible for them to wash and to get warm. The women campers have received a considerable amount of support from Friends nationally. Constantly, the Friends have tried to show the significance of the camp protest to people who were blinded by outrage.

A second example has been written up under the title "Bridge Builders for Peace"<sup>(32)</sup>. Two elderly Quakers, Lucy Behenna and Marion Mansergh put their life savings into a project which enabled small groups of mothers from the USA and USSR to visit each other's country in a number of visits since 1981. Mothers were chosen for this because of the love, trust and knowledge that they have through the bringing up of their children. Their concern with the future for their children meant that they might be able to break down the hostile stereotyping that takes place across national boundaries and build friendship out of common concern.

All of this shows a conviction that love is to be done in minute particulars. Another Quaker poster quotes Rufus Jones:

I pin my hopes to quiet processes and small circles  
in which vital and transforming events take  
place.<sup>(33)</sup>

### Service

Since the mid-nineteenth century the Quaker testimony against

all war has involved Friends in 'an active service of love to all suffering humanity' (34). Support for the Irish during the potato famine and for Finnish fishermen whose homes had been destroyed by British bombardment in 1854 was the beginning of a tradition of service which has impartially cared for the victims of war. In 1947 the American Friends Service Committee and the Friends Service Council of London and Ireland Yearly Meetings were jointly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. In his presentation address, Gunnar Jahn said,

It is the silent help from the nameless to the nameless which is (the Quakers') contribution to the promotion of brotherhood among nations ... They have revealed to us that strength which is founded on faith in the victory of spirit over force. (35)

In the present day, this spirit of service is carried out in a variety of projects receiving Quaker support. For example, Catholics and Protestants are brought together in Northern Ireland, workers and finance are provided for agricultural projects in parts of Africa and so on.

Quakers were very supportive of the League of Nations because they saw the need for nations to work together for the world's common interests. This is exactly what could be expected from 'integrational pacifists'. Friends have maintained an office as a Non-Governmental Organisation at both the United Nations and at the EEC. From these offices it has been possible to publicise particular concerns of Quakers, but it has also been possible to offer friendship and quiet support for diplomats. Sidney Bailey, in particular, was provided with support from



the Society to do this. Nicholas Sims emphasises the need for Quakers to develop a variety of approaches to disarmament. They can support the international diplomatic process by ensuring that the facts are accurate, by encouraging governments in what they manage to achieve rather than disparaging them for their failure, by emphasising hope rather than fear as the driving force for disarmament. The persistence of Quakers (and others) concerned with disarmament is to be valued because few politicians and diplomats stay with the subject of disarmament for more than three or four years(36).

#### The Peace Tax Campaign

Quaker involvement in the Peace Tax Campaign is neither service nor education in any ordinary sense. It does, however, deserve mention. The history of war tax refusal goes back a considerable way, within the life of the Society at least to 1756. In Britain, since 1916 - the beginnings of conscription, provision has been made for conscientious objection to serving with the armed forces. In a nuclear age conscription would be unnecessary and conscientious objection impossible. Consequently the Peace Tax Campaign was launched in 1980 following earlier initiatives of the Peace Pledge Union and the Quaker Peace Committee. It focussed on the only point at which an individual can refuse his or her responsibility for the preparations for nuclear war: the collection of taxes.

(We) ask that it be recognised as a Human Right that we may claim as a matter of conscience we cannot pay for arms. We seek the right that the part of our

taxes which at present goes to arms be diverted instead to peace-building; that governments should create a Trust Fund to receive this diverted tax and distribute it appropriately.(37)

The Peace Tax Campaign has received a good deal of support from individual Friends. A few have refused to pay a proportion of their tax to the Inland Revenue, making it clear that the money will be paid if an assurance can be given that it will not be used for military purposes. Those who have done this have been taken to court and an order for payment has been made. Those still refusing have either had goods distrained from them, usually to a value well in excess of the payment due, or they have been sentenced to a period of imprisonment.

Because the income tax of employed people within the UK is collected direct from the employer under the PAYE scheme the campaign has encouraged members to seek to test the law with the help of sympathetic employers. In September 1983 the Meeting for Sufferings, the Executive Committee of London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, agreed to support about one-third (thirty-three) of the staff at Friends House in London in their refusal to pay war taxes. Twelve per cent of the income tax due for the period September 1983 - May 1984 was withheld. The Inland Revenue brought proceedings against the Clerk and Assistant Clerk of Meeting for Sufferings. In January 1985 a judgement required the payment of the tax and a court fee of only £40. The Judge stated that he was obliged to apply the law as it stood and that change in

the law should be undertaken by persuasion and the legislative process. However, he recognised the defendants' needs to express their views, hence no costs were awarded. Inevitably, the appeal was also lost. It is one of very few cases where the employer was prepared to assist the employed conscientious objector in challenging the law. It was therefore a particularly significant event in the life of the Campaign. As Beryl Hibbs, the Clerk of Meeting for Sufferings, said in a letter to the Prime Minister,

We know from experience that what has appeared to be an abortive witness in the past has, on occasion, proved to be the pathway to acceptable social change. (38)

The Quaker involvement in the Peace Tax Campaign continues. At the London Yearly Meeting in 1987 the following Minute was agreed:

We are Trustees of a long tradition which has sought to bring our religious convictions into the world "and so excite our endeavour to mend it". We are trying to live in the virtue of that life and power which takes away the occasion of all wars.

Fundamentally, taxation for war purposes is not a political or fiscal issue. We are convinced by the Spirit of God to say without any hesitation whatsoever that we must support the right of conscientious objection to paying of taxes for war purposes. We realise that we live in a world where

situations of insanity are rife and where it is impossible to see clearly the final consequences of the actions we might initiate from this Meeting. Nevertheless, we are impelled by our vision of a peaceful and loving society.

We ask Meeting for Sufferings to explore further and with urgency the role our religious society should corporately take in this concern and then to take such action as it sees to be necessary on our behalf. We know that this is only one further step in our witness to the Truth, to which we are continually summoned. We go forward in God's strength. (39)

### Conclusion

The Peace Testimony is rooted in an attitude to life which stems from an understanding of human nature and the Inner Light which dwells in all people. Peace begins in the heart and mind of the individual and without this no real peace can ever grow between peoples. The slogan "If you want peace prepare for war" is nonsense to Quakers. Peace is the only way to peace. There has to be a unity between means and ends. A policy of nuclear deterrence is therefore not a way to peace.

Because Quakers are integrational pacifists other issues of social justice and the care of the earth are naturally linked with that of nuclear disarmament. They retain a positive relationship with the present political order but challenge the

orthodoxies of that order by their clear grasp of the meaning of inner peace and its social transformation into shalom.

Quakers are viewed by the other Churches as an example of pacifists who function like yeast in a lump of dough; the maintainers of a vision of how things might be. In performing this function Quakers have suffered a great deal<sup>(40)</sup>. In the First World War the 16,000 British 'conchies' were treated with disdain. Some suffered appallingly at the hands of the authorities. The 60,000 conscientious objectors in the Second World War received fairer (if not always fair) treatment. Now all the main Churches recognise that pacifism and the individual's conscientious objection to war is an honourable vocation for Christians to follow. In this the Society of Friends is entitled to take much credit for the ways in which they have functioned as the leaveners.

## Chapter 6

### A Theological Analysis of the Church Statements on Nuclear Weapons

#### Introduction

There is a degree of practical agreement in the Church statements that have been considered in chapters 2-5. Even the Church of England has a critical relationship with the Government and has distanced itself by support of a 'no first strike' policy and by its refusal to support nuclear deterrence as a long-term option. Even the Quakers work constructively with the State in the pursuit of pax. Underlying this level of practical agreement there are significant theological differences. It is to the analysis of these that we now turn.

The analysis will take place in two parts. Chapter 6 will consist of a theological analysis of the Church statements. Chapter 7 will examine the debate in order to see which issues need further work. Some suggestions will be made about how best this might be done.

A number of methodologies exist for the analysis of moral theology. In the preparation of this chapter the work of Ernst Troeltsch<sup>(1)</sup> and H. Richard Niebuhr<sup>(2)</sup> was considered. Neither offered an appropriate method of analysis because both focussed on the relationship of Church and Society. The evidence of the texts considered in this study is insufficient to make good use of Troeltsch and Niebuhr's typologies. However, both James Gustafson<sup>(3)</sup> and Robin Gill<sup>(4)</sup> have developed methods for the

analysis of texts of moral theology. For Gustafson, the key theological variables in moral debate are to be found by examining the use of Scripture, the relationship of Grace and Nature, and Ecclesiology. Gill provides a broader framework in which he considers the types of ethical arguments employed (deontological, consequentialist and personalist), the particular bases of Christian ethics (Bible, tradition, experience and belief) and the social determinants which help to form the debate. What follows in this chapter is to some extent a combination of the approaches of Gustafson and Gill.

#### The use of the Bible

There is a widespread consensus among theologians that, for whatever reasons, Jesus taught non-violence. The question of the significance of this for Christians today remains. Biblical criticism tends to emphasise the significance of social and literary context thereby relativising the scriptures. Thus Anscombe pointed to the inappropriateness of making the Sermon on the Mount normative for contemporary Christian Ethics. Those taking Biblical criticism seriously are bound to be faced with some such question as, "if that is what Jesus taught then in that context what does he teach us now in our context?". It is hardly surprising that the answers are various.

In moving from the past to the present teaching of Jesus the Quakers are perhaps the least intellectually disciplined in their use of scripture. In keeping with the approach of George Fox, they use the Bible to support arguments that stand or fall

on other grounds. The appropriateness of scripture appears to be dependent upon its capacity to inspire, and modern Quakers are almost as likely to find inspiration in the scriptures of other faiths as in the Bible. However, the life of Jesus also serves in a powerful exemplary way as a model of non-violence. The main problem with such an approach is its extreme subjectivity coupled with the selectivity that it demands. Why, for example, is Jesus a model of non-violence but not of Christian family life?<sup>(5)</sup> In his Swarthmore Lecture, John Lampen provided an excellent example of this Biblical selectivism that is typical of Quakers<sup>(6)</sup>. He used the story in 1 Sam 24 of David having the opportunity to kill Saul but in which he only cut off a corner of his cloak. The inspirational character of the story for modern peacemakers is outstanding and Lampen used it beautifully. The story is evocative and powerful, particularly given Lampen's own context of Derry in Northern Ireland. Lampen gave no systematic criteria for using this passage rather than any other. He made no attempt to discover the meaning of the story in its own context. Its appropriateness lay entirely in its capacity to illumine and inspire within our present circumstances. For Quakers, the link between the Bible in general, and the teaching of Jesus in the New Testament in particular, may therefore be described as intuitive. It is worth noting that in their use of the Bible the Quakers may possess a gift much needed by some other parts of the Church. It is increasingly noted there needs to be a recovery of the experimental and intuitive in Bible study in order to balance the cerebral and rational<sup>(7)</sup>.



The Lutheran EKD Bulletin (1981) was almost empty of scriptural quotation. This surprising fact is presumably because the document mostly contains what Thielicke called 'counsel' rather than 'preaching'. Consequently most of its judgements were severely practical. The impression is given that the theological discussion occurred prior to the discussion of the morality of nuclear weapons. The crucial framework for the debate was provided by the doctrine of the two kingdoms. Within the document itself scriptural quotation was only frequent in the section headed 'Christian Prayer for Peace and Hope in Faith'. Here scripture was used to give definition to key concepts such as 'peace', 'thanksgiving' and 'forgiveness' and did not form part of the process of argument. The doctrine of the two kingdoms had the effect of distancing the scriptures and of emphasising the importance of prudent politicians<sup>(8)</sup>.

The Anglican report The Church and the Bomb confined its discussion of scripture to a part of chapter 6 on "Wider theological and ethical considerations". Its emphasis on the Wisdom literature was noted, this being particularly supportive of an ethical tradition almost autonomous from theology. However, it also usefully served to indicate that there is not necessarily a discontinuity between the ethics of the Old and New Testaments. Several Biblical themes were explored briefly: the kingdom of God (p.105f), human involvement in God's creativity (p.106), Peace, Love and Justice (pp.111-117) and Principalities and Power (pp.117-119). Whilst the report escaped John Barton's criticism of another BSR report that the Biblical section was dealt with first and then ignored<sup>(9)</sup>, the

Biblical section was not fully integrated into the report and was one of its least satisfactory aspects.

In the Roman Catholic documents the scriptures were used extensively. Musto speaks of American Catholics embracing 'a renewed theology of peace based on the gospels' (10). Usually their use of scripture suggests the appropriation of a careful scholarly approach (11). In his critique of the US Bishop's Pastoral Letter, Stanley Hauerwas considered it unfortunate that they did not make more developed use of the Old Testament. There is a greater continuity between the Old and New Testaments on the question of war than the Bishops convey (12).

The US Roman Catholic Bishops made it clear that they were constructing two forms of argument:

The first is (for) the Catholic faithful, formed by the premises of the Gospel and the principles of Catholic moral teaching. The second is (for) the wider civil community ... (which) although it does not share the same vision of faith, is equally bound by certain key moral principles. For all men and women find in the depth of their consciences a law written on the human heart by God. From this law reason draws its moral norms. These norms do not exhaust the gospel vision, but they speak to critical questions affecting the welfare of the human community ... (13)

This was very much in keeping with the method of other Roman Catholic moral statements. It meant that the Bible is appropriately used only in the construction of the argument for the faithful. The Bible was almost wholly absent from the argument for those who are not Christian, though it was thought to underlie what was said to them and to be in harmony with it. But Hauerwas has observed that the Bible is not integrated into the natural law teaching of the Bishops and this results in an uncomfortable tension:

For there seem to be two different views in The Challenge of Peace that reflect the two different ethical perspectives of the Pastoral - the one based on the Gospel, the other deriving from natural law assumptions. From the perspective of the former, war is the unambiguous sign of sin and can never be called good. From the perspective of the latter, war can sometimes be called a good, indeed a moral duty, necessary to preserve human community. While not strictly incompatible it is not clear how one can hold both at once.<sup>(14)</sup>

In stating this, Hauerwas has demonstrated the subordinate place given to the scriptures in Roman Catholic moral decision-making. The two forms of the Roman Catholic argument are accommodated too readily to each other and perhaps the distinctiveness of the Christian witness is underplayed.

