



Durham E-Theses

Attitudes to war in the Church of England 1939 - 1983

Wilby, Timothy D.

How to cite:

Wilby, Timothy D. (1987) *Attitudes to war in the Church of England 1939 - 1983*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6655/>

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.

TIMOTHY D. WILBY

"ATTITUDES TO WAR IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 1939 - 1983"

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

MAY 1987

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM

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.



-7 JAN 1989

TIMOTHY D. WILBY

ABSTRACT

ATTITUDES TO WAR IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 1939-1983

A study of attitudes in the Church of England must be at once an historical survey of and commentary upon church life within the period stated. In its most formal aspect, this life is reflected in the proceedings of various representative bodies, where they have dealt with matters relating to war. The principal text is undoubtedly the statement of the 1930 Lambeth Conference which has been reaffirmed at each subsequent meeting: "War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ." The period of study is divided into three sections: wartime, up to 1964, and to 1983, and the work of the Canterbury and York Convocations and, later, the General Synod, is dealt with closely. Particularly significant is the Falklands Conflict of 1982.

Also important is theological reflection on the events. Here the influence of Reinhold Niebuhr is clearly detectable, especially in relation to the theological arguments surrounding pacifism. The Falklands Conflict provides an example of how the tradition of the Just War can be applied today. Committees rarely produce prophetic works. This is much more the area in which individual voices matter, and four outstanding examples are discussed: Temple, Bell, Raven and MacKinnon. Then the theology of the church is worked out in two ways. Firstly, in liturgy, the focus of church life, and in relation to war, this is Remembrance Liturgy, so a study is made of its development and content. Secondly, the theology of the church is seen in its practical ministry. Thus the work of Army Chaplains is investigated, with attention to the problems inherent in such a ministry. The existence of forces' chaplains is in itself a reminder of the Church's charge and commitment to preach the Gospel of Peace in the area of man's greatest sin.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 HISTORICAL CONTEXTS	4
I) 1939 - 1945	
II) 1946 - 1964	
III) 1965 - 1983	
CHAPTER 2 (i) THEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS	61
I) Niebuhr and "Social Christianity"	
II) The Theology of Pacifism	
III) Just War Theory and the Falklands Conflict	
(ii) INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS	
I) William Temple	
II) George Bell	
III) Charles Raven	
IV) Donald M. MacKinnon	
V) The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship	
CHAPTER 3 THEOLOGY IN LITURGY: REMEMBRANCE LITURGY	109
CHAPTER 4 THEOLOGY IN PRACTICE: ARMY CHAPLAINCY	142
CONCLUSIONS	165
APPENDICES	171
NOTES	182
BIBLIOGRAPHY	192

INTRODUCTION

"War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ."

(Lambeth Conference 1930)

There is no more terrifying prospect than that of the outbreak of a third worldwide conflict carrying, as it does, the possibility of an end to our world. The position of the Anglican Communion with regard to war is defined by the 1930 Statement quoted above. Yet wars (and rumours of war) continue and, more importantly, their prosecution can be broadly supported by the Church, as was the case during World War II.

If it is therefore accepted that 20th century civilisation cannot advance far enough to renounce war, it should be a responsible role of the Church constantly to remind the world that it is yet imperfect.

The present study is restricted to the Church of England, although mention must inevitably be made of other traditions. In chronological terms, the period of study falls into three sections. The Second World War and its immediate after effects are clearly a separate concern. The debate on war was in the forefront for the whole of this time. Although faced with many problems - particularly concerned with morale - the church raised some (though, sadly, few) voices of protest against aspects of the conduct of the war by Britain. Prayers for victory were said, but against the wishes of church leaders.

Following the war, it was perhaps the great relief of peace which caused the debate on war almost to disappear. Thoughts were turned towards reconciliation and forgiveness, although some early attempts were made to come to terms with the "Bomb". This



second period, from 1947 to 1964, saw a declining interest in war, and ends with the death of one of the Church's elder statesmen, Charles Raven. His pacifism was an outstanding contribution to any understanding of the theology of war even though pacifism seems likely only ever to be an individual, rather than a corporate, vocation in the church.

From 1965 to 1983, it is possible to detect a reverse in Church interest in war. Certainly the two Lambeth Conferences spoke clearly against weapons of mass destruction and the arms race in general. Also, the General Synod provided a new forum in which the concerns of the Church could be debated. The end of the period is particularly significant. Whilst the very length of World War II makes it well-nigh impossible to cover fully in a short study, the short-lived Falklands Conflict is investigated in detail, to discover a church speaking for itself, without particular concern for government pressure.

The chronological frame thus set out, attention must be paid to the prevailing theological trends. Quite outstanding is the thought and influence of the American theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, whose ideas are still relevant in present debates. Although a minority witness, pacifism too has an important contribution, if only because it seems, at first sight, to be "more Christian" than non-pacifism. Just War theory also has a long and noble history, and it is illuminating to apply its conditions to the Falklands Conflict in particular.

Within any period of church history, certain individuals stand out, and space is therefore given to four who have been of particular importance. As has been implied above, the pacifist voice is small, but important, and so a brief account of its expression in the Church of England is also given.

Since much of the belief of the Church comes through its practice, liturgical responses to warfare must be investigated - particularly with reference to Remembrance Sunday. Also, it is important to look at the role of the church within the Armed Forces, and the work of an Army Chaplain is discussed. It could be said that Army Chaplains are as much of a minority as pacifist priests, but their existence in one church shows that one view can and must be tolerated, and that no, single, approach to the problems posed by War is necessarily correct.

What is needed is the prophetic voice of the church. This has certainly been heard during the period under study. When events seem to overtake responsibility, as might arguably have been the case during World War II, such a voice might be reviled until the events have passed. Nevertheless, to hope for prophets in any age should not be a vain hope. For the most difficult task for any Church is surely to preach a gospel of integrity and truth, over against that of comfort and acquiescence.

CHAPTER 1

HISTORICAL CONTEXTS

I) 1939-1945

In setting the present subject into an historical context, there can be no doubt that the war period stands out. If the term "total war" implies the participation in hostilities of both military and civilian personnel, then the Church of England was certainly not exempt. However, the war did not bring an end to the day-to-day running of the Church, and the Convocations of Canterbury and York both met in regular session.

The whole context of pronouncements from groups and individuals is, of course, set by the 1930 Lambeth Statement: "War as a means of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." In fact, it would be true to say that the war was the major concern of churchmen during this time - inescapably.

Whilst Lambeth gives this period a context, the working out was most clearly seen in the proceedings of Convocation which discussed certain implications of war into 1946. If one individual can be said to emerge during this time, it is undoubtedly William Temple. So, it is surely right that a lead can be taken from the output of bishops of the Anglican communion. Although historically the statements of Lambeth Conferences have not been binding upon Anglicans, they should at least be taken seriously. Thus it is of great importance that the 1930 statement, quoted above, has been reaffirmed at every Conference since then, each time with a further demonstration of the growing attitude of the bishops against war.

This statement, produced from the 1930 meeting of 307 bishops and reaffirmed since, may be taken as official Anglican policy. As a product of Lambeth, it is very much in the English tradition of the "via media" and will stand a variety of interpretations, from the pacifist almost to the war-monger. This is because it is not strictly a condemnation of war: such a statement would read "War....is contrary to the teaching....of....Christ." Rather it simply points out the incompatibility between the two, that is, it is a gentle hint rather than a direct order from the bishops. Thus there was little official condemnation from the Church's leaders during World War II, although individuals were notable in their (unofficial) attitudes. So, this 1930 Lambeth Statement is, although important, by no means a specific condemnation of war. This is, by and large, the official and prevailing attitude in the Church of England.

Convocations of Canterbury and York 1939 - 1945

The wartime years produced a not surprisingly large amount of comment from the members of the two provincial Convocations in the Church of England. After this, the matters for debate were considerably wider and discussion of matters pertaining to warfare is quite sporadic, the last in both Convocations appearing, coincidentally, in 1962, although with different results.

Up to the outbreak of war in 1939, the mood of the Convocations may be judged to have been somewhat over-optimistic. At Canterbury, in January, Dr. Lang reported that the "imminent danger of war has passed," although "the crisis remains."¹ Even in May, the Archbishop said: "I cannot bring myself to believe that while all the peoples of the world earnestly long for peace, a thing so wrong, so hideous and so futile as a great war will be thrust

upon us."² His beliefs were unfounded, however, and he later issued a call for prayer, referred to in a motion from Bishop Bell of Chichester:

"That this House, conscious of the world's need for peace and believing that the only foundations on which a lasting peace can be built are moral and spiritual, trust that Christian people of all nations will respond to the recent calls for prayer and the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the attainment of justice and peace among nations issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury jointly with others and also by His Holiness the Pope."³

The initial calls for prayer were later adopted into ten points, which appeared in December 1940;⁴ Bell's motion was passed "nem.con."

At York, matters were a little more practical, the May sessions passing this motion:

"That this House believes that it is the duty of the clergy in time of war to devote themselves to their proper ministerial work, and urges that in every diocese arrangements should be made at once for ascertaining how many men can be spared to act as chaplains and for the best distribution of the rest for ministering to the population and for dealing with the spiritual needs of people removed from evacuated areas."⁵

Yet this was only carried after a successful amendment inserted after 'House', "while not believing that war is inevitable declares that...." There was also a "rider" moved by Fr. E. K. Talbot, of Mirfield:

"That, having regard to the best conditions for the fulfilment of their ministry in the event of war, this House is of the opinion that Chaplains to the Forces should not receive any military rank,

but should be given the simple status of chaplains as such and that the Upper House be asked to recommend this arrangement to the authorities concerned."⁶

After some discussion, it was decided that the rider "be not put", although the Prolocutor, Ven. F. G. Ackerley, commented: "I hope that Fr. Talbot will bring this matter up again at some other time."⁷ Talbot died in 1949, too early, perhaps, for the right time to put the question again.

In the sessions of 1940 the Presidents of both Convocations (Archbishops Lang and Temple) felt it right to comment on the duties of the Church in wartime; the realities were being faced. Lang, in January, spoke of two equal duties:

"One of (the Church's) first duties must be to endeavour to keep the national tone and temper high....equally it is the duty of the Church to guard against the danger that in denouncing the sins of other nations....we should forget our own need of penitence...."⁸

These sentiments were echoed in May by Archbishop Temple, who spoke of the three-fold duties of ministers in time of war. These were: "to sustain the spirit of the people in circumstances of anxiety, grief and fear"; "to call men afresh to God" and "to evoke the spirit in which the problems of peace must be met."⁹ It is clear that ministers were to be more than just morale boosters. They should also recall a true Christian spirit to enable men to evaluate fully their actions in wartime.

In Canterbury, Bishop Headlam of Gloucester was provoked by the Russian invasion of Finland into tabling this unanimously carried motion:

"The Bishops of the Province of Canterbury assembled in Convocation hereby express their deep sympathy for the people and Church of Finland suffering under the cruel aggression of Soviet Russia, and their admiration for the heroic defence of their country by the Finnish Army. They earnestly trust that the peoples represented in the League of Nations will render to Finland the material assistance which their resolutions demand; and they pray that the freedom and independence of Finland may be preserved."¹⁰

Also passed unanimously was the first part of a two-part motion from Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, in a debate on "The War with Germany."

"That this House urges Christians everywhere to work and pray for a just and durable peace, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God'."¹¹

In fact, statements like this, which generally upheld the desirability of peace, presented no problems. Difficulties arose when motions either petitioned or criticised the Government, as did the second part of Barnes' motion. This read:

"That His Grace the President be asked to petition the Government so to adjust the blockade as to allow the free importation of foodstuffs into Germany, in accordance with the precept 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him.'"¹²

This caused much discomfort during the ensuing debate, which heard the extraordinarily naive contribution of Bishop Underhill of Bath and Wells, who was clearly unable to distinguish between truth and propaganda: "German broadcasters had again and again of late given the assurance that Germany was in an excellent position so far as supplies of food were concerned...."¹³

Barnes eventually withdrew this part, if only to allow his first part, rather innocuous by itself, to pass. An interesting occurrence which shows the difficulty in which Convocation found itself concerns a motion tabled by Percy Hartill, Archdeacon of Stoke-on-Trent, in 1939, and carried over to 1940.¹⁴ It sought a ruling on the exact meaning of "just war" according to Article XXXVII, and might conceivably have passed before war was declared. The debate was adjourned however, "until after the close of war", which meant, as with Fr. Talbot's rider, that it was not likely to be raised again.

By May 1941, the war was well under way. Although the Battle of Britain had been won, Europe was still dominated by the Nazis. Temple, during his address at York, was determined to look beyond the boundaries of these islands by reminding Convocation that "we must never for a moment forget that our first responsibility is more than national."¹⁵ However, the needs of the nation were pressing hard: in Canterbury, Bishop Bell tabled a motion expressing sympathy with the victims of bombing in Britain, quoting figures of 34,284 dead and 46,119 injured.¹⁶ Like Temple, Archbishop Lang was concerned to look further afield, and his address of May 1941 contains a most significant passage on the whole question of obliteration bombing:

"But are there not signs of the danger that just indignation may lose its moral strength by degenerating into mere vindictive passion? One of these signs is the demand in certain quarters provoked by the indiscriminate bombing of our civil population, that we should inflict on the enemy's country the same ruthless treatment as that which he is inflicting upon ours, a claim for mere retaliation. It is very natural, very human. But it ought not to be allowed to prevail."¹⁷

Lang retired in January 1942 and when the policy of area bombing was in fact adopted in 1944, Bell was condemned for views similar to the above. "The Times" letter of 21st December 1940 referred to above was mentioned in a motion concerning post-war reconstruction, which was passed "nem. con." by the York Convocation.¹⁸ Business was slightly more full in Canterbury, however, with, in addition to Bell's motion, a somewhat curious one from a Canon H. A. King:

"That the proper steps be taken to secure for the Army Chaplains of the Church of England the same privileges as are given to Roman Catholic Chaplains."¹⁹

The difficulty as King saw it was the supposed anomaly of a Church of England chaplain at odds with a nonconformist superior:

"if a padre was not altogether acceptable to the authorities he might be reprimanded or called to account by men who could not understand perhaps the genius of the Church of England."²⁰

Most members, however, felt that the system was fair enough and did not wish to criticise the Army at that stage. (Indeed, the system prevails to this day). The motion was predictably and sensibly withdrawn.

The sessions of January 1942 were Temple's last at York. His Presidential Address was well received, although not a little confusion occurred around the motion put forward to thank him. Canon Baker moved:

"That this House thanks His Grace the President for his presidential address and calls upon all Christian people to maintain the spirit of love and goodwill, recognising that this must express itself through justice, with whatever sternness justice may require, but must never find expression in vengeance or the desire merely to satisfy the passions of resentment at the evil doing of others."²¹

There was doubt as to whether such a motion would be passed. If it were to be defeated, it was a matter for concern that the House must, by implication, not wish to thank Temple for his address and, in the end, the question was not put.

In his inaugural address at Canterbury in May, Temple spoke movingly of "the solemn moment at which I have been called to this responsibility, and that a "distinctive witness of the Church is needed with a supreme urgency (which) requires a balance very difficult to maintain." And,

"We have at one and the same time to do our utmost both in upholding the steadfastness and constancy of our people in carrying through the war to victory, and also to save our people from so yielding to the passions of war that the nation is disqualified from using victory to God's glory and that they themselves become separated from his purpose of love." ²²

The sentiments of this speech were echoed in a motion by the aforementioned Canon King. It is not amiss, however, to be reminded at this point of the 1930 Lambeth Statement; support was for a means of solving international disputes held to be against the teaching and example of Christ. King's motion was as follows:

"That this House, while strongly supporting the prosecution of the war with the utmost determination, no less strongly deprecates any inculcations, by civil or military authorities, of hatred and vindictiveness." ²³

It was passed "nem. con." the only voice of dissent (and the only abstention) being Archdeacon Hartill who as a pacifist could not "support the prosecution of the war." ²⁴

Both this motion and Temple's address illustrate the difficulties faced by the Church during the war. There was general agreement

that hostilities were unavoidable, and the Church's task was to call men to avoid "yielding to the passions of war." Further justification for the war came from Cyril Garbett, the new Archbishop of York, in his address in October, when he drew attention to Nazi crimes against humanity, including their treatment of the Jews, attempts to exterminate the Poles, and wholesale murders in Czechoslovakia.²⁵ In fact, there was no further debate upon the war until afterwards. Whether it was thought unnecessary, or indiscreet, is not recorded, but certainly Bishop Bell's moves in the House of Lords did not echo in Convocation, perhaps surprisingly. The position of the Church, then, is clear from 1942: that the war was unnecessary, support for it was desirable, but that the call to humanitarian behaviour must be heeded at all times.

So, the Archbishops continued to uphold this message in their addresses. In May 1943, Garbett referred to the reception of refugees from warstricken areas, calling the war "one of liberation from Nazi rule." And, although "we are all deeply thankful for the great victory in North Africa....still greater sacrifices will be required of us....(to) save millions from oppression and murder."²⁶ A year later it seemed that, at last, the end was in sight. Thus, Temple at Canterbury in May 1944:

"We meet at a time when our nation is entering upon what is, we hope, the last phase of the war....As we seek God's help to sustain us in the conflict against the aggression of evil, let us no less seek His help to sustain us in the yet more difficult enterprise of establishing justice and fostering goodwill."²⁷

By October, the Allied penetration of Europe was well under way and Garbett said that it was time for "the Christian to make

up his mind as to the attitude he is to adopt towards a defeated Germany." He suggested that there were three factors involved in such an attitude:

- (a) the punishment of those guilty of atrocities (Garbett referred to the 'murder factory' at Lublin)
- (b) the prevention of Germany's again plunging the world into war.
- (c) "positive reconstruction"

In conclusion, the Archbishop said that: "we must make it plain that while we cannot accept into fellowship an impenitent Germany, we pray for the day when a penitent Germany will have the right to ask the world to forgive the crimes she has committed."²⁸ This was tempered, unfortunately, with the weariness of a long and bitter struggle, and the suggestion that the whole German nation was guilty of Nazi crimes is surely misguided. The constant witness of the confessing Church, for example, shows that the concept of total war is not necessarily tenable.

This latter point was recognised after the victory in Europe by the Bishop of Southwell in a motion in the York sessions of May 1945:

"That this House records its respectful admiration of the heroism and fidelity of the Churches in Europe under the fiery trial of the war, and calls upon the Church of this Province to take its full share in providing means for the work of Christian reconstruction."²⁹

It was passed unanimously.

After the war, the Convocations felt it possible to be somewhat less cautious than before, and even to attack events of the time.

Also, the agents for peace could be assured that the House was behind them: the 1930 Lambeth Statement could be brought out of the cupboard. Bishop Bell, whose voice had been heard, if not heeded in the Lords, deplored the fact that it was "over a year since V.E. day and there were still no signs of settlement."³⁰ He tabled yet another motion which was to be carried unanimously:

"That this House, deeply moved by the peril of the times, by the sufferings of the belligerent countries and by the urgency of mankind's desire to be freed from the fear of war, assures the representatives of Great Britain and her Allies of the sympathy and hope with which it follows them in their difficult tasks, earnestly appeals to them to make peace in Europe without delay, and in every agreement and treaty they may make, to stand firm by the principles for which the United Nations have fought at such great cost - the principles of freedom, justice and the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."³¹

This motion was followed closely by another from the Bishop of Derby (Rawlinson), who reminded the House that not all of the Allies' work was to be commended. While Bell was reflecting the general mood of the House (and perhaps the country) as a whole, Rawlinson rightly drew attention to what he called a "psychological blunder of the first magnitude."³² This was "the decision of the Allied Control Authority in Germany to destroy or deface German War Memorials arising out of the 1914-18 war, as well as the war just ended." He, and the whole House, expressed "the hope that no such defacement or destruction of memorials to the fallen may be carried out in the British Zone in Germany." The sentiments

here expressed are most certainly of a type which would have been left well alone during wartime. The House, free from political and public pressure, seemed able again to echo the Lambeth words of 1930; support for war was not its true belief.

It was perhaps this renewed spirit of justice which led Canon Lindsay Dewar and Dom Gregory Dix to table a motion condemning specific Allied actions during the war:

"That this House condemns the use made of atomic energy to bomb the two Japanese cities Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and deplores the terrible precedent created by these actions."³³

Dewar offered three grounds for his motion, that:

- 1) "there was no reasonable doubt that victory was in sight when the bombs were dropped.
- 2) the suffering caused by the acts in question was of such a kind and on such a scale that nothing but the direst necessity to preserve itself from annihilation, could possibly justify a nation having to recourse to them.
- 3) no warning of any kind was given to the two doomed cities."³⁴

It should be noted that the first ground is, with hindsight, slightly irrelevant. Current estimates show that the alternative method of defeating Japan - being to attack the island of Kyushu with 815,548 men and Honshu with 1,171,646 men - would mean up to a million Allied deaths alone.³⁵ This was a large factor in the eventual decision to use the atomic bomb, albeit a horrifying alternative.

To return to the debate:

"He (Dewar) admitted it would have been far more effective if the House had been able to speak out a year ago and he believed that the House had lost ground by not doing so. It was certain that there were very many people who were looking to the Church in that hour to speak but the Church of England was silent. His contention was that if she remained silent any longer she would

forfeit even more the respect of the people of this country." ³⁶

It was not only the Church's silence that Dewar was concerned about. The American Christian Report Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith showed that such bold and courageous statements had been made elsewhere: "Without seeking to apportion blame among individuals we are compelled to judge our chosen course inexcusable." ³⁷

Continuing the debate, Bishop Mann pointed out that in 1937, the Archbishop of Canterbury had condemned bombing raids on the Chinese by the Japanese "in the name of humanity", and called for the House to do the same with regard to the atomic bomb.