Finally, the Church statements have all been selective in their use of the Bible, being particularly evasive of apocalyptic literature. This is significant for two reasons. First,

apocalyptic gets quite widely used in the debate about nuclear weapons by politically right-wing American fundamentalists. In a pamphlet which is both amusing and terrifying, Roger Ruston and Angela West indicate the pervasiveness of this by quoting speeches by President Reagan expounding the contemporary significance of Biblical apocalyptic now being fulfilled<sup>(15)</sup>. The Churches therefore need to give serious consideration to the significance of apocalyptic in order to prevent its misuse.

Second, it may be that the Church statements, by imposing meaning on the Bible rather than seeking meaning in the Bible, have missed something of fundamental significance to the nuclear debate. New Testament apocalyptic looks forward to the end of time and the second coming of Christ. In this, it asserts that God is the Lord of history and that hope is based firmly only in Him. This does not necessarily lead to complacency about the threat of nuclear annihilation for that would be destruction by human hands and seemingly against the creative purpose of God. It does suggest, however, that even a nuclear catastrophe is not unredeemable and that the Christian may not wish to support the anti-nuclear lobby solely on the grounds of the threat to the earth's survival<sup>(16)</sup>.

That God is the Lord of history is an important affirmation. It is in conflict with the views of a few theologians who have suggested that the possession and threatened use of nuclear weapons so changes our circumstances as to demand a radical reworking of our understanding of God and of what it is to be human<sup>(17)</sup>. In a sense, there is a new eschatology in view, the

end brought about by human means rather than Divine. This possible future impinges on the present in such a way as to force fundamental questions of meaning upon us. Consequently, Christians must be willing to enter into the deconstruction and reconstruction of central Christian symbols, such as God, Jesus Christ, Torah and so on. Again, the basic division appears to be between those who try to impose religious meaning on their circumstances by deconstructing and reconstructing and those who seek the meaning that exists in their circumstances. It is a division between those who seek subjective truth and those who seek objective truth. Inevitably, the latter are inclined to accuse the former of atheism<sup>(18)</sup>.

The discussion of Biblical apocalyptic by the Church statements might, therefore, have raised fundamental disagreements about the sovereignty of God. This rather emphasises the way in which the debate has proceeded in terms of a search for a pragmatic consensus about practical action rather than a careful theological exploration of the area of discussion. This may be an inevitable limitation of Church documents. It is important that the matter gets further attention in the theological debate. It is a pity that the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party missed the opportunity.

Clearly there is a degree of unease about the limited use made of the Bible in the Church statements. The unease is heightened by the fact that there are other parts of the Church which choose to be more explicitly Biblically-based. Besides the narrow Biblicism of a great deal of popular Christianity,

Mennonite theologians such as John Yoder<sup>(19)</sup> and Alan Kreider<sup>(20)</sup> and other radical evangelicals such as Jim Wallis<sup>(21)</sup> have attempted restatements of Christian ethics which draw directly on the teaching of Jesus. The inevitable consequence is an acceptance of a form of pacifism. However, uneasiness is not necessarily an indication of incoherence. The Quaker, Lutheran, Anglican and Roman Catholic documents all indicate coherent if differing approaches to moral theology. The scriptures can be seen to be to some degree formative of the moral argument, though in no case could they be said to be decisive. None of the Churches considered in this study take the view that Christian Ethics and Biblical Ethics are the same thing.

#### The use of the Christian tradition

The Church statements reflect a high degree of consensus about the contents of the Christian tradition with regard to war and peace. It is, of course, a matter of considerable significance that Roman Catholics, Anglicans and Lutherans have rediscovered a place for pacifism within their official teaching. By distinguishing a difference of kind between individual and social ethics they limit pacifism to an honourable vocation for some individuals who either uphold an ideal for the rest of society or function like leaven in the lump. This approach tacitly accepts the criticism of pacifism which has been recurrent since Celsus that pacifism endangers the tolerant society in which it is permitted to exist. A society weakened by too many pacifists will fall prey to its aggressive neighbours<sup>(22)</sup>. However, it seems a pity that the Church

documents do not even explore the social or ecclesial possibilities of pacifism. Sufficient of the secondary literature suggests this might be fruitful<sup>(23)</sup> and it has been the constant witness of the Quakers.

Within the Church documents there is agreement that the principles of the just war tradition make it inconceivable that any nuclear war could be 'just'. The widely held view that even a limited use of tactical nuclear weapons would escalate to a full-scale confrontation coupled with the widespread and long-term effects of radiation, ensures that the devastation caused by the use of nuclear weapons would always be disproportionate to any possible good they could achieve. Co-lateral damage also guarantees that there is no possibility of discrimination between combatants and non-combatants.

Despite the broad agreement between Church statements, the continuing debate has been most heated in an area concerned with the application of the Christian tradition to present circumstances. A complicated factor in all defence thinking is that weapons are held not only for the waging of war but for the maintenance of peace. Therefore the critical area of discussion is whether or not it is possible to construct a theory of just nuclear deterrence? This is where the continuing debate is now focussed which, presumably, is why the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party pays such attention to it.

Two types of argument have been constructed in support of a just nuclear deterrence<sup>(24)</sup>. The first, offering very limited

support for such a policy, is like that offered by the majority of the Church documents considered. The present reality is that world order is dependent upon policies of nuclear deterrence. These therefore gain limited support in the interim as we seek to move towards a more ideal (non-nuclear) solution to international conflict. This position offers a critical, limited and temporary support to the policy of nuclear deterrence.

A stronger form of the argument has also been advanced<sup>(25)</sup>. The reality of our world is that the USA and the USSR have massive stockpiles. Other countries either have (UK, France, India, China) or could soon have nuclear weapons. Israel, South Africa and Iraq may already have the technological capability<sup>(26)</sup>. It is impossible to disinvent nuclear weapons and so we must find ways of learning to live with them. One such way of living with the bomb is offered by nuclear deterrence, a defensive strategy in which retaliation is guaranteed to any aggressor. The policy depends upon the principle of double effect in that the morality of possessing nuclear weapons is given by the intention to keep the peace. However, this is only possible when a potential aggressor is assured of the will and the capacity to retaliate. Therefore, although the use of nuclear weapons is not intended by their possession it may be an inevitable side-effect should an aggressor provide a cause. This second form of the argument has received considerable attention in recent discussions<sup>(27)</sup>. Three aspects may be considered especially significant.



First, those supporting nuclear deterrence stress that it is a policy which works and they point to the peace that has been maintained since 1945. On the other hand, the fact that nuclear deterrence has worked in the past (at least for the 'Super Powers'), is no guarantee that it will continue to do so. Barrie Paskins has described the particularly favourable circumstances in which nuclear deterrence has worked. The continued development of weapons, their proliferation and the increase of border disputes with no 'buffer zone' make present circumstances increasingly less favourable<sup>(28)</sup>. In addition, the meaning of peace attached to a policy of nuclear deterrence is really 'armed truce'. Jim Garrison and Pyare Shivpuri have suggested that such a policy depends upon, and therefore fosters and sustains, a notion of there being an 'enemy'<sup>(29)</sup>. This makes impossible any serious development of international community, something to which all the Churches are committed.

Second, supporters of a just nuclear deterrence stress the importance of mutual balanced arms reductions as the means of arms control. A policy of deterrence, inherently defensive, does not depend on large stocks of nuclear weapons, only sufficient to retaliate with a force that will deter. It is difficult to determine what such a level might be, the judgement depending upon many factors<sup>(30)</sup>, but it will be well below current levels of weapon stocks.

In the late 1980s there have been the first indications of the success of negotiating arms reductions from a position of mutual strength. So far reductions have been on a small scale,

but there is a great deal of hope for the future because of internal economic pressure on both the USSR and USA to reduce arms expenditure. However, it may be that the concept of arms control is based on what opponents of nuclear deterrence regard as a false premise. It is not the excess weapons stockpiled that give rise to the fear of nuclear attack and therefore to proliferation, but the existence of any nuclear weapons which could be used offensively. Because of this, arms control does not deal with the basic causes of nuclear proliferation<sup>(31)</sup>.

Third, the possibility of a just nuclear deterrence relies on the principle of double effect. The intention of deterrence is to keep the peace. However, it is an inevitable secondary consequence that nuclear weapons would be used in retaliation for an attack. On the other hand, the size of the threatened consequence for deterrence to be effective would, presumably, have to be so great as to call into question the morality of those who threaten such an act. This can be argued on deontological grounds: there are some things so awful that you neither do them nor threaten to do them regardless of what other people either do or threaten to do to you<sup>(32)</sup>. It can also be argued on consequentialist grounds: the possible consequences of a policy of nuclear deterrence are out of proportion to any good that could come from it.

In his examination of the case for nuclear deterrence, Anthony Kenny concluded that there is no logic to it in any form<sup>(33)</sup>. He says the policy is murderous in that it fails to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants; dangerous in that it

makes the risk of nuclear war more likely rather than less; and extravagant in that, at a time when the hungry need to be given greater priority, it is possible to conceive of cheaper and more effective means of defence. Curiously, his devastating critique scarcely touches those who continue to propound the stronger form of deterrence. The debate continues with vigour, both sides apparently unable to comprehend the logic of the other's position.

The use of the tradition, though a very significant part of the form of the argument, is not decisive of its substance. Perhaps it cannot be. In "On being in a tradition", Leslie Houlden suggests it is important to recognize two things. First, my particular synthesis of the tradition is always new and second it is my perception of the past which is involved<sup>(34)</sup>. He suggests that it is therefore self-deception to search the past for authorities which will somehow decide the contemporary debate. What we have is 'landmarks' which may usefully guide us in the present and future. It is therefore not surprising that the Christian tradition is used in such a way that it merges into the controversies of the contemporary secular debate about nuclear weapons.

#### Kingdom, Church and World

The Christian must live between the vision of the reign of God and its concrete realization in history. Any ethical response to war must be worked out in the light of this tension<sup>(35)</sup>.

The way in which this tension is lived with is of considerable significance in the formation of ethical argument. The Quaker emphasis seems to be that the kingdom of God is realised in proportion to the ability of people to live the life of the kingdom in the present. The other three churches stress more emphatically the future reality of the kingdom which is only glimpsed in the present. The kingdom is God's and it will not be brought in by human agency but by God's own activity. Perhaps the Lutherans state this most clearly through their doctrine of the two kingdoms. Luther thought that only heroes could bring about change and only then by special divine guidance. For the rest of us, the best we can hope for is that God's providential care will prevent disintegration<sup>(36)</sup>.

Doctrinal statements are affected by these marked differences of emphasis within the same tension between the 'now' and the 'not yet' of the kingdom of God. The Quakers provide the most positive accounts of human nature with their stress on the good within all people: 'walk cheerfully over the face of the earth answering that of God in everyone'<sup>(37)</sup>. At Vatican II Roman Catholics emphasised that people are all made in the image of God and therefore have inherent dignity. The Lutheran emphasis, by contrast, has always been that the image of God found in human beings is severely marred. Consequently there is a need to restrain people from wickedness by law. Anglicans seek to hold to both the insights that people are made in the image of God and that that image is marred. (See, for example, the comments by Dunstan and Habgood in the discussion of the Theological basis of the Church of England statements.)

The distinction made by the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party between Shalom, Pax and inner peace is extremely helpful in illuminating the different understandings of the relationship between Kingdom, Church and World that exist between the Churches. All the Churches have an ambivalent and to some extent critical relationship with the powers of this world. Nevertheless, both the Church of England and the EKD are in some way State Churches. It is not surprising that they have a particular concern with pax. The Lutherans are able to distance themselves from this because of the doctrine of the two kingdoms. Roman Catholics share the Augustinian framework of the two cities with Anglicans but, particularly in the USA, they are a much more clearly defined ecclesial community than the Church of England. They have therefore been able to adopt a more critical stance of the government and to stress the distinctive Christian contributions to peacemaking through inner peace and shalom. Similarly the Quakers, because they have a clear identity within and to some extent over against society, are able to make their particular contribution in the areas of inner peace and shalom. The Church of England stresses the need for pax because of the 'not yet' of shalom. The Quakers stress the possibilities for inner peace and shalom despite the inadequacies of the present pax. In this the Kingdom of God is already being realised among us.

The division of opinion between Christians who use the pacifist tradition and those who use the just war tradition is not really between idealists and realists, as G E M Anscombe suggested (see chapter 1). The Kingdom of God is real for all

Christians whether or not it is realised in the present. Rather, the division is between people who respond in different ways to the same tension that exists between the vision and the realisation of the Kingdom of God. It is tempting to suggest that this division is between those who do their ethics 'from above' and those who do it 'from below'. The consistent pacifist begins with the reality of God's Kingdom as the place from which Christian Ethics begins<sup>(38)</sup>. The just war tradition begins with the 'not yet' of God's Kingdom and seeks to restrict war in the interests of order and justice.

Such an observation poses a difficult question: is it a failure of faith to opt for prudence or is it an indication of sound realism and a recognition that the Kingdom will be realised by God? Perhaps the choice is not either-or, because all the Churches recognise the existence of the tension. Just as the Quakers have demonstrated a remarkable capacity for political realism, so the other Churches need to witness more readily to the possibilities of God's peace breaking into the present. The growing consensus of selective nuclear pacifism that was growing among the Churches in the early 1980s perhaps indicates that this is already happening.