As it was, the House missed a great opportunity to speak with authority and independence. After lengthy debate, and many rejected amendments, a proposal "that the House pass to the next business" was passed by 73 to 57, leaving undecided Dewar's seemingly straight-forward motion. ³⁸

It is clear from this account of proceedings in Convocation that the outstanding Christian leader of the time was William Temple. Although the Archbishop is discussed more fully below, this investigation of the church proceedings during the war would be incomplete without a brief inclusion of Temple's role. As Archbishop of York in 1939, his broadcast address set a true religious tone which won him widespread admiration. He believed that the war was just, saying:

"....The prevailing conviction is that Nazi tyranny and oppression are destroying the traditional excellencies of European civilisation and must be eliminated for the good of mankind." ³⁹

He never spoke in haste, and was admired even by the pacifist lobby. He and Lang (Archbishop of Canterbury) met a deputation

from the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in June 1940 from which came a joint statement notable for its support for the "individual vocation" of pacifists.⁴⁰ In 1942, Temple moved to Canterbury, continuing his work as the major Christian voice of the war years. His early death in 1944 deprived the Church of England of a great Primate to lead it from war into peace.

II) 1946-1964

In the immediate post-war period the main areas of concern worldwide were with reconstruction and the return to normality. However, the atmosphere in which global politics took place had been altered significantly at the end of the war with the use of nuclear weapons. Clearly the leaders of the churches had an excellent opportunity to respond to this new and awesome threat and it is therefore unfortunate that the Lambeth Conference in 1948 was reticent on this matter.

This Conference, presided over by Archbishop Fisher, took as its theme "The Christian Doctrine of Man."¹ Considering that recent years had seen the grossly inhuman death camps of Nazi Germany, obliteration bombing and the advent of nuclear weapons, the Conference had surprisingly little to say. Nevertheless there was a request to Governments to work on arms reduction, and a Committee produced the following statement:

"War on a global scale with modern weapons of destruction must be no more. It is both a blasphemy and an anachronism. We can have either war or civilisation - not both."²

This was a creditable reaction against the events of recent years. Whilst war, in general, is not specifically condemned here, the use of modern weapons is. The choice in 1948 was between war and civilisation - since 1945 man's ability to destroy the latter had been vividly apparent.

So, it seems that in 1948, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion were doing little more than getting back into their stride, after a prolonged gap in their meeting schedule.

Certainly Lambeth was more responsive than either of the Convocations. The failure of Canterbury to say anything really

constructive meant that one of the Church's most public offices was to remain silent, after its promising debate in 1946, until 1954. As Margaret Thrall has commented: "...the official contribution of the Church of England has been minimal or non-existent during the first two and a half decades of the nuclear era." ³

Thrall is actually concerned largely with the proceedings of the House of Lords, but her point is nevertheless worthy, that the bishops failed to respond to the fact that nuclear weapons are not simply very powerful conventional bombs, but are of a different type altogether.

In the meantime, the British Council of Churches was to produce excellent work, and it is most unfortunate that the speed with which it produced a report after the war was not matched by the Church of England.

The results of various commissions and working parties investigating (mostly) nuclear weapons should be regarded as semi-official documents. That is, although the sponsoring body approves the material, it is not necessarily to be taken as its agreed opinion. Thus, since the war, both the British Council of Churches (B.C.C.) and the Church of England have approved reports on subjects such as modern war and the British nuclear deterrent. Perhaps the most important point about these reports is that they have been produced at all, since this shows a certain degree of concern about the subject.

The B.C.C. reports reflect the opinions of British Churches as a whole, and therefore require examination; members of the commissions have usually included Anglicans. To its great credit, the B.C.C. produced a report on The Era of Atomic Power nine months after the first use of atomic weapons in wartime. The commission included Bishop Bell, Canon C. E. Hudson of St. Albans

and Donald MacKinnon, and met first in January 1946, reporting the following May. The result was an assessment of what the advent of the "Atomic Era" meant to Society as a whole, and called on Christians to update their worship and attitudes so as to be able to take a moral lead.⁴ In spite of its relatively quick production, there is no feeling of haste about the report, which produced arguments still valid today about the nature of defence in the light of nuclear weapons. In doing so, it referred to an American Report Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith⁵ which appeared in March 1946 and which anticipates the idea of deterrence.

As has been said, the Church of England was rather slow to follow up the success of the B.C.C. and any chance of taking a "moral lead" was all but lost. However, the one outstanding achievement was the work of a Commission which finally reported in 1948. Indeed, this Church of England report (The Church and the Atom) is a little more adventurous in its conclusions. It was the report of a Church Assembly Commission chaired by the Dean of Winchester, E. G. Selwyn, and contains some notable remarks. On the subject of obliteration bombing:

"....the Commission is agreed that the 'obliteration' bombing of whole cities with high-capacity and incendiary bombs, the success of which is measured by the number of acres devastated, must be condemned. It is inconsistent with the limited end of a just war; it violates the principles of discrimination....and it is not necessary for the security of the attacking aircraft. In fact, it constitutes an act of wholesale destruction that cannot be justified."⁶

Here is the sort of specific condemnation which is not found in the contemporary B.C.C. reports. However, although the B.C.C. in

1946 had advanced the idea of deterrence over the actual use of nuclear weapons, The Church and the Atom commission concluded that:

"On the assumption that today the possession of atomic weapons is genuinely necessary for national self-preservation, a government, which is responsible for the safety of the community committed to its charge, is entitled to manufacture them and hold them in readiness. The Commission believes, moreover, that in certain circumstances defensive necessity might justify their use against an unscrupulous aggressor."⁷

During this period of international reconstruction, the Bishops in the Lords were concerned to stress the importance of agreement regarding the new weapons. It was sincerely felt that there was little chance of any agreement with Soviet Russia. So possession of nuclear weapons was "necessary as a deterrent against any nation who proposed to use....the bombs" as Garbett said in the House in February 1948. Two years later, Garbett modified his position slightly and raised the idea of desirability of a "no-first-use" declaration by the Western Alliance,⁸ which is at least in contrast to the suggestions of the 1948 report (see above).

Britain entered the nuclear "club" on 23rd October 1952 with the testing of her first atomic device. Incredibly this brought no reaction from church leaders, and it was the question of the hydrogen bomb to which Convocations addressed themselves in 1954. Bishop Wilson of Birmingham brought the matter to the attention of Canterbury Convocation by tabling the following motion in the first session of 1954:

"That this Convocation:

- i) regards the existence of the H Bomb as a grievous enlargement of the evil inherent in all war and as a threat to the basic obligations of humanity and civilisation;
- ii) recognises that statesmen, in the discharge of their responsibilities and in the existing conflict of international interests and beliefs, cannot separate consideration of the H Bomb from that of other weapons of war or from the total state of international relations;
- iii) calls upon all statesmen urgently to seek agreement on such limitations, reductions and control of armaments as may remove immediate threats of war and encourage the return of mutual confidence.
- iv) declares to the nations that they can only be delivered from the evils of war by a general submission to the laws of God as revealed in Jesus Christ;
- v) calls upon all Christian people in their prayers, thinking and spoken words to seek justice, righteousness and peace for the healing of the nations."⁹

This is quite clearly a significant motion, including condemnation of modern weaponry with a call to Christ. It also illustrates how the mood of the Houses changed in the years after the war. Freed from the political constraints it was possible now to make adverse comment upon the actions of government and to be the representative of the people. The Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Mortimer, said during the course of the debate in the Upper House that "he considered it would be deeply immoral and unchristian if this country were ever to use the H-Bomb offensively or even as a retaliation after an attack."¹⁰ This comment is most striking in

that it takes even further Lindsay Dewar's comment that "only to preserve itself from annihilation could possibly justify a nation having recourse to them." These are, however, only personal remarks made during the debate, and Dr. Mortimer's sentiments were not to be echoed in the Lambeth Statements of 1958 mentioned above. The motion itself was carried.

At York, in the May 1954 sessions, Archbishop Garbett himself expressed fears about the safety of deterrence as a means of preserving peace. Prompted by the H-Bomb question, he said in the Presidential Address:

"Nor have I great confidence in the hope, expressed by many, that the new weapons are so horrible that no nation will dare to use them, with the certainty that instant retaliation will follow....A serious and sustained attempt should be made to remove the causes of war, and to reach agreement for an all-round reduction in armaments."¹¹

Garbett, however, was apparently unable to see any alternative to the possession of nuclear weapons. His uneasiness with deterrence was repeated in the Lords in December 1954: I am afraid I have little faith in those who say, 'These weapons are so terrible that they are themselves a deterrent to war, and it is most unlikely they will ever be used...' A nation in danger of defeat which possessed these bombs would, I think, almost inevitably use them."¹²

But yet, when the subject came up at the 1958 Lambeth Conference, these sentiments were not expressed. Rather it was left to Archbishop Fisher to be heartily relieved at the failure of a resolution condemning nuclear weapons, proposed by Bishop Greer of Manchester. "Archbishop Fisher....said that if it had

been passed he didn't know what he should have said to the Prime Minister."¹³ Local national politics played a perhaps surprisingly large role in an international episcopal conference, as is seen in some parts of the report of the Committee on "The Reconciling of Conflicts Between and Within Nations." The failure of the Bishop of Manchester's proposal must be seen in conjunction with this report, which confirmed and supported (for the time being) the policy of nuclear deterrence still in force today:

"Some of the committee are convinced that in the present uncertain situation, and until international agreement is reached, individual nations are justified in retaining (sc. thermonuclear) weapons as a lesser evil than surrendering them and increasing the possibility of an unscrupulous attack."¹⁴

So, although war is a "blasphemy and an anachronism" (1948), the retention of weapons of war was taken to be a quite different matter. In terms of deterrence, the retention of such weapons contributes to peace, rather than war, and it is this view which was adhered to in 1958.

The "for-the-time-being" of the Report was made clear by the call for governments "to work for the control and abolition of all weapons of indiscriminate destructive power, atomic, biological and chemical, as a condition of human survival."¹⁵

Thus the bishops offered their support to the civilised (if somewhat - in their view - undesirable) policies of the secular powers, and the final resolution was as follows:

"The Conference calls Christians to subject to intense prayer and study their attitudes to the issues involved in modern warfare."¹⁶

In retrospect, this policy may be deemed to have been quite sensible. In spite of the growing public debate, and the Aldermaston marches during Holy Week of that year, it was perhaps fair to call Christians to think more deeply about the questions, whilst recalling as well their political duties. "Prayerful acceptance" might well sum up the bishops' attitude in 1958 to the secular authorities, who were themselves left to "work for control."

Meanwhile, the B.C.C. continued to produce reports, keeping alive the debate amongst the Church community. An important outcome was the desire, expressed in a B.C.C. statement, to welcome "the use of atomic energy to the end that it will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind." (This itself was quoting the United Nations General Assembly). Here there is a contrast with the attitude of many anti-nuclear groups who start simply with weapons and later include power stations in their list of undesirables.