A consequence has been that the Churches are entering into more critical relationships with their States. The progress of secularisation and pluralism has provided a context in which this has become possible. Perhaps the strongest encouragement for this process from a theologian has come from Stanley Hauerwas<sup>(39)</sup>. He has suggested that the Churches need to

rediscover their distinctive identity for two reasons. First, because it is only in such Church communities that the Gospel can be witnessed to with integrity. This is not a narrow and introverted sectarianism, in which people withdraw from the world for the sake of their own salvation. Rather, it is the task of people who bear witness to the truth that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. It does, however, testify to the need for the world's conversion. Second, Hauerwas emphasised the importance of the Church community as the place where Christian character and virtue is nurtured in individuals.

An alternative response, one more congenial to State Churches, is provided by Robin Gill<sup>(40)</sup>. Following Weber, Gill suggested that as a matter of descriptive sociology, a Church by definition could not be pacifist even if some of its individual members were. A Church's membership is characteristically compulsory and inclusive in that most, if not all, of a society's infants are baptised and the individual does not join the Church by conversion. A sect can be pacifist because its membership is voluntary and exclusive. Gill emphasised the pastoral strengths of the Church which shares the ambiguities of society at large and which gets caught up in the ethical dilemmas that are part of the lives of its members. This is the sort of Church that Alan Wilkinson encourages. Having recognised the failure of the English Churches to say anything distinctive about war and peace in the period 1900-1945 he urges them to accept

their powerlessness and marginality, staying with

their bewilderment and continuing to try to hold together truths and experiences which seem contradictory. Therefore, like the Psalmists, the Churches would allow for doubt and questioning in worship as well as affirmation. The Churches would recognise that their penchant for enthusiasm and their dislike of ambivalence isolates them from crucial areas of experience. Such a new way should not be confused with sectarianism, self-pity, masochism, a cult of failure, cowardice or a lack of faith. It would involve a readiness to recognise gratefully and without envy that other people have different tasks in the human community but that the Christian task is to keep the rumour of God alive, to be alert to the signals of transcendence<sup>(41)</sup>.

The great weakness of Gill and Wilkinson's approach is that it pertains to a relationship between Church and Society which may have existed in Christendom but which no longer pertains today. In England in the 1980s Church and Society do not have an identical membership. Ronald Preston states the matter clearly in his analysis of the contemporary usefulness of H Richard Niebuhr's five-fold typology of the relationship between Christ and culture. He suggests that the Christ of culture typical of classical Anglicanism (and of Gill and Wilkinson) is insufficiently critical of its milieu. According to Preston, Christ the Transformer of culture is the only one adequate to our time of rapid social change<sup>(42)</sup>.



Gill also suggested that the social and political witness of the Church is best left to individual Christians<sup>(43)</sup>. Presumably there is still a place for Church reports to inform and educate the individual but it is inappropriate and unnecessarily divisive for Churches to try to agree on social and political policy statements. This is very much in keeping with the Anglican tradition. It raises in an acute way a question about the authority of each of the Church statements and indicates a great deal about each Church's self-understanding.

For Anglicans and Lutherans authority rests unambiguously with the individual who is responsible before God in making moral decisions. Reports supported by the General Synod, for example, have no binding authority on members of the Church of England. Members are free to disagree. However, there is no doubt that a report passed by the Synod with an overwhelming majority would have considerable weight given to it.

For Roman Catholics the position, in theory, is somewhat similar. No Papal teaching on matters of morality has been declared infallible and the individual is entitled to be at odds with his or her Church. However, as the discussion of conscience in chapter 2 showed, the Church does in fact claim considerable authority for its moral teaching. The treatment of Fr Charles Curran should be a source of considerable concern in ecumenical dialogue.

The Society of Friends looks like the most libertarian of Churches in matters of morality. The very way in which its attitude to nuclear weapons had to be developed from the lives of its individual members suggests that this is so. In most matters of morality it is unambiguously true. In respect of nuclear weapons it is not. For Quakers the Peace Testimony is a matter of what Lutherans call 'status confessionis'. You cannot join the Society unless you assent to it. Consequently the authority of the Peace Testimony is not of something imposed by a hierarchy on a Church's membership. Rather it is the authority of a Society of Friends who join together individually assenting to the historic Peace Testimony of the Society. It is a perfect example of how the Quakers' social ethics are the sum of individual ethics.

In view of this critical relationship between Church and Society, acknowledged in all of the documents, it is a pity that the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran documents do not go further in their consideration of individual opposition to the policies of the State than to give approval to the conscientious objection to military service by some individuals. In a nuclear society with no need of conscription it is difficult to see what 'conscientious objection' might mean. Only the Quakers have taken this seriously. Small numbers of Christians of all denominations have felt it necessary to commit acts of civil disobedience and it is a pity that the tradition of 'holy disobedience' within Christianity has not been explored in the major Church statements.

That the relationship of Kingdom, Church and World is problematic is clearly focussed by the recent Church statements on nuclear weapons. The tensions between the three entities are handled by the Churches in varying ways, not always reflecting denominational differences. The important common element is that the tensions are maintained so that the Church becomes neither utopian in such a way that it has nothing to say about world peace, order and justice, nor secular in such a way that it has nothing to say about the peace of God.

#### The types of moral arguments employed

Robin Gill provides a simplistic though useful typology. He distinguishes between three basic types of moral argument. Deontological arguments are based on a notion of it being right to do something out of a sense of duty. Consequentialist arguments are based on a notion of it being right to do something in order to bring about good consequences or ends. Personalist arguments are based on a notion of its being right to do something in order to maximise the good of the people involved. All three types of argument are used by each of the four denominations considered in this study.

Personalist and consequentialist arguments always involve matters of judgement. They depend upon a prudent reading for the case. Deontological arguments, by contrast, appear to be a straightforward use of a strongly held moral principle. For example, it is the duty of one human being not to kill another. Or, it is the duty of a government to ensure the defence of the nation. Where deontological principles make conflicting claims

there has to be some way of settling the matter. It may be that some principles are held so strongly that they override all others. This would be true for consistent pacifists about the duty not to kill someone. In most cases, however, the application of even deontological principles is a matter of judgement, something more akin to art than to logic.

If the Christian is to develop a sound capacity for moral judgements amidst all the conflicts and ambiguities of the world then Hauerwas's point about the need for strong ecclesial communities becomes all the more pressing. Church is the place where Christian character and virtue can be developed. It is the place where the almost aesthetic qualities of moral judgement will be caught by those who belong. All the Church statements considered in this study emphasise the need for developing peace education and spirituality as part of developing the whole people of God. It is an important ecclesial task if Christians are to contribute anything distinctive to peace-making in the world.

#### Non-theological factors

A striking feature of all the Church statements is the significance of what might be termed 'non-theological' factors in their arguments. The Roman Catholics speak of a need for 'prudential judgements' outside the special competence of the Bishops and therefore having a different authority to other sections of their teaching. The Church of England's The Church and the Bomb begins with a chapter describing the variety of types and uses of nuclear weapons. Only one chapter is given

to 'Wider theological and ethical considerations'. The Lutherans have done the most significant part of their theology (the doctrine of the two kingdoms) before they consider the subject of nuclear weapons in particular. The pacifism of the Quakers, though consistent, is shaped by the prudential application of non-violence to particular circumstances. Small wonder, then, that John Habgood, the Moderator of the World Council of Churches' Hearings in Amsterdam in 1981, commented that the four theologians who opened the Hearings

spent more of their time defending practical policies than in trying to elaborate some coherent Christian framework within which actual decisions might be made. Such theology as emerged was fragmentary, and consisted more of individual Christian 'insights' related to particular circumstances than the general guidelines which, perhaps naively, had been hoped for.(44)

It is now a relative commonplace to note as Jacques Ellul did that the differences between Christian attitudes to violence are 'not so much a matter of theological disagreement as of temperament'(45). James Gustafson noted something similar in the wider ethical debate when he observed that in matters of ethics, radicals relate well to radicals, moderates to moderates and conservatives to conservatives across denominational divides(46). In this respect it might have been more revealing to take the writings of individual theologians rather than of Churches for this study to see how they used the theological differences that existed between them.

The importance of sociological factors has already been noted, particularly the significance of secularization and pluralism in making it conducive for the Churches to adopt a more distinctive and critical role within society. Historical, political and geographical contexts all go some way to shaping what the Church has to say. These factors predispose people to begin their political analysis in varying places and, as Courtney Murray observed about the application of the just war tradition (see above, page 30), that will lead them to different conclusions.

### Conclusions

Theological variables account for a good deal of the differences in emphases between the Church documents. In addition the broad agreement about the facts of our circumstances accounts a great deal for the measure of practical agreement that has emerged. It could be said that fundamental theological themes are inadequately explored by most of the statements and that the Churches are too dependent upon pragmatism. A commentator such as Stanley Hauerwas would probably say that this illustrates the crisis facing modern theology and the Church. What is needed, Hauerwas would say, is a greater confidence in the life of the Church and a rediscovery of theology.

Although a great deal of what Hauerwas has to say is attractive, his position is over-stated. It is hardly surprising that God, the creator, is to be known by reason nor that His kingdom is to be known in the world and not just the

Church. Non-theological factors will inevitably affect the Church's discussion for the problem of nuclear weapons presents itself in the first place as a secular issue.

What then is the role of the Church in this debate? I suggest it lies somewhere between being the State's chaplain and being a counter-culture. Of course there are many possible positions between these two extremes but Duncan Forrester suggests four tasks which could be described as essential to any conceivable position:

- (1) The confessional task by which, amidst the uncertainties and relativities of life, the Church confesses the truth of the Gospel in ways related to particular courses of action.
- (2) The demystifying task by which theologians operate like the child in Hans Christian Andersen's story of the Emperor's new clothes. This task is to speak in the interrogative rather than the imperative.
- (3) The visionary task which takes care to nurture fundamental values, ideals and ends.
- (4) The prophetic task by which the Gospel is related in a specific way to policy. It is concerned with the actualities of power and with individuals taking responsibility before God for their actions and decisions<sup>(47)</sup>.

In arguing that the application of these tasks needs to be flexible Forrester neatly summarises the task that faces the

Churches;

Christian theology is not so much a framework or a system of thought, logical, coherent, systematic, as a form of response to Jesus Christ. In one sense the theological task is always the same - to proclaim the Gospel - but the mode of fulfilment of the task is very variable ... The one Gospel is expressed in different and specific ways to different people; it always addresses the whole person in the context of that person's responsibilities, vocation and skills as well as the person's fears and failures and need for forgiveness and encouragement.<sup>(48)</sup>

The context is, therefore, highly (though not wholly) determinative of both the content and the form of the Gospel which the Church bears. At the present time the Churches of the West are agreed that the crisis of our nuclear age is such that they must speak clearly and critically about the reliance on nuclear weapons for maintaining world order. In this they are closer to being a 'counter culture' than an uncritical State's chaplain. It is a response to their reading of 'the signs of the times'.



## Chapter 7

### Continuing the debate more fruitfully

Although the Church documents exhibit a considerable degree of unity their discussion has been a frustrating experience for many within the Churches. The arguments are by no means settled. Disagreement has frequently been highly emotive with that interminable character which Alasdair MacIntyre reckons typical of contemporary moral debate<sup>(1)</sup>. Further, the discussion of Church statements has usually focussed on the politically controversial judgements about nuclear deterrence to the almost total exclusion of other issues. Consequently, in writing this final section, I have tried to learn from Richard McCormick and his experience of the equally highly contentious discussion of abortion within the Churches. Out of his long and frequently painful and wearied experience, McCormick suggested some rules for the debate which might make the difficult and polarised discussion more fruitful<sup>(2)</sup>. All are concerned with conducting the debate with integrity, seeking truth and maintaining respect for people who conscientiously disagree. Applied to the nuclear debate some of McCormick's rules can be stated simply and need no discussion; others need a little comment; the remainder need extensive treatment.

Represent the opposing position accurately and fairly<sup>(3)</sup>

Admit doubts, difficulties and weaknesses in one's own position

This can breathe a great deal of new life into a polarised debate. In our discussion of both pacifism and just war theory

we have repeatedly drawn attention to their strengths and weaknesses. It is inevitably the case that any particular policy that a Church or individual might adopt in relation to nuclear weapons has a similar range of strengths and weaknesses. People might differ as to the balance and significance of these, but to publicly admit them would add greatly to the honesty and integrity of the debate.

Distinguish the pairs right-wrong, good-bad

For McCormick, good-bad refers to the intention of the person doing the action. "One's action can therefore be morally good, but still be morally wrong. It can be morally right but morally bad." Such a distinction

allows one to disagree agreeably - that is without implying, suggesting or predicting moral evil of the person one believes to be morally wrong. This would be a precious gain in a discussion that often witnesses this particular and serious collapse of courtesy.(4)

Avoid the use of slogans

Actually, as Reinhold Niebuhr has pointed out<sup>(5)</sup>, there is a place for slogans in the political mobilising of groups who need to be given emotional energy in order for them to act decisively. The Churches still ignore this far too often. In the abortion debate it is very instructive that Oliver O'Donovan identified the decisive argument as the one that the ethicists thought too crude to be taken seriously: the woman's right to self-determination in respect of her own body<sup>(6)</sup>. It

has proved a powerful slogan in the public debate on the abortion laws. Given that there are still many people for whom peacemaking is not an urgent issue the Churches might well consider how best to learn from Reinhold Niebuhr and develop emotionally potent slogans around which to galvanise people. Only the Quakers appear to have attempted this with a very fine series of posters.

However, careful debate within the Churches does need to be conducted in a different way and McCormick is right to indicate that the use of slogans can obstruct discussion. For example, in the General Synod's discussion of The Church and the Bomb the Bishop of London prevented exploration of the meaning of peace by, effectively, using the slogan "we're all for peace"<sup>(7)</sup>. Doubtless it was intended to establish the good motives of all the participants in the debate but it actually did much more.

Distinguish between morality and public policy<sup>(8)</sup>

Although some criticism has been made of some of the Church statements on this account, they did in fact all take the need for this distinction very seriously. There was general agreement that it is not enough to state the ideal as though it were possible this side of heaven. The Churches have to show how it is possible to live more fruitfully in the goodness of God's creation whilst recognising the inevitably contingent and interim nature of moral decisions. There is, then, a need for a proper discussion about how best this can be done. It is crucial that the Churches do not narrow the political

possibilities by limiting political realism and responsibility to the realm of what is rather than what could be. Of the Churches considered, it is the Quakers who most consistently hold alternatives in front of our society. Stanley Hauerwas suggests that the Church as a whole is called to do this by witnessing to the present possibility of Christians being God's Peaceable Kingdom<sup>(9)</sup>. No matter how much the statements of other Churches differ from this, they all state the urgency of seeking alternatives to nuclear weapons in maintaining international order.

Attempt to identify areas of agreement

There is sufficient divergence in both the method and conclusions of the statements considered to suggest that they exemplify the lack of moral consensus that Alasdair MacIntyre has identified within our society as a whole. The consistent pacifism of the Quakers is in disagreement with the strictly limited support given to nuclear deterrence by Roman Catholic and Anglican statements, and with the variety of responses to the exercise of power (including nuclear weapons) acceptable within Lutheranism. It would be foolish to deny these differences exist.

Nevertheless, there are at least two ways of telling every story and the choice between them is perhaps as much a matter of temperament as anything else. The Church statements can also be shown to exemplify a considerable measure of agreement, particularly in their conclusions. Most strikingly there is agreement about the urgency of the crisis that faces humankind.

The capacity to bring about our own extinction has focussed the need for Christians to be peacemakers. This must be done from a motive of selfless love not selfish fear. In addressing the wider society the Church statements all stress the need for education about nuclear weapons. A number of the documents themselves made a very substantial contribution to this process. The statements exhibit a widespread concern for the health of democracy, though there is too little analysis of the problem (see below).

In what they have to say to their own Church members there is a great deal in common. They suggest education programmes, of which there are now hundreds<sup>(10)</sup>, dealing with theology and the details of our present nuclear crisis. As part of this, specific suggestions single out spirituality as a particularly important area for the Churches to concentrate on. It is fascinating to discover that Jonathan Schell, a staff writer on The New Yorker, in his widely acclaimed book The Fate of the Earth, pointed to the resources of Christian spirituality that would be necessary for us to survive this nuclear crisis. Pointing to the paralysis that many people feel in the face of such a huge and intractable problem he highlighted the Judeo-Christian tradition as being able to continue to affirm the goodness of creation, thereby enabling people to retain the capacity to act. He suggests that an affirmation of the goodness of creation runs through the ceremonial words of Christian sacramental occasions:

Marriage vows, in which the couple swear to love one another in sickness and in health and "for better for

worse", seem to signify an affirmation not only of the married condition but of the whole human condition. And in words sometimes spoken in burial services the affirmation is made outright: "Ashes to ashes, dust to dust. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." (11)

Certainly the Church statements show the beginning of an awareness that a particular gift they hold in trust for the world is this resource of an empowering spirituality. The ecumenical flourishing of certain forms of spirituality is one of the most marked features of the contemporary Church. The rediscovery of Ignatian spirituality that has taken place over the last twenty years has had a profound impact well beyond the Roman Catholic Church. A number of writers have indicated its particular usefulness for Christian peacemaking (12).

MacIntyre's observation was that society had lost a rational way of securing moral judgements. It is therefore worth noting that the basis of much of this flourishing spirituality is not rationality as such but an emotional response to shared experience within a common tradition.

All the Church statements indicate the need for Christians to begin the task of peacemaking in their own hearts as the beginning of a movement out to the whole world. The idea of this movement from the self outwards is well stated in the 'Universal Prayer for Peace' (13):

Lead me from death to life, from falsehood to truth.

Lead me from despair to hope, from fear to trust.

Lead me from hate to love, from war to peace.

Let peace fill our heart, our world, our universe.

Such a prayer implies a direct link between inner peace and shalom.

Those influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr might be inclined to say that this individualistic stress on education and spirituality by the Churches is a repeat of the mistake made earlier in this century by the liberal optimists Niebuhr criticised so effectively in 1932. For example, the Grubb Institute, responding to a recent Church of England Board of Social Responsibility Working Party referred generally to a

turning away from the language of vision and dream, except at the level of the individual and his or her own personal aspirations.<sup>(14)</sup>

However, in much of the developing spirituality there is a corporate focus, not only an individual one, and the Churches have, to some extent, learned Niebuhr's lesson. This is not only to talk of shalom. Their stress on education and spirituality is also balanced by what they have to say about political policies. In any case, it is worth the Churches spending time attending to resources not readily appreciated by the politicians, even if to do so is to lack 'political realism'.

In an essay on the psychological characteristics of the paralysis experienced by the majority in the face of the Bomb,

Nicholas Humphrey draws parallels between our present circumstances and the victims of dreadful precedents when people have gone to their destruction almost without protest. He draws on the memoir of Nadezhda Mandelstam who, during the Stalinist purges in Russia, watched in silent disbelief as her friends and then her family went the way of all the others. She said,

Later, I often wondered whether it is right to scream when you are being trampled under foot ... I decided it is better to scream. This pitiful sound ... is a concentrated expression of the last vestige of human dignity ... By his screams a man asserts his right to live, sends a message to the outside world demanding help and calling for resistance. If nothing else is left, one must scream. Silence is the real crime against humanity. (15)

Having recognised the urgency of our circumstances, and without necessarily abandoning a commitment to the practice of politics, the development of spirituality within the Churches is, in part, waking people up to the necessity of screaming. Those who do not perceive the same degree of urgency might suggest that Christian spirituality offers insights into the ways in which it is possible to oppose the threat of nuclear weapons. This might range from protest against political policies to finding ways of reclaiming our lives from the apparently all-pervasive threat of 'the bomb'. In an unpublished paper, "Taking time for peace: the ethical significance of the trivial", Stanley Hauerwas stresses the



importance of ordinary human activity as being at the heart of living peacefully. To refuse to allow the threat of nuclear weapons to dominate every aspect of our lives is to personally protest against the tyranny of nuclear weapons. That this can only be done, according to Hauerwas, under the gracious providence of God, is a marked contribution of Christian spirituality.

Moving to what has been said in the Church statements about the morality of nuclear deterrence it is, again, possible to find a substantial measure of agreement. None supports the present NATO, British, French and American policies of nuclear deterrence except as an interim stage in what must be a rapid process towards greater disarmament. There remains disagreement between those who argue for a minimal deterrence and those who seek total nuclear disarmament, though the latter would be glad to see progress towards even the former's objectives.

Commenting on the measure of agreement that exists between the Churches Howard Davis cites the WCC's statement on Peace and Justice from the 1983 Assembly as the point towards which the the Churches worldwide were moving:

We believe that the time has come when the Churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. (16)

Certainly this is to overstate matters as they presently stand. It is to confuse the formulation with the substance, to use McCormick's phrase (see note (3)). The same words could be interpreted in a number of ways, particularly with regard to the policy of nuclear deterrence. Nevertheless, Davis is right in identifying the drift of the official Church statements, and in pointing to the considerable measure of existing agreement.

There is, therefore, a good deal more consensus between the Church documents than MacIntyre would lead us to expect. However, the discussion of the statements continues in an unresolved way and it is therefore appropriate to turn to the next of McCormick's rules for the debate.

Try to identify the core issues at stake

To speak as if there were one core issue in this debate may be to appear foolish. It is quite clear that there are many issues at stake, both theological issues and prudential judgements. However there does appear to be one issue above all others which is at the heart of the matter.

From the discussion of the Church statements it might be expected that this one issue is the unresolved discussion of the morality of nuclear deterrence. Certainly this has been the focus of public debate. The matter seems to be unresolvable. Whilst Richard Harries uses just war criteria to show the possibility of there being a just nuclear deterrence, Anthony Kenny uses the same criteria to demonstrate

its impossibility<sup>(17)</sup>. Both make their case on rational grounds yet neither are persuaded by the other's logic.

In that the major issue of public policy at stake in the debate is that of deterrence it is hardly surprising that the discussion of the Church statements has been dominated by it. However, the Lutheran EKD Bulletin (1981) explicitly tried to avoid the same irreconcilable discussion that has dogged the secular debate and Ronald Preston expressed criticism of the Church of England's The Church and the Bomb for failing to guard sufficiently against this happening. Howard Davis is surely right to say that the effect of this curiously restricted and interminable discussion of the morality of nuclear deterrence is to 'give at least some legitimacy to the status quo'<sup>(18)</sup>. In addition, the Bishop of Salisbury has frequently commented since 1983 that he regrets the way in which the discussion of nuclear deterrence prevented discussion of virtually all of the other proposals put forward in The Church and the Bomb<sup>(19)</sup>. It is therefore a pity that the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party continued the discussion of deterrence with some vigour.

If the discussion of nuclear deterrence has proved so obstinate and has obstructed the wider debate it may be that it is not the core issue. Rather, it is the impenetrable surface of the debate. Correctly identifying the core issue should have the effect of opening the whole debate to a clearer and freer discussion. Throughout the debate various contributors have suggested that more attention needs to be given to the

understanding of power that lies behind the discussion and it is here, I suggest, that we find the real core issue.

As in the case of the Bishop of London and the Church of England's The Church and the Bomb, questions about the use of power have usually been raised by people who see themselves as 'realists', critical of the idealism and political naivete of the Church statements. The issue here is about the appropriate role for the Church. Donald MacKinnon refers to Rolf Hochhuth's play The Soldiers (1977) in which Winston Churchill and Bishop George Bell are shown in a fictional meeting in which Bell fails to play his role as pastor and understands too readily the political dilemmas of the statesman. In this he is shown to fail Churchill at a crucial moment. MacKinnon suggests that the most important task for religion is to maintain the tension that inevitably exists between the prophet-prelate and the statesman<sup>(20)</sup>. In this, MacKinnon accepts the debate in the same form that the self-styled political 'realists' have constructed it but suggests that the role of the Church is the opposite of what these realists suggest. Idealism, the maintenance of vision, has its place.

To accept the nuclear debate in this form is to ascribe a very curious meaning to the word 'realism'. If it is realistic to threaten the destruction of millions of people in the name of 'peace' then the 'idealist' is entitled to question the terms of the debate<sup>(21)</sup>. To quote Howard Davis:

Progress would require a language and morality less

corrupted by the 'realism' which defines what is possible in terms of what is ... (22)

The redefining of the debate is surprisingly difficult to do in any way that is effective upon political policy-making. The fatalism and paralysis experienced so widely is in part because although people regard the build-up of arms as regrettable, they perceive themselves to be powerless in the face of it. According to the American sociologist C Wright Mills, even in the 1940s and '50s decision-making had become concentrated in the hands of an interlocked political, military and economic 'power elite'(23). This elite is able to sustain the momentum of the arms race in its own interests and is not democratically accountable. Eldridge quotes Wright Mills' schematic image of American society:

The top of American society is increasingly unified, and often seems wilfully co-ordinated - at the top there has emerged an elite of power. The middle levels are a drifting set of stalemated, balancing forces: the middle does not link the bottom with the top. The bottom of society is politically fragmented and, even as a passive fact, increasingly powerless: at the bottom there is emerging a mass society.(24)

This is borne out by the way in which the interminable academic discussion of the pros and cons of nuclear deterrence has in fact permitted the status quo to continue (see above), exemplifying the middle level of stalemated balancing forces. The widespread fatalistic acceptance of nuclear weapons despite

evidence that most people expect them to be used in war within their own lifetime<sup>(25)</sup> exemplifies the passivity of the mass society.

Wright Mills' analysis is supported by recent research undertaken for the American Council on Economic Priorities. They speak of an 'iron triangle' of interlocking interest composed of Defence Department procurement officers, military contractors and members of Congress from Defence Department districts. They control decision-making at the Pentagon and are self-reinforcing. Besides consequent mismanagement that accounts for \$10-\$30 billion a year (figures attributed to the President's Budget Director) the CEP's study points to two further conclusions. First, the constant purchasing of ever more sophisticated weaponry is not the consequence of a coherent and politically controlled military policy. It is a response to the constantly changing possibilities offered by the defence industries coupled with a false assertion that the Soviet Union has spent considerably more than the United States on the military over the past ten years. Second, the study points to the massive social cost of this military dominance of the American economy:

Jobs, investment, and economic growth will be sacrificed. Technological progress will be distorted. And social programmes aimed at decreasing human suffering will be cut. The high technology sector, an industry important to future American economic growth, will be hardest hit by the arms increases. Even before the build-up, electronic and

aerospace firms supplying the weapons industry were functioning close to their limits. Now the administration has called on industry to increase weapons output faster than during the Vietnam war. To produce the substantially greater number of sophisticated jet fighters and missiles the Pentagon is asking for, these companies must compete against civilian firms to obtain scarce resources such as technically skilled labour, key subcomponents and rare metals. Pitting military demands against civilian production will drive up prices as the economy recovers from the present recession, and could stifle the ability of the US technology firms to compete internationally.(26)

It begins to look as though the 'power elite' cannot even operate in favour of its own long-term interests.