¹⁷
Christians and Atomic War was again intended to stimulate Christians to update their thinking on "the disarmament problem and defence policy in the nuclear age."¹⁸ Part of this updating stressed the importance of accurate technical and political information, the lack of which often made Christian arguments weak or irrelevant. To this end the second chapter was a detailed summary of the "Current Defence and Disarmament Situation" and an appendix contained technical information about nuclear weapons. Its general thesis was that it is the prime concern of Christians to prevent the outbreak of atomic war by a constant informed witness to the governments. Two years later, in 1961, a further report was prepared (The Valley of Decision. The Christian Dilemma in the Nuclear Age)¹⁹ which presented arguments for and against deterrence in the light of a survey of the Bible and Church history.

It is a feature of all these reports, and The British Nuclear Deterrent²⁰ of 1963 that no firm statement is made either for or against nuclear weapons. The position of pacifist or anti-nuclear commission members is noted, but only as an individual response. The B.C.C. reports are perhaps more accurately termed "discussion documents", which presented the current debates accurately and concisely to offer the individual the technical apparatus by which he could make up his own mind. They are of a different nature, therefore, from the more outspoken, though fewer, reports and statements from the Church of England.

However, the silence in the Church of England is, by contrast with the B.C.C., very marked. Indeed, after the 1954 Convocation debates, the subject was not raised again until 1962.

In January of that year, Rev. W. F. Ewbank (Carlisle) felt that the time was right for the House at York to recall the basic and definitive Lambeth Statement of 1930. In fact that recollection was left out of the final, successful, motion by a narrow amendment (43 to 42) the remaining version being:

"That this Convocation urge the members of the Church in face of the dangerous and difficult problems of the present time, to respond to the call of the Lambeth Conference of 1958 'that Christians should subject to intense prayer and study their attitudes to the issues involved in modern warfare.'"²¹

It is a pity that debate of quality should have resulted in a motion of such little effect. Ewbank brought up, possibly for the first time, that traditional just war theory was not able to cope with the problems raised because of modern weapons. He believed that:

"We must acknowledge that the traditional doctrine of the 'just' war is no longer applicable as it stands. We may affirm that it still holds good, very largely, for small wars, for police action, for border struggles and the like; but that in the face of modern major scientific warfare, it has lost most of its meaning."²²

Mention of the 1930 Lambeth Statement was dropped in case the Press should take it as a direct comment on the situation in the Congo at that time.

Contrastingly, the Canterbury Convocation felt that there was no particular event influencing their debates in 1962. Canon Douglas Rhymes, in introducing a motion on Nuclear Weapons to the Lower House, said: "Momentarily the tension on Berlin had ceased and....at the moment no one was in fact testing bombs." Nevertheless "it seemed to him vitally important that the Church should declare itself on this issue."²³ This desire seems quite fair; to this end the following was proposed:

"That this House, alarmed by the dangers to humanity involved in the continuance of nuclear testing, and the recurrent threats of nuclear war, is of the opinion that:

(a) there should be no resumption of nuclear testing by any of the nuclear powers;

(b) negotiations for the reduction and ultimate abandonment of nuclear weapons should be urgently sought under a system of international inspection.

(c) there can be no conceivable circumstances which could ever justify nuclear war and every government should start from this basis in seeking to reach agreed solutions to present and future international problems."²⁴

As in 1954, disapproval of the deterrence policy was voiced, albeit by the proposer, a pacifist. However, the motion is not worded in overtly pacifist terms, nor does it seem particularly unilateralist. It was, though, on these grounds that it was attacked. One speaker (Rev. Dr. S. R. Day) pointed out that it would have no effect whatever on the Russian Government, who "would have a really good and hearty laugh."²⁵ To have thought otherwise would be clearly optimistic, of course, but surely what mattered was for the Church to "declare itself". The debate became quite tedious, the conclusion being that the motion was adjourned 'sine die' because no agreement could be reached as to what best expressed the opinions of the House.

The work of both Convocations throughout the wartime period and after was, as might be expected, rather cautious. Often the quality of the Presidential Addresses was not echoed on the floor of the House, and many opportunities were lost - as in 1962. If there were only one significant speech in the whole time, it would undoubtedly be that of Archbishop Lang in May 1941. Here was an early and outright condemnation of the (then only proposed) allied policy of obliteration bombing. His hauntingly prophetic words seem to have been quickly forgotten, except by Bishop Bell, whose stand in the House of Lords is far more widely known.

After the war, there was nothing which seemed to spur the Convocations to spare much time to consideration of war. Although crises occurred - in Korea, Cuba and Vietnam, for example - nothing was said. The bold resolution in Canterbury in 1954 lost its force with time and by 1962, it was clear no-one remembered Dr. Mortimer's words which are echoed in (c) of Canon Rhymes' ill-fated motion. Had the latter succeeded, there would have been a detectable

shift in the beliefs of the Canterbury Convocation, but this was not to be. Perhaps the advent of Synodical government in the Church of England could introduce opportunities for more and informed debates upon this topic.

The choice of date for the end of this section is governed not by events, but by one person. In 1964 Charles Raven died, and the Church lost one of its most clear-sighted and consistent theologians. His theology, and its contribution, is discussed fully below. During this period he published The Theological Basis of Pacifism (1952) and remained a pacifist until his death. His biographer wrote: "In Flanders he came very near to death, but he escaped and for almost half a century he, who hated war but was ever a fighter, never spared himself in the struggle for truth and justice and peace."²⁶

III) 1965-1983

The two most significant contributions to the subject in this period both occur towards the end. The first was the Falklands Conflict in 1982 during which much was expected of - and much given by - the Church of England. The second was the historical debate in the General Synod on The Church and the Bomb.

Before these two important topics, however, are the continuing debates at Lambeth Conferences, and the inauguration in 1970 of the General Synod itself. Towards the end of the 10th Lambeth Conference in 1968, war became most apparent in the events of the day. As the bishops reached war and peace on the agenda Soviet troops invaded Czechoslovakia, and this event seems to have spurred the bishops on to produce a series of statements much more far reaching and worthwhile than those of 1958.

"The killing of man by his brother man is agonisingly incompatible with the ethic of Our Lord Jesus Christ" and "Nothing less than the abolition of war itself should be the goal of the nations, their leaders and all citizens."¹

These were not merely calls for a fresh look at the question, but clear directives as to the behaviour required of all men. Not only this, the worldwide arms trade was discredited in the report's review of events since the 1958 Conference.

While progress has been made in limiting the nuclear arms race, especially in the partial test-ban treaty and the non-proliferation treaty, a real threat to humanity has arisen in the repeated outbreaks of non-nuclear wars using highly sophisticated conventional weapons. They cause terrible suffering to civilian

populations, aggravate the refugee problem, and bring the danger of escalation. It is an international scandal that such wars are being encouraged by proxy through the competitive delivery of arms." ²

Resolution 8, in reaffirming the 1930 Statement, went further, in condemning the use of nuclear and bacteriological weapons, and upheld the rights of conscientious objectors. The Bishop of Manchester's failure in 1958 turned into success; the Bishops of 1968 were worried about the future of mankind, rather than "what might be said to the Prime Minister":

"This conference states emphatically that it condemns the use of nuclear and bacteriological weapons....holds that it is the concern of the Church to oppose persistently the claim that total war or the use of weapons however ruthless or indiscriminate can be justified by results....urges upon Christians the duty....to work towards the abolition of the competitive supply of armaments." ³

Resolution 5 of the 1978 Lambeth Conference represents perhaps the greatest step forward in any definition of an Anglican attitude to war. The bold words of 1968 became even bolder:

"we further declare that the use of the modern technology of war is the most striking example of corporate sin and the prostitution of God's gifts." ⁴

It is all the more remarkable considering that there was no specific provision for a discussion of war on the Conference's agenda. The Resolution was a direct result of pressure from the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship which, although a minority voice within the Church of England, seems to have been able to touch on a vital nerve at that time.

The result is that the Lambeth Conferences since 1930 have provided members of the Church of England with much food for thought with regard to war. There is even, in part 3 of the 1978 Resolution, a suggestion for action as well as thought.⁵ Of course, the problem is that of the authority of these statements: they can only ever be suggestions or guidelines, and public opinion can ignore them easily enough. Yet, as a guide to the "official" feeling of the Church, they are invaluable and reliable documents. The sense of compromise discernible in 1958 is certainly not a feature of the two more recent statements. In these, the Conference speaks out in the name of Christ and his Church, and over against national politics.

In 1970, a new voice was heard in public debates, with the first sessions of the General Synod, although it was well established before matters of war appeared in debates.

It is quite clear, however, that the inclusion of lay people in the "Church's parliament" has extended the scope - and even quality of the debates. Perhaps this has included an improved sensitivity to the wishes of ordinary Church members. For example, it was thought in 1978 that the "man in the pew" was of the opinion "that the churches are tarred with the brush of financing terrorism."⁶ The reason for this was the recent grant made by the World Council of Churches (W.C.C.) to the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front. The Bishop of Bath and Wells tabled a motion noting that the grant had caused some controversy, and urging the W.C.C. to investigate more fully the theological and political aspects of its Programme to Combat Racism. Although only somewhat indirectly connected with a particular attitude to war, this motion (which was carried) shows at least that the General Synod was more worried about its public appearance

than either of the Convocations. To have acknowledged secular criticism and, further, to resolve to look into the matter shows also that the Synod did see itself as being able to comment on particular incidents which might affect the Church's standing.⁷

A measure of this admirable attitude was soon seen in 1979 when a new Board of Social Responsibility Report Christians in a Violent World⁸ was discussed. The report was accepted in spite of its lack of theological content. Mr. M. Chandler said of it:

"The Working Party was not satisfied with the world's efforts to cope with the arms race. I think our distinctive contribution to the debate is the recognition that you will not get disarmament on a significant scale until you have removed legitimate fears which exist between nations."⁹

Interestingly this echoes some words of Canon Rhymes' who had, in 1962, pointed out that "fear was a very bad basis on which to build international relations";¹⁰ at least in 1979, Synod was aware that this might be fair to say and did not accuse the report of being simply pacifist or unilateralist. Not only that, a motion put by Canon Paul Oestreicher, as much of a pacifist as Canon Rhymes, was carried successfully:

"That this Synod, grateful that the Church's role in preserving and promoting peace has been opened up by this Report, urges the Board for Social Responsibility to explore how the theological debate relating to discipleship in this field might be more effectively and purposefully conducted throughout the Church of England in the light of witness and insights of the whole ecumenical movement."¹¹

Although this motion is in itself somewhat wordy, and even meaningless to "the man in the pew", the debate was carried on even further.