If Wright Mills is correct to talk of a 'power elite' then even democratically elected politicians may lack the capacity to exercise real political power against the interests of the elite. Eldridge cites President Jimmy Carter as an example(27). There is evidence that on coming to office Carter was deeply antipathetic to nuclear weapons and argued strongly with the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a policy of minimum deterrence. By 1980 he had issued a policy document explaining a strategic doctrine for fighting a nuclear war in such a way as to lay the groundwork for his successor, President Reagan, to talk of the possibility of winning a nuclear war. Another example is provided by the French Socialist President Mitterand

who was elected to his first term of office after a campaign with a strongly anti-nuclear element. He has been singularly ineffective in altering French nuclear policy and now expounds the nuclear orthodoxy of the military. In these circumstances who is to say that 'realism' belongs to the politicians?

Richard McCormick's final rule for debate is helpful in identifying a possible way through this discussion of power. McCormick says that it is important to incorporate the woman's perspective or women's perspectives. This is as true of the nuclear debate as it is of the abortion debate. In the discussion of Church statements very few women's voices have been heard, yet in the generating of public discussion women have been prominent. The Women's Peace Camp at Greenham Common has been an extraordinarily potent symbol of the alternatives to a nuclear society. The politicians who support current nuclear policy would like to pretend that the Greenham women have nothing to say about the reality of the exercise of power, but that is to miss the women's significance. The women have always intended to engage with power, aiming to counter the roots of its abuse which lies in the will to dominate others. According to two of the campers,

From the very beginning of the Camp the principle of working without hierarchies was established. Most of our experience in this divided world shows us that certain people are in charge and the rest are meant to follow ... so we are starting from scratch, developing attitudes and methods that make domination and opting out unnecessary. We try to



give every woman a voice - as in meetings where every woman speaks in turn around a circle - and this makes us listen to each other. We are teaching each other in an intense way. And this means that women who have been identified by the press as spokeswomen have no more impact on decision-making than the women who may have arrived the day before. It is new to us, we fail often, but it must be done, for political change is deeper and more firm when there is personal change too.(28)

The Camp is not specifically Christian, but no Christian could fail to hear echoes of the teachings of Jesus. Elizabeth Templeton is surely right to suggest that Greenham presents a theological challenge to the Churches:

Either we must say that it is a late, secular expression of the Manichaeian/Calvinist ambivalence about engagement with power, a protest gesture which, albeit brave and imaginative, is basically irrelevant to the real world of political decision-making, or we must say that the insights into how human society works and the choices are a vehicle of genuine prophecy, and reproclaim the Gospel's dialectic about power and powerlessness.(29)

She goes on to note how this dialectic is being explored in the Churches of the Third World, particularly in liberation theologies.

It is generally recognised that liberation theologies are by definition contextual and local so that which is appropriate to parts of the Third World cannot be simply transferred to the West. For Templeton it is the commitment of the liberation theologians which is the key.

The passion of liberation theology is that of people whose existence depends upon the transformation of the world, whose energy is dedicated to it, and yet who live at risk in that commitment, because it generates crisis for those with investments in the old order. If it simply seeks to reverse the old order, and create a new pattern of power and importance with the actors changing roles, it is no longer liberation theology.<sup>(30)</sup>

Here then, in a consideration of the exercise of power, questions of what and when is the Kingdom of God, of the role of the State, the relationship of Church and State, as well as technical and prudential questions about nuclear weapons and strategy in particular, are laid bare as if exposed by penetration to the core issue in the debate. The women's perspective outlined above offers one way through the problems posed by nuclear weapons but there need to be many more possibilities generated and discussed and acted upon. The Churches have an important task in sustaining the imaginative capacities of individuals and groups and of helping people to act in no matter how small a way.

The Church has an ambiguous record as the sustainer of imagination and vision. Magnificent cathedrals which now lift the eye to God were built on the backs of the poor and were often part of their subjugation. Nor has the Church always encouraged the individual to explore his/her relationship with God. Dostoyevsky neatly captured the ambiguity of this in his well known story about the Grand Inquisitor<sup>(31)</sup>. The Church has also played its part in social control by being the opiate of the people.

It may be very significant that the place of vision that unlocked the final part of this study was outside the church and on the margins of society in the Women's Peace Camp at Greenham. This is not what Stanley Hauerwas would have wanted! This is not to romanticise the significance of the Greenham women nor the other margins of society. But the Church will have to do some very careful listening in the margins of society if it is to discern the work of God in the world and discern alternatives to the nuclear status quo. The Church will be unable to do this if its primary concern is with maintaining social order, the pax of the world. Its primary concern must always be with inner peace and with the eschatological reality of shalom. Where there is no vision the people perish.

Notes

Unless otherwise stated the place of publication is London.

Preface

1. Albrecht, Paul and Koshy, Ninan (eds) Before it's Too Late: the challenge of nuclear disarmament, Geneva: WCC, 1983.
2. Gill, David (ed) Gathered for Life: Official Report of the WCC, Vancouver 1983, Geneva: WCC, 1983.
3. Troeltsch, Ernst The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, George Allen and Unwin, 1931.
4. London Yearly Meeting, Church Government, London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1968.
5. Religious Society of Friends 'To Lima With Love' The response from the Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain to the World Council of Churches document Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, Quaker Home Service, 1987, 55.
6. Kelly, Kevin T Life and Love: Towards a Christian dialogue on bioethical questions, Collins, 1987, is a fascinating example of this in a highly controversial area of discussion. I am indebted to Kelly for his use of Richard McCormick's suggested rules for discussion in the abortion debate. (See chap. 7 of my present study.)

Chapter 1

The Traditions of Christian Pacifism and the Just War

1. Bainton, Roland Christian Attitudes to War and Peace, Hodder and Stoughton, 1961.
2. For example, Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael The Ethics of War, Duckworth, 1979, p.193.
3. There are notable exceptions. For example some of the contributors to Lawler, Philip F (ed) Justice and War in the Nuclear Age, Washington: University Press of America 1983, begin with an analysis of the threat posed by Communism. Their strident use of just war theory at times borders on a 'holy war'. See the comments by Courtnay Murray on page 30.
4. Teichman, Jenny Pacifism and the Just War, Oxford: Blackwell, 1986, p.4.
5. Ibid., p.62.
6. Ibid., p.10.
7. Cadoux, C J The Early Christian Attitude to War, Headley Bros, 1919, p.20.
8. Mk 12.17 and Synoptic parallels.

9. Hinchliff, Peter Holiness and Politics, Darton Longman and Todd, 1982, pp.3-5.
10. Cadoux, C J, op.cit., ch.1.
11. Helgeland, John, Daly, Robert J and Burns, Patout J Christians and the Military, SCM, 1987, p.1.
12. Ibid., ch.2.
13. Ibid., p.1.
14. Ibid., pp.15-16.
15. Anscombe, G E M "War and Murder" ch. II in Stein, Walter (ed) Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience, The Merlin Press 1961, but the edition quoted was reprinted and published in 1981.
16. Ibid., p.55.
17. Ferguson, John The Politics of Love: The New Testament and Non-Violent Revolution, Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1973.
18. Ibid., p.60.
19. Helgeland, John, Daly, Robert J and Burns, J Patout op.cit., ch.3.

20. Ibid., p.41.
21. Nuttall, Geoffrey Christian Pacifism in History, Berkeley: World Without War Council, 1971, ch.1.
22. Eusebius tells of there being Christian soldiers in the Thundering Legion, Ecclesiastical History v.4.3-5.7.
23. Ferguson, John op.cit., p.64.
24. Forrell, George W History of Christian Ethics Vol. 1, from the New Testament to Augustine, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979, p.94.
25. Ibid., p.94.
26. Ferguson, John op.cit., p.65.
27. Ibid., p.63.
28. Helgeland, John, Daly, Robert J and Burns, J Patout, op.cit., ch.9.
29. For example see Kee, Alistair Constantine Versus Christ, SCM, 1982.
30. Quoted in MacKinnon, D M "Kenosis and Establishment" in The Stripping of the Altars, Fontana, 1969, p.15.

31. Cochrane, C N quoted in Bailey, Sydney Prohibitions and Restraints in War, Oxford: OUP, 1972, p.5.
32. Ibid., p.5.
33. Gill, Robin A Textbook of Christian Ethics, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985, p.300.
34. Bailey, Sydney op.cit., p.6.
35. Nuttall, Geoffrey op.cit., passim.
36. Quoted in Ibid., p.45.
37. Ibid., p.75.
38. Yoder, John H Nevertheless, The Varieties and Shortcomings of Religious Pacifism, Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1971, Preface.
39. Teichman, Jenny op.cit., pp.6-7.
40. Bailey, Sydney "How we wrote 'The Church and the Bomb'" Crucible Oct-Dec 1983, pp.177-184.
41. The report of a Working Party under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Salisbury The Church and the Bomb: Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience, Hodder and Stoughton/CIO, 1982, pp.121-2.



42. Anscombe, G E M op.cit.
43. Ibid., p.46.
44. Ibid., p.47.
45. Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael op.cit., p.115.
46. Anscombe, G E M op.cit., pp.52-53.
47. Ibid., p.56.
48. Ruston, Roger "Christian Pacifism", a paper given to the Association of Teachers of Moral Theology, May 20-22 1983, p.4.
49. Niebuhr, Reinhold Moral Man and Immoral Society, New York: Scribner's 1932, Preface.
50. Ruston, Roger op.cit., pp.14-15.
51. For example, Hauerwas, Stanley The Peaceable Kingdom, SCM, 1984, ch.6.
52. One writer, Jan Narveson, has suggested that pacifism is incoherent and can be shown to be self-contradictory. His case would require detailed presentation to do it justice. It is sufficient to note that both Paskins and Dockrill and Teichman, having analysed his argument, found it

lacking. It is therefore not the ultimate criticism of pacifism that Narveson seemed to think. See Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael *op.cit.*, pp.121, 187 and 241-3; and Teichman, Jenny *op.cit.*, pp.29-37.

53. Teichman, Jenny *op.cit.*, p.51.

54. Williams, Rowan The Truce of God, Fount Paperbacks, 1983, p.28.

55. Holmes, Arthur F War and Christian Ethics, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1975, p.87.

56. Teichman, Jenny *op.cit.*, p.51.

57. *Ibid.*, pp.51-52.

58. *Ibid.*, p.54.

59. Two exceptions are known. The Franciscans Alexander of Hales and John de la Rochelle both discuss the propriety of war. See Heath, Thomas Appendix 2 in Aquinas Summa Theologicae vol.35, Blackfriars, 1972.

60. Bailey, Sydney *op.cit.*, p.6.

61. Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael *op.cit.*, p.192.

62. Anscombe, G E M *op.cit.*, p.59.

63. Bailey, Sydney How Wars End vols. I and II, Oxford: Clarendon 1982, provides a detailed account of seven wars in the period 1946-64. Although much of Bailey's study is encouraging in the way international conventions and regulations have been used, he also shows how wars gain an illogical momentum of their own.
64. Quoted by Finn, James in "Pacifism or Just War: Either or Neither" in Murnion, P J (ed) Catholics and Nuclear War. A Commentary on 'The Challenge of Peace', the US Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter on War and Peace, Geoffrey Chapman, 1983, p.132.
65. MacIntyre, Alastair After Virtue: a study in moral theory, Duckworth 1981, p.6.
66. For example Finnis, John Fundamentals of Ethics, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1983 and Clark, Stephen R L From Athens to Jerusalem: The Love of Wisdom and the Love of God, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
67. Finnis, John "Morality and the Ministry of Defence", The Tablet 3.8.85.
68. However, Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael *op.cit.*, ch. v show that the just war tradition can still be used outside its usual natural law framework.
69. Finn, James in Murnion, P J (ed) *op.cit.*, p.134ff.

70. Paskins, Barrie and Dockrill, Michael *op.cit.*, p.193.
71. Quoted in Wilkinson, Alan Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945, SCM, 1986, p.209.
72. Cited in McCormick "Nuclear Deterrence and the Problem of Intention: A Review of the Positions" in Murnion, P J (ed) *op.cit.*, p.169.
73. For example, Gill, Robin The Cross Against the Bomb, Epworth Press, 1984.
74. For example, this was the contemporary reaction of many to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945; it was briefly the attitude of Thomas Merton in 1962; it is the attitude of a good many people in relation to tactical, or battlefield, nuclear weapons in the present day.
75. For example, Harries, Richard Christianity and War in a Nuclear Age, Mowbray, 1986.
76. Habgood, John Church and Nation in a Secular Age, DLT, 1983, p.168.

Chapter 2

Roman Catholicism

1. Musto, Ronald G The Catholic Peace Tradition, Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986, p.184.
2. Ibid., p.239.
3. "Gaudium et Spes", 78. In Documents of Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, Leominster: Fowler Wright Books, 1981.
4. Ibid., 78.
5. Ibid., 82.
6. Ibid., 39.
7. Ibid., 10.
8. Ibid., 78.
9. Ibid., 13.
10. Ibid., 80.
11. Ibid., 81.
12. Ibid., 79.

13. Ibid., 78.
14. Quoted in Teichman, Jenny Pacifism and the Just War, Oxford: Blackwells, 1986, p.14.
15. "Gaudium et Spes" op.cit., 16.
16. The Guardian, 20.8.86.
17. "Gaudium et Spes" op.cit., 45.
18. Ibid., 43.
19. John XXIII 29.10.58, reprinted in Peace and Disarmament: Documents of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, Geneva: WCC, 1982.
20. "Gaudium et Spes" op.cit., 82.
21. Pius XII, Christmas radio message, 24.12.54, reprinted in Peace and Disarmament op.cit..
22. The US Bishops' Pastoral Letter on War and Peace in the Nuclear Age The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise And Our Response, SPCK/CTS, 1983. See especially paras 9-13.
23. Novak, Michael Moral Clarity in a Nuclear Age, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983.