A motion was tabled which related directly to the Lambeth Conference

of the previous year: the first instance of any debate in this area taking into account what had been said by the Anglican bishops. (Indeed, as has been seen, the 1930 statement was completely forgotten by Convocation in 1942) The motion, put by the Rev. P. W. H. Eastman, was as follows:

"That this Synod, having taken note of the references to the Arms Trade in the report G.S.414, urgently requests that strong representation (particularly by the Board for Social Responsibility) be made to H. M. Government to:

- 1) Provide public information about arms sales so that in a free society proper judgment can be made regarding their morality.
- 2) Ensure that arms are not sold to regimes where there are proven abuses against human rights, especially torture;
- 3) Investigate and create means whereby those employed in arms manufacture may constructively use their resources.

I move this motion formally, recalling the Lambeth Conference's call to Christian people everywhere to protest in every way possible at the escalation of the sale of armaments of war. I ask the Synod to do just that."¹²

Although H. M. Government does not yet seem to have taken up these suggestions, the whole 1979 debate on Disarmament was a great step forward for the Church. Eastman's motion was eventually carried over to the 1980 sessions and passed 197 to 23.¹³ Point three is particularly worthy of note. The majority of peace movements, whether political or religious, offer no alternative economic programme if arms production were to cease tomorrow. For many armaments workers, there is no particular moral choice in their occupation, but simply a choice between work and unemployment.

So, such an alternative economic package should be part of the task of working for peace through disarmament, and it could be an area in which the Church could direct some of its work.

Also in the 1980 session, a motion was carried noting the growing danger of Soviet Imperialism.¹⁴ This was followed in 1981 by a lively debate on a motion calling upon the Government to appoint a Minister of Disarmament.¹⁵ During this, mention was made of a Board of Social Responsibility working party whose report - which was published as The Church and the Bomb - was awaited with anticipation. Some words of Dr. Sakharov were recalled: "I consider averting thermonuclear warfare has absolute priority over all other problems."¹⁶

It would seem that an opportunity was missed by the Synod in 1982. Between the February and July sessions was the Falklands Conflict, and in July Dss. J. Hunt regretted that there was no chance to discuss it.¹⁷ Canon Oestreicher replied that it would be "wiser to wait" - the issues were still blurred by the freshness of the events - and apparently Standing Committee had given a few people some time to prepare something.¹⁸ This has never come to light, but much was said in public by notable churchmen, which is dealt with below.

The February 1983 session of General Synod dealt at length, and in detail, with the report, published the previous November, The Church and the Bomb. The amount of public reaction this debate aroused was quite considerable, and it brought to the public's attention the real quality of work which the Church of England can produce. Both before and after the debate on February 10th 1983, the newspapers were full of material, about speakers, the Report itself, and so on.

The Times published an article by Paul Johnson on January 29th, entitled "Christians Awake." His conclusion that "the present strategy of nuclear deterrence is the only moral choice open to us" was not totally convincing, however. To say that "Christ himself endorsed deterrence and warned against one-sided disarmament" in a reference to St. Luke merely led to a correspondent the following week to adduce the opposite argument from the same text. Similarly his "the Soviet system has a structural propensity to evil" was balanced by a timely reminder of the doctrine of original sin. The Bishop of Oxford noted the real background to the press coverage of the days before the debate:

"Sir, it is really refreshing to see how the Bishop of Salisbury and his modest working party seem to have put the wind up some of the Government's supporters."¹⁹

Other articles looked at the personalities involved, and what different bishops might say.²⁰ Professor Michael Howard offered an important insight into the economics of the debate with a reminder that the original adoption of deterrence in 1953 was "for one very simple reason: it was cheap. It gave us, in the parlance of the time, "a bigger bang for the buck." The high standard of living in the West is directly relating to this "cheap" defence option and Howard considered that its replacement by conventional defence could have "a noticeable impact on other sectors of the economy."²¹

"Those who have come to believe in God should see that they engage in honourable occupations which are....also useful to their fellow men." Titus 3 v.8 (N.E.B.)

Even the customary scriptural quotation in The Times personal column for 10th February 1983 suggested that tremendous interest

awaited the Synod's debate. It was to be broadcast live by BBC 2 - a step not yet taken by the House of Commons - and it was the main news item of the day.

The debate itself could reasonably be called the most well-ordered and balanced view to date of the subject of nuclear weapons and morality of deterrence. As is well known, the report actually argues a powerful case for unilateralism on strategic and moral grounds. Its opponents - both in Synod and outside - have generally found its conclusions rather idealistic in a less than ideal world. The initial motion was, in fact, neutral on this central issue, allowing for amendments either way. Thus the Bishop of Salisbury, Chairman of the working party, proposed that Britain should disarm unilaterally. This was defeated 338 to 100.²² On the other side, the Bishop of Birmingham proposed the "defensive" possession of nuclear weapons: "Since they could be made in the back yard, it seemed to him that the planet would need the nuclear deterrent to the end of time to guard against future blackmail." This amendment was carried by 275 to 222, and the whole motion, including this, was carried by 387 to 49. The Archbishop of Canterbury in the course of the debate, seemed to anticipate many of its conclusions. He was worried about the effect of unilateralism upon already fragile disarmament talks, and quoted some remarks of the Pope the previous year, agreeing that, whilst deterrence is not acceptable as an end in itself, it is "as a step on the way towards a progressive disarmament." In supporting the final form of this motion, Dr. Runcie said clearly: "I cannot accept unilateralism as the best expression of a Christian's prime moral duty to be a peacemaker."

The final form of the motion was as follows:

"That this Synod recognising

- a) the urgency of the task of making and preserving peace;
- b) the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present situation and
- c) that it is not the task of the Church to determine defence strategy but rather to give a moral lead to the nation;
 - 1) affirms that it is the duty of H. M. Government and her allies to maintain adequate forces to guard against nuclear blackmail and to deter nuclear and non-nuclear aggressors;
 - 2) 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;
 - 3) 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;
 - 4) 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;
 - 5) bearing in mind that many in Europe live in fear of nuclear catastrophe and that nuclear parity is not essential to deterrence, calls on H. M. 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."

An area relating to the whole debate was that of mass indiscriminate killing in war, and this led to a brief debate and the carrying of the following motion:

"That this Synod believes that indiscriminate mass destruction in war cannot be justified in the light of Christian teaching and calls upon the dioceses to study and pray about the issues raised in the report "The Church and the Bomb" and in particular the theological and moral issues so as to enable people to make a more informed and committed contribution to the making and preserving of peace and to the search for ways of resolving conflicts other than by war."

This of course echoes the 1930 Lambeth Statement, but the excesses of war should always be remembered; mass killing with conventional weapons is as abhorrent as with nuclear weapons. Initially Dresden and Hiroshima are equally horrific. What makes nuclear warfare unthinkable are the after effects of fall-out and the danger to unborn life. Thus, Sir William van Straubenzee M.P. spoke of his experiences as a 22 year old soldier "when a bomb of stupendous size which they could not fully comprehend was dropped and killed 340,000 people. But there was a background of thousands of others being killed by conventional weapons." At the time he was glad it brought the war to a halt. One of the conclusions he reached then he still believed right today: "that we could never have dared to drop that bomb on them if they had had a bomb like that to drop on us."

So the outcome of the debate was somewhat less than radical. It certainly demonstrated the skill and concern with which the Church of England can debate its (and others') affairs. On the whole, however, it was not a theological debate turning rather on practical and political issues. In fact the only theological contribution came from Archbishop Blanch, who reminded the Synod

that "we are discussing the end of the world - or how to delay it." He opened up the debate from the moral and political to the spiritual and theological, pointing the issues towards "how to enable mankind to live with the fear, not just the threat." It may be that it is in this direction that the task of the Church now lies, although this is perhaps more a prophetic than a synodical task.

No official report, before or since, has aroused as much comment as did The Church and the Bomb in 1982. It came quite soon after another controversial Church of England production, "The Falklands Service", which is discussed in detail below, and confirmed in many eyes that the Church was not necessarily any longer idly to be summed up as "the Tory party at prayer." The Church and the Bomb is a substantial report, certainly the largest of any to do with "nuclear weapons and Christian conscience."²³ It is a full treatment of the subject, including the latest available information about weaponry and strategy, and then the theological thinking behind the guidelines suggested. As has been seen, its conclusions centred around unilateral action from Britain as a means of breaking "the log-jam in which we seem to be caught."²⁴ This is viewed with regard to the long-term aim of balanced forces, "eventually, of course, balancing at nil."²⁵ The General Synod debate rejected the unilateral course, and the hope of a "nil balance" is perhaps somewhat idealistic because of the possibility of "future blackmail" as Bishop Montefiore said.

In fact the recommendations to the Government are in a section apart from the main, numbered, conclusions. These are in five categories: Disarmament, United Kingdom Policies, Social, International and The Churches.²⁶ Here the stress is on the need for greater availability of information and the "educational task."²⁷

The argument is opened up into the field of increased aid programmes to the Third World:

"The whole military endeavour, with its huge worldwide industrial base, absorbs an immense fund of human energy. If peace is to flourish, this energy will have to be diverted into new channels. The obvious candidate for this is the world economic problem and the gap between North and South. Other fields are those of conservation of resources and the rehabilitation of the environment where greed and folly have dangerously destroyed it. The health and wealth of the human race demand all the effort and ingenuity we possess. What we need are the institutional means to switch these from war to peace."²⁸ Finally, in the "Conclusion" there are reminders of the basic themes running through the report. The first is a "moral challenge new in human history" which is that "the cause of right cannot be upheld by fighting a nuclear war"²⁹ and it would seem that this is the most important point made. The "three general points" with which the report ends are also worthy of note.³⁰ Firstly, that the task of nuclear disarmament is only one stage in the task of "eradicating war altogether from the world's agenda". (The words used echo the 1930 Lambeth Statement). Secondly, the working party are thoroughly conscious of the sacrifices of those who have given their lives in past wars. Thirdly, and this is a reminder of the theological background to the report:

"the need to keep firmly before us our duty to the whole human family whom God took as his own children by coming among us and sharing our life in Jesus."³¹

The Church and the Bomb was a major achievement. It should

not be dismissed because one part of its recommendations was rejected in Synod. It remains one of the most careful and accurate summaries of all the issues involved, and is wholly based on that theological point just quoted.

The shift in treatment of the subject between 1946 and 1982 is clear. The major point is that in The Church and the Atom the belief was that certain circumstances might allow the use of nuclear weapons, whereas this is certainly not the case in The Church and the Bomb. The period covered by these reports is that covering the development of nuclear deterrent forces on both sides, plus a greater knowledge of the terrible long term effects of nuclear weapons. Certainly in the Church of England attitudes have changed with the greater availability of information, enabling church people to take a greater and more informed part in the whole debate; these reports are of great importance.

To conclude this section setting out the historical contexts of the subject matter, it is useful to look closely at the events of the Falklands Conflict. Because it was a small scale affair, it can be investigated in some detail; a perfect illustration of how the Church of England can operate independently of the state in wartime.

Reactions to the Falklands Islands Conflict

An ideal opportunity to study attitudes to war in the Church of England occurred when events unfolded which led to the formation of a large naval fleet later to be instrumental in the re-establishment of British rule eight thousand miles away. Overnight, Argentina in "liberating" the "Islas Malvinas", had assured the Falkland Islands of a place in the contemporary history of the British people, many of whom thought that the islands were probably somewhere

off the remoter parts of Scotland. The atmosphere which surrounded the events, perhaps created to a certain extent by the press, resembled Britain in "her finest hour", according to some who could remember those times. All in all, only a relatively short time later, the second quarter of 1982 seems somehow unreal. Even the reports of pilgrimages of the bereaved to the graves in the Falklands seem to refer to events which surely did not, and certainly should never, have happened.

Over against a picture of "wartime" Britain, it is useful to investigate the events and concerns of one interested party - the Church of England. It could scarcely be expected that the Church could remain aloof from the events of the conflict. Yet, there was church business to be dealt with: the visit of a unique church leader - which itself was threatened by the remote happenings in the South Atlantic. The conflict affected national life, and a national church must inevitably be bound up in this. Cities such as Coventry and Sheffield saw packed Memorial Services after ships bearing their names were lost, and the lives of men with them. The morality of going to fight at all was rightly discussed and called into question. After all, if a national church exists, it must never be simply a spiritual tool of the Government, as George Bell pointed out in 1939. If outrage was caused by the Church's reaction to the conflict then it is a sign that the Church was, in a sense, putting the right questions: hinting at the truth when it was not expected. (This applies particularly to the service in St. Paul's on 26th July 1982).

Representatives of the Church took as full a part in the conflict as any one. The Church continues rightly to allow clergy to become chaplains to the Forces; some of these men sailed to

the Falklands with the task force, and were on hand during some of the most fierce fighting. The ministry of Christ is essential in the areas of man's greatest sin. A great part of the Church's reaction may therefore be assumed by the existence of the forces' chaplains: Christ must be represented, not to condone but to comfort, and to challenge. There was, of course, no question of the Church's actually praying for victory. To agree to the necessity of force in the last resort is one thing, but to ask God to take sides is quite another. If some members of the Government expected the latter approach to be taken by the national Church they were, thankfully, disappointed.

The greatest expression of the Church's view of the conflict was the "Falklands Islands Service." Some were disappointed by its contents, most were satisfied. It is interesting to go through the service (and the Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon) and note those features which give a guide to how the Church actually made sense of the events, and how it saw its role in helping people to come to terms with them. For the most part, this service was the last, as well as the major, public response of the Church to the conflict. (See below, page 130)

There are, however, a few comments which appeared later to which reference should be made. Unlike popular literature, which has produced a rash of "authoritative accounts" of the events, the Church has made no lengthy comments, even if it had been expected to. On the other hand it would be extremely surprising if individuals in the Church felt there was nothing to say after the dead were buried.

Events which so dominated the news reports in 1982 may easily be forgotten. This being the case, a brief summary of the happenings in the South Atlantic is necessary, as a basis for any discussion of the Church's reaction.

No one, if the Franks Report is right, expected the invasion of the Falklands Islands. For many years, British strategic thinking has centred around the "Continental commitment" and the role as a member of NATO. Similarly, the South Atlantic has received much less than priority in Foreign Affairs. As G. R. Dunstan puts it:

"Their minds were focussed, and their sights were set, on the great lions of the US and the USSR, on the tigers of the Levant and the oil-rush Gulf, some growling defiance, some locked in combat; and a little mouse slipped through and snapped up some crumbs of colonial cheese - the Falkland Islands."³²

The conflict arose originally through diplomatic intransigence on both sides. Formal negotiations on the future of the Islands had been going on since the mid-sixties and in February 1982, the Argentines began to threaten that force might be resorted to if no progress was made. The British Government took the line that no further talks could be held "in the present atmosphere of threats":³³ no one really took seriously the possibility of an invasion.

Diplomatic events took a sharp turn, however, with the landing of Argentine scrap metal merchants at Leith on South Georgia, a Falklands dependency, on 19th March 1982. Technically these men were illegal immigrants, their legal contracts having expired; accordingly diplomatic machinery was set in motion to process them through the proper channels. Significantly, the Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, was busy at the time with Middle East peace talks. The crisis developed, with Argentina refusing to

help seriously to avert it. By 26th March, intense naval activity by the Argentines - ostensibly for exercises - was noted by intelligence sources, but overlooked in London.³⁴ On 1st April it was apparent that invasion of the Islands was imminent. As The Times editorial said:

"The South Georgia incident seems to have developed into a Falklands Islands crisis".³⁵

It pointed out that the Government could not afford to back down. The next day it was reported that the United Nations had met to discuss the invasion threat, and had appealed to Argentina and Britain to pursue a diplomatic solution. This was too late - 2nd April was also the date of the Argentine invasion of the Falkland Islands. It was suddenly clear that action had been taken, and a Britain obsessed with European nuclear strategy was faced with an immediate non-nuclear problem which, although thousands of miles away, was on her doorstep.

The House of Commons, as is well documented, had its first weekend sitting since the Suez crisis of 1956 - an unfortunate parallel. The newspapers and news broadcasts carried reports of the invasion, and the general tone was that the Argentine act was "naked aggression." Britain had to be prepared to "reply to force with force."³⁶ The United Nations passed a resolution, number 502, which called for an end to hostilities, the withdrawal of Argentine troops and settlement by peaceful means. This was to be Mrs. Thatcher's justification for using force and also useful was Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which gives the right of self-defence to nations whose interests are threatened.

Events moved quickly from then on. On Monday 5th April, Lord Carrington resigned, to be replaced by Francis Pym; the first ships of the hastily assembled Task Force sailed from Portsmouth. This gave approximately three weeks for any attempts

at peace through diplomatic means to succeed. All efforts at a non-violent resolution of the crisis - the Haig mission and the United Nations intervention - came to nothing. On 25th April the first military action after the initial invasion occurred: the recapture of South Georgia, which had been the origin of the dispute in the first place. There was one Argentinian wounded, but no deaths on either side, a tame beginning to a small-scale war. The signal from the Task Force read "Be pleased to inform Her Majesty that the White Ensign flies alongside the Union Flag at Grytvyken, South Georgia. God save the Queen." ³⁷

At the beginning of May the first significant losses were sustained. The bombardment of Port Stanley's airfield was begun. Two ships, the Argentine "General Belgrano" and the British "HMS Sheffield" were lost. By 20th May the UN peace talks had finally broken down and the day after British troops established a bridge-head at Port San Carlos. So, by the end of May, more lives and ships had been lost, but two settlements, Darwin and Goose Green, had been taken and their inhabitants, who had been imprisoned, freed.

By the beginning of June, the British had taken Mount Kent and were within eight miles of Port Stanley. There was a serious setback to morale on 8th June when fifty lives were tragically lost at Bluff Cove during an attack on the assault ships "Sir Galahad" and "Sir Tristram". A week later, however, on 15th June, ten weeks after the Task Force had sailed, the first British forces entered Port Stanley. The conflict was over, but the overall problem of sovereignty remains unsolved.

Some of the events deserve greater attention to detail. For both countries support from world opinion was important, and

from the beginning Britain, with the UN resolution on her side, had been treated favourably. When the news broke that the "General Belgrano" had been sunk, with 301 lives lost, opinion turned against the British. Here was a real act of war - the first of the entire conflict. What is more, the Argentine cruiser was outside the 200-mile "Total Exclusion Zone" around the islands which had been declared effective from 12th April. It seemed the British forces had used unfair superiority, and had attacked outside its declared hostile limits. The destruction of "HMS Sheffield" to some extent redressed the balance by showing that British ships were also vulnerable. Twenty men were killed in the "Exocet" missile attack on Tuesday 4th May; five days later a memorial service was held in Sheffield Cathedral. The biggest British disaster was at Bluff Cove, about fifteen miles to the south-west of Port Stanley. Fifty men, mainly Welsh Guardsmen, were killed on board the attacked ships which were unloading men and supplies ready for the final move to Stanley. In war, it is expected that lives will be lost. Even so, the numbers were distressing and made people at home realise just how hostile "hostilities" could be.

This is a very brief summary of an equally brief conflict. It was only ten weeks from the sailing of the task force to the entry into Port Stanley. In those ten weeks the papers were full of the conflict - The Times of April 5th had more than four complete pages of news about the Falklands and a leading article headed "We are all Falklanders now." The Sun even relegated its "Page Three Girl" to further into the paper, a sure indication of truly momentous news. The voice of the Church on the matter could be heard and was reported, and although the climax was to be the "Falklands Service" on 26th July, much was said to indicate

a Christian view of the conflict which is worthy of mention.

For a time during the conflict it seemed that there was nothing of importance happening except in the South Atlantic. Only a week after the Task Force was assembled, it was Easter Sunday: the majority of Britain spent Holy Week in preparation for war with Argentina. So, Easter (April 11th) was the first major opportunity for Church leaders to speak out on the coming conflict, although at this stage diplomatic channels were still open. Both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope were reported to have mentioned the conflict in their Easter sermons. They were concerned with the continuation of efforts for peace, and a similar phrase was used by each, that there should be sought "peace with justice and respect for international law."³⁸

It is significant that the Pope was shown to be interested in the conflict, because of his effect upon the whole Christian body in Britain at that time. He was due to pay a pastoral visit from 28th May to 2nd June, and there was widespread concern for the "effect" of the crisis on the Pope's visit. As Clifford Longley of The Times pointed out: "There is very much a religious dimension to the Falklands Islands crisis."³⁹ This debate was to continue until almost the last moment, before the final decision to go ahead with the visit was made.