24. "Gaudium et Spes" op.cit., 83.
25. Ibid., 81.
26. Schneiders, Sandra M "New Testament Reflections on Peace and Nuclear Arms". In Murnion, P J (ed) Catholics and Nuclear War, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.
27. Langan, John "American Catholics and the Peace Debate", Washington Quarterly, 5 (Autumn 1982), pp.123-7.
28. Schillebeeckx, Edward "Eager to Spread the Gospel of Peace", Concilium, April 1983, pp.72-81.
29. Langan, John op.cit., p.124-5.
30. For example, see the introduction of Schall, James V (ed) Out of Justice, Peace. Joint Pastoral Letter of the West German Bishops, and Winning the Peace. Joint Pastoral Letter of the French Bishops, San Francisco: St Ignatius Press, 1984.
31. Langan, John op.cit., p.125-6.
32. For a sharp description of this problem see MacIntyre, Alastair, op.cit.
33. For example see French Bishops 8-9. Cardinal Hume (also printed in Schall, James V op.cit.) and the West German

Bishops take a similar line but do not employ all the arguments given here.

34. The Challenge of Peace, op.cit., 190.
35. Schall, James V op.cit., p.14.
36. The Challenge of Peace op.cit., 246.
37. GDR Bishops' "Pastoral Letter for World Peace Day 1983", Berlin, 1983.
38. Wicker, Brian Nuclear Deterrence: What Does the Church Teach?, Catholic Truth Society, 1985, pp.6-8.
39. The Challenge of Peace, op.cit., 289.
40. In the secondary literature the paradox is often remarked upon that the political right tends to be supportive of nuclear weapons and opposed to abortion whilst the political left tends to be opposed to nuclear weapons and supportive of abortion. See, for example, G R Dunstan's comments about 'Liberalism' in The Artifice of Ethics, SCM 1974, p.75ff.

### Chapter 3

#### The Church of England

1. Loades, Ann "The Church and the Bomb" King's College Theological Review, Vol 8, No 2, 1984, pp.59-61.



2. Dunstan, Gordon "Theological Method in the Deterrence Debate", chap.2 in Goodwin, Geoffrey (ed) Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence, Croom Helm, 1982.
3. Ibid., pp.47-8.
4. Habgood, John op.cit. 1983, p.168.
5. Langan, John op.cit.
6. The Church and the Bomb p.109.
7. The debt of Anglicanism to Aquinas is beautifully traced by McAdoo, H R in his The Structure of Caroline Theology, Longmans Green and Co, 1949.
8. Kelly, Kevin Conscience: Dictator or Guide? A Study in Seventeenth Century English Protestant Moral Theology, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967.
9. Wood, Thomas English Casuistical divinity in the Seventeenth Century with Special Reference to Jeremy Taylor, SPCK, 1952, pp.ix-x.
10. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit. (1985) p.33.
11. Habgood, John (1983) op.cit., p.163.

12. Oldham, J H quoted in Preston, Ronald Church and Society in the Late Twentieth Century: The Economic and Political Task, SCM, 1983, p.144.
13. Preston, Ronald op.cit., (1983), p.148.
14. Ibid., p.147.
15. The Church and the Bomb p.158.
16. Bailey, Sydney op.cit., (1983).
17. Elford, John "The Church and Nuclear Defence Policy", ch.8 in Moyser, George (ed) Church and Politics Today. The Role of the Church of England in Contemporary Politics, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985, p.193.
18. Baker, John Austin "The freedom not to be afraid", The Observer 7.11.1982. He was replying to two articles published in preceeding weeks by Conor Cruise O'Brien.
19. Habgood, John The Guardian 18.10.1982.
20. Preston, Ronald op.cit., (1983) pp.185-6 (note 33).
21. The Bishop of London's main contributions to the debate are on pp.4-9, 22-24, 24-27, 62-64 and 64-65 of The Church Synod Debate op.cit..

22. Comments on the reporting of the positions of the Bishops of London, Salisbury and Birmingham are contained in Glasgow University Media Group War and Peace News, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, ch.9.
23. The General Synod Debate op.cit., p.61f.
24. Ibid., pp.49-53.
25. Ibid., p.64.
26. Ibid., p.39.
27. Ibid., p.53.
28. The Church and the Bomb, ch.8, para.1.
29. Habgood, John op.cit., (1983), p.165.
30. Baker, John Austin "The Church and the Road to Peace" ch.10 in Gladwin, John (ed) Dropping the Bomb. The Church and the Bomb debate, Hodder and Stoughton, 1985.
31. Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age, p.vi.
32. Ibid., p.21.
33. Eliot, T S Murder in the Cathedral, Faber and Faber, 1969, p.47.

34. Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age, p.23.
35. See for example Charles Raven's criticisms of the British Council of Churches' report published in 1946, The Era of Atomic Power. Raven thought the weakness of the whole report is that:
- it assumes the exercise of power is the only means of overcoming evil; that it has no acknowledgement of Christ's refusal either to fight or to flee; and that in consequence it has no clear faith in the victory of love and no clear gospel as to the conditions of that victory. (Quoted in Dillistone, F W Charles Raven, Hodder and Stoughton, 1975, p.235.)
- In this Raven confuses power with violence. The pacifist implication is obvious in a way that is not so with the Bishop of Oxford's Working Party's report.
36. Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age, p.vii.
37. Ibid., p.49.
38. Quoted in Wilkinson, Alan Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945, SCM, p.206.
39. Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age, p.vi and p.165.

40. Hauerwas, Stanley Against the Nations: War and Survival in a Liberal Society, Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985, p.179.

Chapter 4

Lutheran Churches

1. Williams, Rowan The Wound of Knowledge, Darton Longman and Todd, 1979, p.143.
2. Yule, George "By faith alone" The Tablet, 10.12.83 p.1201f.
3. Bainton, Roland Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther, New York: Signet Classics, 1950, p.41.
4. Martin Luther "The Freedom of a Christian" (1520), in Dillenberger, John (ed) Martin Luther, Selections from his writings, New York: Anchor Books, 1961, p.61.
5. Ibid., p.55.
6. Ibid., p.69.
7. Ibid., p.62.
8. Ibid., p.62.
9. Ibid., p.75.

10. See for example Lazareth, William "Lutheran Ethics" in Macquarrie, John and Childress, James A New Dictionary of Christian Ethics, SCM, 1986.
11. Mk 12.17 and Synoptic parallels.
12. Martin Luther "Secular Authority: To what extent it should be obeyed" (1523), in Dillenberger, John (ed) op.cit., pp.368-71.
13. Martin Luther "Whether soldiers, too, can be saved" in Luther's Works Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967, vol.46, p.96.
14. Ibid., p.105f.
15. Ibid., p.115.
16. Thielicke, Helmut Theological Ethics, A & C Black, Vol.1 1968, Vol.2 1969, based on German editions of 1958 and 1959.
17. Ash, Timothy Garton "Martin Luther: Communist hero" The Tablet, 17.12.83, p.1129f.
18. Thielicke, Helmut op.cit., vol.1, p.365.
19. Ibid., vol.1, p.371.

20. Ibid., vol.2, p.249.
21. Ibid., vol.2, p.249.
22. Ibid., vol.2, p.250.
23. Ibid., vol.2, p.327.
24. Ibid., vol.2, p.348.
25. Ibid., vol.2, ch.19.
26. Ibid., vol.2, p.229.
27. Ibid., vol.2, p.230.
28. Ibid., vol.2, ch.26.
29. Ibid., vol.2, p.475.
30. Ibid., vol.2, p.476.
31. Ibid., vol.2, p.477 and p.487.
32. Knox, Ronald God and the Atom, Sheed and Ward, 1945, p.128.
33. See for example The Church and the Bomb p.63f.

34. Thielicke, Helmut op.cit., vol.2, pp.492ff.
35. Ibid., vol.2, p.497.
36. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland "The Preservation, Promotion and Renewal of Peace: A Memorandum of the Evangelical Church in Germany", Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland Bulletin: Special Issue, 1981.
37. American Lutheran Church Mandate for Peacemaking, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982.
- Division for Mission in North America, Lutheran Church in America Proposed Social Statement of the Lutheran Church in America: 'Peace and Politics: God's Call to Temporal Peacemaking', New York: Department for Church and Society, 1983.
- Bishop's Conference of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Finland Peace Development and Human Rights, Guidelines for action adopted by the Bishops' Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, Helsinki: Church Office for Foreign Affairs, undated but since 1980.
- Simojoki, Martti, Archbishop of Turku and Finland, and Vladimir, Archbishop of Dmitrov, Communique after the third theological conversations between the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and the Russian Orthodox Church, 23-28.5.74, Helsinki: Church Office for Foreign Affairs, 1974.
38. EKD (1981) op.cit., p:5.



39. Ibid., p.23. See also pp.42-46.
40. Bishops Conference of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Finland, op.cit., p.8.
41. Krusche, Gunther "Confidence rather than Deterrence" in Abrecht, Paul and Koshy, Ninan (eds) op.cit., pp.90-99.
42. Ibid., p.97.
43. EKD (1981) op.cit., p.31.
44. Vikstrom, John "Mission and Kingdom of God: Redemption and kingdom of peace as object of faith and ethical task. A contribution to the current interchurch dialogue" in Lutheran Contributions to the Missio Dei Geneva: Department of Church Co-operation of the Lutheran World Federation, 1984.
45. EKD (1981) op.cit., p.82f.

## Chapter 5

### The Religious Society of Friends

1. Nickalls, John L (ed) The Journal of George Fox, Religious Society of Friends, 1975, p.11. Hereafter cited as Journal.
2. Ibid., p.xxvi.

3. Ibid., p.263.
4. Ibid., p.128.
5. Ibid., p.19.
6. Jones,Rufus M Quakerism: A Religion of Life, Headley Brothers, 1908, p.43.
7. Gorman,George Introducing Quakers, Quaker Home Service (third edition).
8. Trevelyan,G M English Social History, The Reprint Society Ltd, 1948, p.269f.
9. Journal, p.65.
10. Quoted in Nuttall,Geoffrey Christian Pacifism in History, Berkeley California: World Without War Council, 1971, p.51.
11. Quoted in Graham,John W War from a Quaker Point of View, Headley Bros, undated but probably 1915, p.37.
12. Journal, pp.398-404.
13. Quoted in Nuttall,Geoffrey op.cit., p.52.

14. Brock, Peter Pioneers of the Peaceable Kingdom, Princeton University Press, 1968, p.xi.
15. Ibid., p.xiii.
16. Ibid., p.xiii.
17. Graham, John W op.cit., p.58.
18. Brock, Peter op.cit. (1968), p.18.
19. Woolman, John, quoted in Reynolds, Reginald The Wisdom of John Woolman, Friends Home Service Committee 1972, p.13.
20. ibid., p.13.
21. Brock, Peter op.cit., p.133.
22. See Mendl, Wolf Prophets and Reconcilers: reflections on the Quaker Peace Testimony, Friends Home Service Committee 1974, ch.II.
23. Curle, Adam True Justice, Quaker Home Service 1981, p.53.
24. Brock, Peter referred to in Teichman, Jenny Pacifism and the Just War, Oxford, Blackwell, 1986, pp.6-7.
25. Curle, Adam op.cit., p.24.

26. Quaker Peace and Service "Poster List", May 1985.
27. Curle, Adam "The Fire in the Peat", The Friend 18.2.83 pp.189-191.
28. Niebuhr, Reinhold Moral Man and Immoral Society, New York: Scribners's, 1932.
29. Curle, Adam op.cit. 1983, p.190f.
30. Mendl, Wolf op.cit., p.8.
31. Quaker Peace and Service op.cit.
32. Quaker Peace and Service Bridge Builders for Peace, Mothers for Peace Visits USA-USSR-UK, Quaker Peace and Service, 1983.
33. Quaker Peace and Service op.cit. (1985).
34. Alexander, Horace G The growth of the Peace Testimony of the Society of Friends, Quaker Peace and Service 1982, p.14.
35. Quoted in Ibid., p.30.
36. Sims, Nicholas A "Quaker Approaches to Disarmament - What have we learned?", The Friends Quarterly, July 1985.

37. Peace Tax Campaign A Submission to the Council of Europe,  
Peace Tax Campaign, 1983.
38. Quaker Council for European Affairs Paying for Peace,  
Brussels: Quaker Council for European Affairs 1985, p.52.
39. Peace Tax Campaign "Newsletter", No.50, August-September  
1987, p.1.
40. See, for example, Moorehead, Caroline Troublesome People:  
Enemies of War 1916-1986, Hamish Hamilton, 1987.

## Chapter 6

### A Theological Analysis of the Church Statements on Nuclear Weapons

1. Troeltsch, Ernst, op.cit.
2. Niebuhr, H Richard Christ and Culture, New York: Harper,  
1951.
3. Gustafson, James Protestant and Roman Catholic Ethics:  
Prospects for Rapprochement, SCM, 1979, ch.4.
4. Gill, Robin A Textbook of Christian Ethics, Edinburgh:  
T & T Clark, 1985, pp.3-29.
5. Scott, Janet What Canst Thou Say? Towards a Quaker  
Theology. Quaker Home Service 1980, p.55f.

6. Lampen, John Mending Hurts, Quaker Home Service 1987, p.46.
7. See, for example, Young, Francis and Wilson, Kenneth Focus on God, Epworth, 1986, ch.2.
8. Harries, Richard quotes Luther: "I would rather have a bad man as ruler who was prudent than a good man who was imprudent", in "The Church and the Bomb: a reaction" Christian Vol.7 No.2, 1983, p.24.
9. Barton, John "The use of the Bible in moral debate" Theology, May 1985, pp.204-9.
10. Musto, Ronald G op.cit., p.239.
11. There are very occasional exceptions, as when the West German bishops use Jesus' acceptance of the centurion as proof that he was not opposed to the military as such.
12. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit., (1988), p.200, note 7.
13. The Challenge of Peace op.cit., 16 and 17.
14. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit., (1985), p.179.
15. Ruston, Roger and West, Angela Preparing for Armageddon: Some Theological Advice for President Reagan, Pax Christi, 1985.

16. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit. (1985) chs.8 and 9. He is particularly critical of the 'survivalist' motives that lie behind Jonathon Schell's The Fate of the Earth, Picador 1982. A more understated case for the place of Biblical apocalyptic in the Church's discussion of nuclear weapons is provided by Lord Blanch ch.8 in Gladwin, John (ed) op.cit.
17. Examples of a radical reworking of theology in a nuclear age are provided by Kaufman, Gordon D op.cit. and Garrison, Jim op.cit. (1982).
18. See the discussion of Kaufman and Hauerwas' positions in Jung, L Shannon "Nuclear Eschatology", Theology Today, July 1983, pp.184-194.
19. Yoder, John H The Politics of Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
20. Kreider, Alan Journey towards Holiness, Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1986.
21. Wallis, Jim Agenda for Biblical people, Triangle, 1986.
22. The argument was recently expressed in criticism of the US Roman Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter by Novak, Michael op.cit., p.28.
23. For example, see work by Yoder, Hauerwas and Ruston.

24. A third argument is offered by John Langan and is outlined by McCormick, Richard in Murnion, P J (ed) op.cit., p.171f. Langan interests himself in tactical nuclear weapons and suggests that they may fulfil just war criteria. McCormick is convincing in saying that this fails to take seriously the common judgement that any nuclear exchange will escalate. It also appears to ignore the character of the radioactive legacy. In the English context, the same points were made in correspondence from Williams, Rowan and Harries, Richard in The Guardian, 10.1.87 and 13.1.87.
25. See, for example, Bridger, Francis The Cross and the Bomb, Mowbray, 1983.
26. The Church and the Bomb ch.2 includes the judgement that twenty-nine States are capable of acquiring nuclear weapons in thirty-forty years, and thirteen of these have plausible political incentives to exercise this option.
27. Recently it has been stated at length by Harries, Richard op.cit. (1986 (b)).
28. Paskins, Barrie "Proliferation and the Nature of Deterrence" in Blake, Nigel and Pole, Kay (eds) Dangers of Deterrence: Philosophers on Nuclear Strategy, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983, pp.112-131.
29. Garrison, Jim and Shivpuri, Pyare The Russian Threat, Its Myths and Realities, Gateway Books, 1983.



30. Hinchliff, Peter Letter, The Times, 6.3.84.
31. Paskins, Barrie op.cit.
32. Santer, Mark in Gladwin, John (ed) op.cit., p.121.
33. Kenny, Anthony The Logic of Deterrence, Firethorn Press, 1985.
34. Houlden, J L Connections: The Integration of Theology and Faith, SCM, 1986, p.119.
35. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit. (1985), p.177.
36. Preston, Ronald H The Future of Christian Ethics, SCM, 1987, p.41.
37. Nickalls, John L (ed) op.cit., p.263.
38. See, for example, Nuttall, Geoffrey op.cit., p.73f.
39. Hauerwas' writings on war and peace centre on the importance of the Church's witness to God's peaceable kingdom in such a way as to necessitate a very clear division between Church and Society.
40. Gill, Robin Prophecy and Praxis, Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1981, esp. ch.1.

41. Wilkinson, Alan op.cit., p.321.
42. Preston, Ronald H op.cit. (1987), p.45f.
43. Gill, Robin op.cit (1981), ch.1.
44. Habgood, John op.cit., p.163.
45. Ellul, Jacques Violence, Mowbrays, 1978, p.23.
46. Gustafson, James op.cit., p.30.
47. Forrester, Duncan "The Theological Task" in Davis, Howard (ed) Ethics and Defence: Power and Responsibility in the Nuclear Age, Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
48. Ibid., p.33.

## Chapter 7

### Continuing the debate more fruitfully

1. MacIntyre, Alasdair op.cit., ch.2.
2. McCormick, Richard A How Brave a New World?, SCM, 1981, ch.9. I have changed the order in which McCormick states his rules.
3. It seems to me that McCormick's separate rule to distinguish between the formulation and the substance of a

moral conviction can be subsumed into this more general rule.

4. McCormick, Richard A op.cit., p.179f.
5. Niebuhr, Reinhold op.cit. (1932), p.xv.
6. O'Donovan, Oliver Begotten or Made? Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, p.7.
7. See above, ch.2.
8. McCormick also asks for a distinction to be made between morality and pastoral care or practice. This applies less readily to the nuclear debate, except in the more general sense that a distinction has to be made between an abstract moral statement and its practical application.
9. Hauerwas, Stanley op.cit. (1984), esp. chs.5 and 6.
10. See, for example, Cesaretti, C A and Vitale, Joseph T Rumours of War: a moral and theological perspective on the arms race, New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.
11. Schell, Jonathan op.cit., p.176f.
12. For example, Hughes, Gerard W God of Surprises, Darton Longman and Todd, 1985.

13. This prayer is used by people of many faiths, and is used in churches of all denominations in Britain during the annual 'Week of Prayer for World Peace'.
14. Cited in BSR Changing Britain: Social Diversity and Moral Unity, Church House Publishing, 1987, 39.
15. Quoted in Humphrey, Nicholas Four Minutes to Midnight, The Menard Press, 1982, p.7.
16. Quoted in David, Howard (ed) op.cit., p.13f.
17. Harries, Richard op.cit. (1986(b)).  
Kenny, Anthony op.cit..
18. Davis, Howard op.cit., p.11.
19. For example, Baker, John Austin in Barrett, Clive Peace Together: A Vision of Christian Pacifism, Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1987, p.114.
20. MacKinnon, Donald "Power Politics and Religious Faith", ch.7 in his Themes in Theology: The Three-fold Cord, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987. He makes much the same point in ch.8 using Creon and Antigone to exemplify the proper dialectic that must be maintained between those who exercise power and those who question them.
21. Eldridge, John in Davis, Howard op.cit., p.190.

22. Davis,Howard op.cit., p.269.
23. Wright Mills' argument is summarised by Eldridge,John op.cit., pp.189ff.
24. Quoted in Eldridge,John op.cit., p.190.
25. At the height of public agitation about nuclear weapons in the early 1980s a series of opinion polls in Britain showed that over 80% of the British public expected a nuclear war to take place within their lifetime.
26. DeGrasse,Robert Murphy,Paul and Ragen,William The Costs and Consequences of Reagan's Military Buildup, New York: Council on Economic Priorities, 1982, p.1f.
27. Eldridge,John op.cit., p.195.
28. Harford,Barbara and Hopkins,Sarah (eds) Greenham Common: Woman at the Wire, The Women's Press, 1984, p.3.
29. Templeton,Elizabeth "Power and Powerlessness" ch.14 in Davis,Howard op.cit.
30. Ibid., p.265.
31. Dostoyevsky, F The Brothers Karamazov, Book 5, ch 5, Penguin, 1977.

Bibliography

- Abrecht, Paul & Koshy, Ninan (Eds) Before it's Too Late: the challenge of nuclear disarmament, Geneva: W.C.C., 1983.
- Alexander, Horace G. "The growth of the Peace Testimony of the Society of Friends", Quaker Peace & Service, 1982.
- Alexander, Horace G. "What has Gandhi to say to us?", Quaker Peace and Service, 1984.
- Amam, Kenneth (Ed) Border Regions of Faith: An Anthology of Religion and Social Change. Mary Knoll: Orbis Body 1986
- American Lutheran Church Mandate for Peacemaking, Minneapolis: Augsburg 1982.
- Ash, Timothy Garton, "Martin Luther: Communist hero", The Tablet, 17.2.83.
- Auckerman, Dale Darkening Valley: A Biblical Perspective on Nuclear War Seabury Press 1981.
- Bailey, Sydney D. "Objections to Quaker Pacifism", New Christian, 16.6.66
- Bailey, Sydney D. Prohibitions & Restraints in War, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1972.
- Bailey, Sydney D. How wars end: Vols I and II, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1982.
- Bailey, Sydney D. "How we wrote 'The Church and the Bomb'" Crucible October - December 1983, pp. 177-184.
- Bailey, Sydney D. Christian Perspectives on Nuclear Weapons, British Council of Churches, 1984.

- Bainton, Roland Here I stand: A Life of Martin Luther, New York: Signet Classics, 1950 (i).
- Bainton, Roland Christian Attitudes to War and Peace, Hodder and Stoughton, 1961.
- Baker, John Austin "The freedom not to be afraid" The Observer, 7.11.81.
- Barrett, Clive (Ed) Peace Together: A Vision of Christian Pacifism, Cambridge: James Clarke & Co. 1987.
- Barton, John "The use of the Bible in moral debate" Theology: May 1983 pp. 204-9.
- Bingham, June Courage to Change: An Introduction to the Life and Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr, New York: Scribners, 1961.
- Bishops' Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, Peace Development & Human Rights, Guidelines for action adopted by the Bishops' Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, Helsinki: Church Office for Foreign Affairs, undated but since 1980.
- Blake, Nigel & Pole, Kay (Eds) Dangers of Deterrence: Philosophers on Nuclear Strategy, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Board for Social Responsibility Changing Britain, Social Diversity and Moral Unity, Church House Publishing, 1987.
- Bolsover, Phil Civil Defence: The Cruellest Confidence Trick, C.M.D., 1982.
- Bridger, Francis (Ed) The Cross and the Bomb, Mowbray, 1983.
- British Council of Churches The Era of Atomic Power, S.C.M., 1946.
- Brock, Peter Pioneers of the Peaceable Kingdom, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

- Brock, Peter Pacifism in Europe to 1914, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Bukovsky, Vladimir The Peace Movement in the Soviet Union, The Coalition for Peace Through Security, 1982.
- Cadoux, C.J. The Early Christian Attitude to War, Headley Bros., 1919.
- Carver, Field Marshal Lord A Policy for Peace, Faber and Faber, 1982.
- Cessaretti, C.A. and Vitale, Joseph T. Rumours of War: a moral and theological perspective on the arms race, New York: The Seabury Press 1982.
- Clark, Stephen R.L. From Athens to Jerusalem: The Love of wisdom and the Love of God, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Collins, G.N.M. et al The Christian and the State in Revolutionary Times, Huntingdon, Cambs.: The Westminster Conference, 1975.
- Culliton, Joseph T. (Ed) Non-Violence - Central to Christian Spirituality: Perspectives from Scripture to the Present. Toronto Studies in Theology: Vol.8, Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.
- Curle, Adam The Basis of Quaker Work for Peace and Service, Quaker Peace and Service, February 1980.
- Curle, Adam True Justice, Quaker Home Service, 1981.
- Curle, Adam "The Fire in the Peat" The Friend, 18.2.83.
- Davis, Howard Ethics & Defence: Power & Responsibility in the Nuclear Age, Oxford: Blackwell 1986.
- DeGrasse, Robert, Murphy, Paul, Regan, William The Costs & Consequences of Reagan's Military Buildup, New York: Council on Economic Priorities, 1982



- Dillenberger, John (Ed.) Martin Luther, Selections from his writings,  
New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Dillistone, F.W. Charles Raven, Hodder & Stoughton, 1975.
- Division for Mission, Lutheran Church in America Proposed Social Statement  
of the Lutheran Church in America: 'Peace and Politics: God's Call to  
Temporal Peacemaking', New York: Department of Church & Society,  
1983.
- Documents of Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents,  
Leominster: Fowler Wright Books, 1981.
- Donaghy, John To Proclaim Peace: Religious Communities Speak Out on the  
Arms Race, F.O.R. Box 271 Nyack, N.Y. 10960 2nd edn. 1983.
- Dostoyevsky, F. The Brothers Karamazov, Penguin, 1977.
- Dunstan, G.R. The Artifice of Ethics, SCM, 1974.
- Eliot, T.S. Murder in the Cathedral, Faber and Faber, 1969.
- Ellul, Jacques Violence, Mowbray, 1978
- Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland "The Preservation and Promotion of  
Peace: A Memorandum of the Evangelical Church in Germany",  
Evangelische  
Kirche in Deutschland: Special Issue, 1981.
- Ferguson, John The Politics of Love: The New Testament and Non-Violent  
Revolution, Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1973.
- Finnis, John Fundamentals of Ethics, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Finnis, John "Morality and the Ministry of Defence", The Tablet, 3.8.85.

- Finnis, John et al., Nuclear Deterrence, Morality and Realism, Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Forrell, George W. History of Christian Ethics Vol.1 from the New Testament to Augustine, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979.
- Forrester, Duncan B. Theology and Politics, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Fox, Richard Wightman Reinhold Niebuhr: A Biography, New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Gallie, W.B. Philosophies of Peace and War, Cambridge University Press 1978
- Garrison, Jim The Darkness of God: Theology after Hiroshima. S.C.M., 1982.
- Garrison, Jim and Shivpuri, Pyare The Russian Threat, its Myths and Realities, Gateway Books, 1983.
- G.D.R. Bishops "Pastoral Letter for World Peace Day 1983", Berlin, 1983.
- Geyer, Alan The idea of Disarmament: Rethinking the Unthinkable, Elgie, Illinois: The Brethren Press, 1982.
- Gill, David (Ed) Gathered for Life: Official Report of the W.C.C., Vancouver 1983, Geneva: W.C.C., 1983.
- Gill, Robin Theology and Social Structure, Mowbrays 1977.
- Gill, Robin Prophecy & Praxis, Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1981.
- Gill, Robin The Cross Against the Bomb, Epworth Press, 1984.
- Gill, Robin A Textbook of Christian Ethics, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985.
- Gladwin, John (Ed) Dropping the Bomb: The Church and the Bomb Debate, Hodder & Stoughton, 1985.