Perhaps the most definitive public statement was made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords' debate, on Wednesday 14th April. He reported receiving a message from the Chaplain in the Falklands which said that the Islanders wanted to maintain links with this country. The Churches saw two important principles which were at stake - the importance of upholding international law (which seemed to support the British through the

UN), and the right of peoples to determine their own form of government. Most clearly, the Archbishop summed up the position thus:

"This country would have been in breach of its moral duty if it had failed to react in the way it has."⁴⁰ The debate was held only just in time for the Archbishop to speak out: the next day he left for a 14 day visit to Nigeria. He left behind, however, a broadcast message to the Islanders which went out on 18th April:

"You can be assured that the prayers not only of Anglicans, but of Christian people throughout the whole world, are with you at this time of stress and uncertainty."⁴¹

On the same day there was a special service in St. Paul's Cathedral, of prayers and intercessions for the beleaguered Falkland Islanders. Local church life in this first month of the conflict saw two appeals launched, for Carlisle and Chelmsford Cathedrals, and controversy provoked by a Eucharist celebrated by a woman priest from New Zealand. Cardinal Hume gave his opinion that war would rule out a Papal visit, but the Pope himself had made no official statement as yet. A Times editorial, "The War Within", gave a brief account of just war theory, and suggested what the Church ought to be saying, "that war and the Christian conscience have never been wholly reconciled."⁴² By the end of the month, the Lambeth Statements had been remembered, and were being quoted (rightly) as official Anglican policy but were (wrongly) interpreted as pacifist statements. Pacifism is, of course, an ancient and dignified Christian tradition, but it is not the only accepted view of warfare in the Church. As the then Bishop of Durham, John Habgood, said: "All honour to those who risk their lives in the cause of peace whether by fighting or by abstaining from fighting. But we must be careful not to glorify the fighting

itself or see it as anything other than evidence of human failure."⁴³

Hostilities were well under way by the beginning of May, and Dr. Runcie, back from Nigeria, spoke more about the conflict. On 2nd May - the day that the "General Belgrano" was sunk - he said: "I believe that within the complexities of an imperfect world, self defence, and the use of armed force in defence of clear principles can sometimes be justified....Action must never be inspired by feelings of revenge or recrimination."⁴⁴ This contrasts with the words of Dr. John Robinson, Assistant Bishop of Southwark, who attacked Christian leaders for not standing against the use of force: "One more example in which Christians have nothing to say. I think we shall look back with shame on this business."⁴⁵ An important point in the religious debate was raised by Clifford Longley, in a discussion of the "last resort", that is, in terms of when force begins to be used. This is directly applicable to just war theory: "the identification of the "last resort" is a political and military, not a moral or theological judgment. Churchmen are authoratitive on principles, not on policies."⁴⁶ Such principles were expounded later, when Dr. Runcie urged the moral duty of counting the cost at every stage of the conflict ("HMS Sheffield" had also been lost by this time).⁴⁷

On 9th May the memorial service for "HMS Sheffield" was held in Sheffield Cathedral. The same day, the Dean of Canterbury preached a sermon entitled "A Christian response to the Falkland Islands Crisis." The text was 2 Corinthians 4,13 - "'I believed and therefore I spoke out' and we too, in the same spirit of faith, believe and therefore speak out." Immediately after the invasion he had felt "outrage tinged with satisfaction at being again at one, in our confused world, over a clear issue....and pride that

we could redress the balance by sending brave men and fine ships." However, these initial responses were only a part of what a Christian must feel - responses which come before we "pause long enough to hear what is being spoken to us....Moral issues are dangerous because we find it easy and comforting to label other people with the unpleasant bits in ourselves." The Dean went on to criticise the nation's feeling of moral purity in the circumstances, when "because it suits our pockets we as a nation support the dictators of Argentina." The real cause of the conflict lay in economic greed and the desire to sell arms. "What is hypocritical is to elevate moral positions taken up in particular cases if we have neglected, and been silent about, the more fundamental matters of the law - justice and mercy." The gospel is a reminder that Christ offers the only true way to peace: "In that spirit of faith we believe and speak out."

The Pope came to Britain on 28th May - the day British forces took Darwin and Goose Green. A few days before, the United Reformed Church Assembly approved covenanting-for-unity proposals. For a short while the churches had news to interest them other than the Falklands, and by 15th June the cease-fire had been called. The Archbishop of Canterbury called for prayers of thanksgiving to be said in all churches on the next Sunday, the 20th; there was a thanksgiving service in Port Stanley Cathedral on the same day. So the conflict ended almost as swiftly as it had begun. The Church had useful comments to make, although its most public pronouncement, the "Falklands Service", was still to come.

Hostilities in the Falklands Islands ceased on Monday, 14th June 1982, with the surrender of the Argentine forces. The Falkland Islands Service was held six weeks later, on 26th July. With the end of events, however, came only the beginning of written

comment. Unavoidably several hastily-compiled "authoritative accounts" appeared: similar newsworthy events in the past - the "Yorkshire Ripper" saga, for example - have always produced such a crop. Unfortunately, some publishers could not even wait for the end of the conflict - Coronet's contribution to the genre, by a "top investigative team", only goes as far as 4th June, even before the Bluff Cove disaster, and can hardly live up to its claim of being a "full authoritative account"⁴⁸. The BBC contributed, with the book of the events and the series of the book....At least the whole conflict was covered.⁴⁹ More recently, the half-expected "part-work" published by Marshall has become available.

Comment has not, fortunately, been restricted to the market of the quick-selling paperback. There have also been books about the problems faced by journalists during the conflict, and about the actions of an individual MP (Tam Dalyell) both in and out of Parliament. The Church of England has not had anything particular to say as a body, through the General Synod. However, some material concerning the Falklands has appeared since the events, and this must be investigated.

Perhaps one problem with the conflict was that everything happened so quickly, and after the Falklands Service the Church seemed to have had its say. The Church's major publication of 1982, which has caused a great deal of comment, was of course The Church and the Bomb. The time spent on its production reflects the attitudes of the nation as a whole, with its growing awareness of the problems raised by nuclear-weapons strategy. Thus, whilst the wider issues of world problems were being discussed, the events in the South Atlantic happened too quickly for any weighty Synod-working party pronouncements to be made. As has been seen, the report includes a useful discussion of just war theory. Yet its

implication is that, today, wars are unlikely to be fought without recourse to a nuclear exchange (this being the main concern of the report). It would be useful for the Synod to produce some work, in response to the Falklands conflict, which deals with the Church's attitude to non-nuclear armed conflicts, otherwise Article XXXVII is almost the only guide. If, as has been seen, the just war theory is slightly less than adequate in its application today, then it is vital for any church to be thinking seriously about the issues involved. Especially important for Britain is the realisation that NATO is not the only area which requires military participation.

The Board for Social Responsibility, which convened the working party which produced the Report, publishes a quarterly journal Crucible. To its great credit, Crucible made an early comment on the Falklands conflict, as soon as possible after the events. The editorial "Words in Wartime" concentrated largely upon the words of the Pope at Coventry, saying that war is "totally unacceptable as a means of settling differences between nations."⁵⁰ It was actually written before the conflict ended, although at a stage when "the outcome of the military struggle appears to be little in doubt, with the expulsion of the Argentine invading forces only a matter of time." The "responsible view" of the conflict is identified by the editor as being "that the particular armed conflict in which we are now engaged is a matter of sad necessity, not sought by us but properly to be carried through to its conclusion." This is a worthy point, but it rather begs the question of the Government's attitude to the Islands. It is true to say that the conflict was not sought - no responsible government could surely actively desire war. However, it is also

fair to say that the British Government probably made the invasion inevitable by its policy, which implied that the Islands were not a serious priority. The article is also right to point out that the disagreement among Christians over the conflict, was not to be "deplored". In identifying the "fundamental cleavage between those who see the avoiding of war as having the same priority as the restoration of British rule, and those who do not", the author brings in two notes of caution. First, the appeals to just war theory were largely attempts "to validate the use of force" rather than to impose restraints on its use (which is the true purpose of the theory). Second, and this is a crucial comment: "Those Christians who have taken their stand on the 'mind of Christ' have pointed to the difficulties involved in subjecting war to moral constraints; they have however not always acknowledged the difficulties and inconsistencies involved in treating the word and example of Christ as a moral law." For such perceptive and useful remarks to be made during the conflict is a creditable achievement.

The April-June 1983 issue of Crucible again deals with the conflict in a series of reflections, "After One Year"⁵¹. As is pointed out, "the Falklands have mostly disappeared from the headlines, (and) the churches have lapsed into silence." The former point is not quite true as the news reports kept alive "Falklands news" particularly with regard to the pilgrimage of relatives of the British dead. If the Church has really lapsed into silence, it may fairly be asked if this is surprising. As has already been mentioned, the conflict was a very short-lived affair and it is hard to think that much more could really be said about it. What is needed is a working-out of the church's

response to modern armed conflict in general, which is asking for more than is provided by the Lambeth Statements. Willmer reminds his readers of the usual Old Testament texts (swords into ploughshares, etc.) but then dismisses them: "a universal living together in this style is a dream at least as unrealistic as total disarmament." Those (of his students) who disagreed with British policy and even the concept of self-determination, he reminds of their privileged position in the world. Such an attitude is, he says, "on a par with our saying as rich people that the poor have nothing to complain about since materialism is dangerous and the blessings of wealth a delusion." It is always easy to decide that a minority should have no opportunity to decide its future, and in the Falklanders' case, he condemns the simple economic view that the expenditure of £500,000 per islander was unnecessarily excessive. The most practical point in the article is also the most obvious. It would have been a laudable Christian response not to have sent a task force (although also a breach of moral duty), thereby showing up the Argentine aggression "for what it was." "Such a policy would no doubt have meant that the Falklands would today still be under Argentine rule." The author ends with some questions, in spite of the arguments he has put forward in favour of the British reaction. It is still up to the Church to question the response, particularly in the face of that strongest of Christian traditions, "turning the other cheek."

Only one other major journal dealt seriously with the conflict in the months immediately following: the "Modern Churchman". A point made above is interestingly underlined in Anthony Dyson's editorial (in Vol. XXV No. 2). It begins with the announcement of a series of articles on the themes of "nuclear energy and nuclear

war, disarmament, peace and the just war." The conflict has pointed out that the concern today cannot be limited to the horrors of global, nuclear, conflicts, when a war can still be "waged and won in a flash." It was not total war, but a small armed operation, the sort of thing for which armed forces exist in the first place. Dyson isolates three events during which, in 1982, the Church was not content to "identify with the prevailing secular wisdom." The first was the Pope's visit - a reminder not just to Roman Catholics that war ought to be a thing of the past. Second and third were the Falklands Service and The Church and the Bomb although the former echoed the prevailing secular wisdom far more than some reports gave it credit for. The editorial seems to suggest that the conflict will have some effect on the future contents of the journal. This is certainly to be hoped for, for the events are important enough to be at least a reminder that the world can dictate the Church's concerns to more than a small extent.

Much less satisfactory has been the contribution of Christian to the debate about the conflict. The issue for the end of 1982⁵² has fallen into the very trap which the Modern Churchman seems set to avoid, namely a concern only with the nuclear debate. This is not to say that the conflict is not mentioned at all. It is, but in a most unsatisfactory and unthinking way - through "poetry". The three "Task Force Poems" are by a Quaker writer and deal less with the conflict itself than with the pacifist view of war in general.⁵³ What is particularly unfortunate about their inclusion is that there is no other, more reasoned, treatment of the subject elsewhere in the issue. To take up a point of Willmer's in the aforementioned Crucible article, the poems

seem to deal with ideals rather than realities, which it is simply not possible to do with every single world event. Ideals provide a guide to life, not a commentary upon it.