- Glasgow University Media Group War & Peace News, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985.
- Goodwin, Geoffrey (Ed.) Ethics & Nuclear Deterrence, Croom Helm, 1982.
- Gorman, George Introducing Quakers, Quaker Home Service, 1978.
- Graham, John W. War from a Quaker Point of View, Headley Bros., 1915(?).
- Grannis, Christopher et al The Risk of the Cross: Christian Discipleship in a Nuclear Age, New York: The Seabury Press, 1981.
- Gustafson, James Protestant & Roman Catholic Ethics: Prospects for Rapprochement, S.C.M. 1978.
- Habgood, John Article in The Guardian 18.10.82.
- Habgood, John Church & Nation in a Secular Age, Darton Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Harford, Barbara & Hopkins, Sarah (Eds.) Greenham Common: Women at the Wire, The Women's Press, 1984.
- Harries, Richard "The Church and the Bomb: a reaction", Christian Vol.7 No.2 1983, pp. 22-29.
- Harries, Richard (Ed.) Reinhold Niebuhr & the issues of our time, Mowbray, 1986(a)
- Harries, Richard Christianity & War in a Nuclear Age, Mowbray, 1986(b)
- Harries, Richard, Letter, The Guardian 13.1.87
- Hastings, Adrian A History of English Christianity 1920-1985, Collins, 1986
- Hauerwas, Stanley The Peaceable Kingdom, SCM, 1984
- Hauerwas, Stanley Against the Nations: War and Survival in a Liberal Society, Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.

- Helgeland, John, Daly, Robert J., Patout Burns, J. Christians and the Military, SCM, 1987
- Higginson, Richard, The Contribution of Helmut Thielicke to Theological Ethics, University of Manchester, Ph.D. Thesis, 1982.
- Hinchliff, Peter Holiness & Politics, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1981.
- Hinchliff, Peter Letter, The Times, 6.3.84
- Holmes, Arthur F. War & Christian Ethics, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Horsley, Richard A., Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Houlden J.L. Connections: The Integration of Theology, SCM, 1986
- Hughes, Gerard W. God of Surprises, Darton Longman & Todd, 1985
- Humphrey, Nicholas Four Minutes to Midnight, The Menard Press, 1982.
- Ignatieff, Michael "Berlin, the peace movement and the 'German Question'", New Society 3.3.83 p333.
- International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Let's Build America, Washington D.C.: Kelly Press, 1984.
- Ishida, Takeshi "Beyond the traditional concepts of peace in different cultures", Journal of Peace Research, 1969, part 8 pp.133-145.
- Johnston, James Turner, The Quest for Peace: Three Moral traditions in Western culture, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Jones, Rufus M. Quakerism: A Religion of Life, Headley Bros., 1908.
- Jung, L. Shannon "Nuclear Eschatology", Theology Today, July 1983, pp.184-194.
- Jungk, Robert The Nuclear State, John Calder, 1979.

- Kaufman, Gordon Theology for a Nuclear Age, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- Kee, Alistair Constantine Versus Christ, SCM, 1982
- Kelly, Audrey Christians as Peacemakers, Q.P.S. 1983.
- Kelly, Kevin T. Conscience: Dictator or Guide? A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Protestant Moral Theology. Geoffrey Chapman, 1967.
- Kelly, Kevin T. Life and Love: Towards a Christian dialogue on bioethical questions, Collins, 1987.
- Kenny, Anthony The Logic of Deterrence, Firethorn Press, 1985.
- Knox, Ronald God and the Atom, Sheed & Ward, 1945.
- Kreider, Alan Journey towards Holiness, Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering 1986.
- Lampen, John Mending Hurts, Quaker Home Service, 1987.
- Langan, John "American Catholics and the Peace Debate," Washington Quarterly, 5 (Autumn 1982) pp.123-7.
- Lawler, Philip F. (Ed.) Justice & War in the Nuclear Age, Washington: University Press of America, 1983.
- Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament A Tax on Peace: Conscientious Objection and the Taxpayer, Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament, undated but probably 1983.
- Loades, Ann "The Church & the Bomb", King's College Theological Review, 8: 2, 1984, pp 39-61
- London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends Church Government, London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1968.

- Lunn, Pam Beginning Now - Part 2: Peacemaking in Practice, Dunamis 1984.
- Luther, Martin Luther's Works, Vol.46, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Lutheran Contributions to the Missio Dei, Geneva: Department of Church  
Co-operation of the Lutheran World Federation, 1984.
- McAdoo, H.R. The structure of Caroline Theology, Longmans Green & Co.,  
1949.
- McCormick, Richard A. How Brave a New World?, S.C.M. 1981
- MacIntyre, Alastair After Virtue: a study in moral theory, Duckworth, 1981
- MacKinnon, D.M. The Stripping of the Altars Fontana 1969.
- MacKinnon, D.M. Creon & Antigone: ethical problems of nuclear war,  
The Menard Press, 1982.
- MacKinnon, Donald Themes in Theology: The Three-fold Cord, Edinburgh:  
T & T Clark 1987.
- Macquarrie, John The Concept of Peace, S.C.M. 1973.
- Macquarrie, John & Childress, James (Eds.) A New Dictionary of Christian  
Ethics, S.C.M. 1986.
- Maquire, Daniel C. The Moral Revolution: A Christian Humanist Vision,  
San Francisco: Harper Row, 1986.
- Martin, David Pacifism: An Historical & Sociological Study, Routledge  
and Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Mendl, Wolf Prophets and Reconcilers: reflections on the Quaker Peace  
Testimony, Friends Home Service Committee, 1974.
- Merritt, Sandy (Ed.) Speaking our Peace (a series of booklets giving the  
experience of the Quaker Peace Action Caravan), Quaker Peace and  
service, 1987-8.

- Merton, Thomas On Peace, Mowbray, 1986.
- Mette, Norbette "Between the Security Society and the Peace Movement - On the Current Debate among Catholics in the Federal Republic of Germany", Concilium April 1983, pp 67-71.
- Moorehead, Caroline Troublesome People: Enemies of War 1916-1986, Hamish Hamilton, 1987.
- Mott, Michael The Seven Mountains of Thomas Merton, Sheldon Press, 1986.
- Mountbatten, Lord et al Apocalypse Now, Nottingham: Spokesman, 1980.
- Moyser, George (Ed) Church & Politics Today. The Role of the Church of England in Contemporary Politics, Edinburgh: t & T Clar, 1985.
- Murnion, P.J. (Ed.) Catholics & Nuclear War. A Commentary on 'The Challenge of Peace', the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter on War and Peace, Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.
- Musto, Ronald G. The Catholic Peace Tradition, Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986.
- Nickalls, John L. (Ed) The Journal of George Fox, Religious Society of Friends, 1975.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard "The Grace of Doing Nothing" Christian Century, 49, 29.3.82, pp.378-80.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold "Must we do Nothing?" Christian Century, 49, 30.3.32 pp 415-7.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold Moral Man & Immoral Society, New York: Scribners, 1932.
- Noel-Baker, Philip What Nuclear War Would Mean, Quaker Peace & Service 1980.
- Novak, Michael, Moral Clarity in a Nuclear Age, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983.

- Nuttall, Geoffrey Christian Pacifism in History, Berkeley: World Without War Council, 1971.
- O'Donovan, Oliver Begotten or Made? Oxford: Clarendon Press 1984.
- Ormrod, David and Race, Alan "Towards a Theology of Disarmament", Theology May 1985, pp. 189-199.
- Pannenberg, Wolfart Ethics, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press 1981.
- Paskins, Barrie & Dockrill, Michael The Ethics of War, Duckworth, 1979.
- Peace & Disarmament: Documents of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, Geneva: World Council of Church, 1982.
- Peace Tax Campaign A submission to the Council of Europe, Peace Tax campaign 1983.
- Peace Tax Campaign "Newsletter" No.50 August-September 1987, p.1
- Preston, Ronald Church & Society in the Late Twentieth Century: The Economic & Political Task, S.C.M., 1983.
- Preston, Ronald The Future of Christian Ethics, S.C.M. 1987
- Quaker Council for European Affairs Paying for Peace, Brussels: Quaker Council for European Affairs, 1985.
- Quaker Peace & Service Bridge Builders for Peace. Mothers for Peace Visits USA - USSR - UK, Quaker Peace & Service, 1983.
- Quaker Peace & Service "Poster List", Quaker Peace & Service, May 1985
- Raven, Charles Is War Obsolete?, Allen & Unwin, 1935.
- Raven, Charles "Is there a Christian Politics?" The Hibbert Journal Vol.XLIX 1950-51 pp. 348-354.
- Raven, Charles The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1952.



- Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain. "To Lima with Love" The response from the Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain to the W.C.C's document Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry, Quaker Home Service 1987.
- Reynolds, Reginald The Wisdom of John Woolman, Friends Home Service Committee, 1972.
- Ruston, Roger "Christian Pacifism" A paper given to the Association of Teachers of Moral Theology, May 20-22 1983.
- Ruston, Roger and West, Angela Preparing for Armageddon: some Theological Advice for President Reagan, Pax Christi, 1985.
- Ryle, Martin H. The Politics of Nuclear Disarmament, Pluto Press, 1981.
- Reid, Charles J. (Ed) Peace in a Nuclear Age: The Bishops' Pastoral Letter in Perspective, Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1986.
- Schall, James V. (Ed) Out of Justice, Peace. Joint Pastoral Letter of the West German Bishops, and Winning the Peace. Joint Pastoral Letter of the French Bishops, San Francisco: St. Ignatius Press, 1984.
- Schell, Jonathan The Fate of the Earth, Piccador, 1982.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward "Eager to Spread the Gospel of Peace", Concilium, April 1983, pp.72-81.
- Scott, Janet What Canst Thou Say? Towards a Quaker Theology, Quaker Home Service, 1980.

- Simojki, Marti, Archbishop of Turkey & Finland, & Vladimir, Archbishop of Dmitrov, Communique after the third theological conversations between the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and the Russian Orthodox Church, 23-28.5.74.
- Sims, Nicholas A. "Quaker Approaches to Disarmament - What have we learned?" The Friends Quarterly, July 1985.
- Stein, Walter (Ed) Nuclear Weapons & Christian Conscience, The Merlin Press 1961, reprinted & published 1981.
- Suggate, Alan. "William Temple on Pacifism", Modern Churchman, New Series Vol xxix No.1, 1986, pp. 7-14.
- Suggate, Alan M. William Temple and Christian Social Ethics Today, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.
- Sykes, Stephen George Moyser, Church & Politics Today, (a review), Crucible, April-June 1986, pp 67-72.
- Teichman, Jenny Pacifism and the Just War, Oxford: Blackwell 1986.
- The Council on Economic Priorities The Costs and Consequences of Reagan's Military Buildup. A Report to the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO and the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, New York: Council on Economic Priorities, 1982.
- The General Synod of the Church of England, The Church and the Bomb: The General Synod Debate, C.I.O., 1983.
- The Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues under the Chairmanship of Olof Palme Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament, Pan Books, 1982.

- The Report of a Working Party of the Board of Social Responsibility of General Synod of the Church of England, (Chaired by the Bishop of Oxford) Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age, Church House Publishing, 1988.
- The Report of a Working Party on Defence and Disarmament of the Department of International Affairs of the British Council of Churches and Conference of British Missionary Societies. The Search for Security: A Christian Appraisal, C.I.O., 1973.
- The Report of a Working Party under the Chairmanship of the Bishop of Salisbury, The Church and the Bomb: Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience, Hodder and Stoughton/C.I.O., 1982.
- The U.S. Bishops' Pastoral Letter on War and Peace in the Nuclear Age The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and our response, S.P.C.K./C.T.S., 1983.
- Thielicke, Helmut Theological Ethics, A & C Black, 1968 (Vol.1) and 1969 (Vol.2).
- Thompson, E.P. "Peace and the East", New Society 2.6.83.
- Thompson, E.P. and Smith, Dan (Eds.) Protest and Survive, Penguin, 1980.
- Trevelyan, G.M. English Social History, The Reprint Society Ltd., 1948.
- Trotltsch, Ernst. The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, George Allen and Unwin, 1931.
- Wallis, Jim Agenda for Biblical People, Triangle, 1986.
- Walsh, M. "God and the Atom", The Tablet 3.8.85, pp 798 and 9.
- Walters, Philip. "The Churches and the Peace Movements in Eastern Europe", Communist Affairs, Vol. 3 No.3. July 1984, pp349-53.

- Washburn, Patricia & Gribbon, Robert, Peacemaking without Division: Moving beyond congregational apathy and anger Washington D.C.: The Alban Institute, 1986.
- Waugh, Evelyn Ronald Knox, Fontana, 1962.
- Wengst, Klaus Pax Romana and the Peace of Christ, S.C.M., 1987
- Wicker, Brian Nuclear Deterrence: What Does the Church Teach?, Catholic Truth Society, 1985.
- Wilkinson, Alan. Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-45, SCM, 1986.
- Williams, Rowan The Wound of Knowledge, Darton Longman and Todd, 1979.
- Williams, Rowan The Truce of God, Fount Paperbacks, 1983.
- Williams, Rowan Letter, The Guardian, 10.1.87.
- Williams, Rowan and Collier, Mark. Beginning Now - Part 1. Peacemaking Theology, Dunamis, 1984.
- Wilson, Bryan Religious Sects, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.
- Wood, J. Duncan "The Background to Quaker Work at the U.N." Quaker, Peace & Service undated but after 1980.
- Wood, Thomas English Casuistical Divinity in the Seventeenth Century with Special Reference to Jeremy Taylor, S.P.C.K., 1952.
- Yoder, John H. Nevertheless: The varieties and shortcomings of Religious Pacifism, Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press 1971.
- Yoder, John H. The Politics of Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Yoder, John H. " 'What would you do if.....' An exercise in situation Ethics", Journal of Religious Ethics, 1974 Vol.2. Part2, pp.81-105.
- Young, Francis & Wilson, Kenneth. Focus on God, Epworth, 1986.

Yule, George "By Faith Alone", The Tablet 10.12.83.

Zahn, Gordon War, Conscience and Dissent, New York: Hawthorne, 1967.