Two sermons which refer in passing to the Falklands conflict are worthy of mention. The first is the Remembrance Sunday address, given by Alan Wilkinson in 1982, which again underlines the speed with which the crisis developed:

"Last Remembrance Day no one thought that a few months later soldiers would be burying British and Argentine dead beneath crosses 8,000 miles away. I believe we were right to resist Argentinian aggression. But we should not forget that the war was the result of a series of political mistakes. Nor must we evade the irony, so characteristic of war, that much of the way of life we sought to defend has been effectively destroyed by the conflict."⁵⁴

The two latter points are extremely important in trying to think in any serious terms about the conflict; there are long term problems resulting from avoidable political errors. The second sermon is the Archbishop of Canterbury's "Chatham House Address", given in January 1983, which was entitled "Just and Unjust Wars". The invitation to speak had been given "well over a year ago, before I was recognised as one of the most dangerous wets at large." Inevitably the Falklands conflict is mentioned:

"It is too soon to extract all the lessons from the Falklands conflict, but in the light of the just war tradition I still think it was right to send a Task Force after the Argentinian invasion, because it was necessary that aggression should not be permitted to short circuit the progress of negotiation....The principle of proportionality demands that we measure the immediate damage inflicted and the cost incurred against the good intended by taking

up arms, but today we must also, in an inter-dependent world, reflect on the wider consequences for the international community." As has been seen, a strict application of just war theory does not necessarily lead to a favourable conclusion for either side in the conflict. However, the fundamental cause may be considered just (at least on the British side) even if the actual conduct of the fighting leaves some doubt under the principle of proportionality.

Similar points are made by G. R. Dunstan in the article already referred to. He calls the Government's Falklands policy ill-conducted: they "did not keep up the means to defend that which they would not concede; they gave no credible impression of a naval or military resolve, so by default inviting an aggressor to invade." In looking to "wider consequences" as the Archbishop suggests, Dunstan puts into perspective the real long-term problem caused by the principle of self-determination: the disproportionate political and military cost of maintaining the 1800 Islanders - "not financial cost only, but cost also in terms of international relations as between Britain, Western Europe, Latin America and North America." His remarks come in a book devoted to the nuclear question, again stressing the fact that much recent Christian thought has neglected to consider the important moral question of armed conflict in general.

This review of the Church of England's commentary has made clear a certain approach to the long-term problems which have arisen. The fact that there is even a small amount of continued debate is commendable. If it is too early to make any very useful predictions about the future, two points are worthy of mention. The conflict, which should never have happened, was the result

of successive Governmental errors: it was right to send the Task Force to resist aggression. That the debate must continue goes without saying; that it should widen into a more general view of the Church's response to war is desirable. For the conflict to have produced no worthwhile comment from the Church would have been very disturbing. What is vital to remember, however, is that the conflict did happen and does raise questions. Questions which the Church cannot afford to ignore.

These three sections, then, have set out a brief historical context in which the Church may be seen to have been active, to a greater or lesser extent. Certain outstanding figures have been noted, but only in passing, and they are dealt with in greater detail below. So also, the theology of what has been set in context must be set against a theological background of the major influences upon the course of debates about war.

CHAPTER 2 (i)THEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

In the previous section, it may be seen that the Church responds largely to events. That is, the historical context is governed by happenings more so than by individuals. In the theological world this is rather less so, although a movement such as pacifism is an exception. The reaction in the Church of England in recent years can be divided into three general moods, corresponding to the historical periods discussed above.

The wartime period obviously made the question of war itself a major concern, as the debates in Convocation show. The second section is a contrast. In spite of the need to come to terms theologically with "the bomb" there was a declining interest in war as a topic for discussion. The most recent period saw a continuation of the uneasy peace with little interest in matters of war until the establishing of the General Synod. This new public voice in the Church of England coincided with a desire for greater public involvement and concern for matters of defence and morality. The Church was seen to speak out on important matters, including the Falklands Conflict.

If the theological mood, at least in the early period, can be said to have been set by an individual, then that person was Reinhold Niebuhr. As an American Evangelical, he is outside the bounds of this study. However, as a theologian whose influence is enormous (particularly upon Temple), mention must be made of his contribution to the theological debate on war and the Church. By contrast, the growth of pacifism is much more the sweep of a movement. It is most important as a theological context, of

course, and is discussed below, as is the idea of Just War Theory. This latter idea is applied to the particular situation of the Falklands Conflict.

Lastly, a survey of the public statements of the Church is made, with particular regard to their theological content, leading up to The Church and the Bomb report and debate at the end of the period.

I) Niebuhr and "Social Christianity"

As a young man, Niebuhr believed in the inherent goodness of man and the inevitability of human progress. So, it was as a liberal optimist that he began a pastorate in Detroit in 1915. His thirteen years there caused him to reject his former thinking, seeking rather to restate the traditional doctrine of original sin, as it was manifested in social and historical situations. He became convinced that human relations were based on power, rather than ethics:

"Relations between groups must therefore always be predominantly political rather than ethical - that is they will be determined by the proportion of power which each group possesses at least as much as by any rational and moral appraisal of the comparative needs and claims of each group."¹

Applying these ideas to the war in Europe he constantly stressed that war could only be a product of sin - based as it was on a power struggle. This is not to say that Niebuhr had no concept of Christian hope. Rather, he held hope and realism in tension as the following well known statement shows:

"Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."²

He was perhaps most influential during the war in his opposition to pacifism. His was the criticism of a former pacifist and consequently carried the sharp attack of a convert to the opposite cause. In Christianity and Power Politics he devoted a chapter to an attack on pacifism, based on his conviction of the centrality of original sin. He seems to have seen pacifism as a sort of latter-day Pelagianism. If we are the crucifiers of Christ, as well as his disciples, then there is a need for justification and forgiveness, but Christian pacifism stressed too much the goodness of man and exaggerated the power of non-violence against a tyrannical oppressor.

"If we believe that if Britain had been fortunate enough to have produced thirty per cent instead of two per cent of conscientious objectors to military service, Hitler's heart would have been softened and he would not have dared to attack Poland, we hold a faith which no historic reality justifies."³

He saw the pacifist error as being the belief that man can truly attain such a state of love that it can leave sin behind and thus become an effective weapon against the sinful world. This idea is echoed in the New Testament (e.g. 1 John 5,18), but Niebuhr felt that the main thrust of the gospel is "primarily the assurance of divine mercy for a persistent sinfulness which man never overcomes completely." As Wilkinson comments: "The New Testament does not view history as a gradual ascent to the kingdom, as do modern pacifists, but rather as moving to climax of judgment."⁴ He also felt that pacifists might be more effective if they had not been so easily self-righteous and convinced of the certainty of their claims. These temptations might indeed be balanced with Paul's reminder that "All have sinned and fall

short of the glory of God." (Romans 3,23) Thus his world-view was quite different from that of the liberal optimist and pacifist. In putting the idea of original sin at the centre of his theology, he was also putting more emphasis on the need for grace, than was evident in his opponents' views. Original sin led to a world constantly engaged in a power struggle and "an uneasy balance of power would seem to be the highest goal to which society could aspire."⁵

The potential of Niebuhr's thought was quickly realised, and his influence on wartime English theology was consequently profound. In the 1930's the popularity of Christian pacifism had grown sharply, and Niebuhr's critique of the movement was a basis from which non-pacifists were able to work. Also, his views were equally critical of a warring nation which tries to claim righteousness for itself, giving the right balance in his theology. This sort of balance was attractive to many, such as Alec Vidler, then Warden of St. Deniol's library, who found no solution to the opposing positions of pacifism and non-pacifism. He took from Niebuhr the notion of the relationship between the kingdom of God and historical existence, concluding:it is not within our power to synthetize in any final form the dual obligations to which we are subject as citizens of the kingdom of God (the order of grace) and as citizens of this world (the order of nature); the fact that we are under the impulsion to seek for such a synthesis is evidence that there is one, but it is, so to say, super-historical or trans-historical."⁶

Perhaps the greatest English disciple of Niebuhr was D. R. Davies, who had trained for the Congregational ministry during the First World War. An ardent pacifist and liberal, his faith

was transformed by a visit to Spain in 1937, coinciding with his study of Niebuhr's writings. Having previously abandoned his ministry, he returned to the Congregational Church in 1939 but was ordained as an Anglican under Vidler's influence. As Niebuhr's disciple, he was anxious to promote his work in England, through books such as Reinhold Niebuhr: Prophet from America (1945). His On to Orthodoxy (1939) was the account of his conversion to neo-orthodoxy from liberalism. Although well received, Davies had a tendency to generalise, indeed to over-react against his former creed, certainly more violently than Niebuhr had against his own pacifism. He laid the blame for the rise of Nazism squarely upon liberalism, losing the more balanced view which recognised, as Vidler did, how the Versailles Treaty at the end of the Great War had contributed to Germany's economic difficulties.

It must always be remembered that Niebuhr's theology grew out of his pastoral experience as a minister in Detroit. Indeed the relationship between theology and ministry must be constantly stressed, for the one suffers without the other. So, in providing a theological context for the working out of English theology during the Second World War, two prayers of Niebuhr's provide a fitting reminder of the importance of worship.

"Grant us grace, O Lord, to learn of your judgments which overtake us when we set brother against brother and nation against nation. Give us wisdom and strength to fashion better instruments for our common life, so that we may dwell in concord under your providence, and may your kingdom come among us through Jesus Christ our Lord."⁷

"God, give us grace to accept with serenity the things that cannot be changed, courage to change the things that should be changed, and the wisdom to distinguish the one from the other."⁸

The Theology of Pacifism

Even though pacifists have been, historically, a minority, their voice is still important. Indeed, the pacifist position often seems to have an "ideal" quality about it, which lesser Christians would wish to imitate, but are unable to through personal weakness. For present purposes, the definition of a pacifist is that of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, that membership of the Christian Church "involves the complete repudiation of modern war." This definition avoids the need to investigate the attitudes of, say, the pre-Constantinian church, being concerned solely with modern war. It also identifies pacifism as being something more than simply the dislike of war which is a more general Christian (and indeed humanitarian) attitude.

G. C. Field in Pacifism and Conscientious Objection (1945) noted his experiences as a member of the wartime "Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal":

"On the Tribunal of which I was a member, we listed adherents of fifty-one different religious bodies. And, though these did not all differ sharply from one another in the grounds of their Pacifism, a considerable number did. In addition there were those, comparatively few in number, whose objections were based on ethical or humanitarian grounds independently of any religious beliefs."⁹

This illustrates part of the problem in any discussion of the theology of pacifism: the fact that it can adopt, or be derived from, so many different forms. Even the A.P.F. definition limiting the discussion to "modern war", makes no distinction between limited-objective operations - such as the Falklands Campaign - and the prospect of nuclear warfare.

One of the most important English contributions to the debate about pacifism is Cadoux's Christian Pacifism Re-examined. The writer based his pacifism upon three points:

"1) That the activities of fighting men cannot be harmonised with any standard of conduct reasonably describable as Christian;

2) that war inevitably tends to lead on to further war, and to worse war;

3) that the Christian ethic definitely inculcates on its adherents the policy of overcoming evil with good, and of making the sacrifices incidental to any temporary failure in so doing."¹⁰

In spite of this challenge, however, Cadoux himself was unable specifically to condemn the war outright, only to demonstrate his own inability to take part as a combatant:

"But I do not expect the country at large to be able to pledge itself to adopt my method (of non-violence), and I am therefore ready to recognise as a second best its adoption of the only means of checking Hitler which as a community it knows - namely, by force of arms."¹¹

Thus, Cadoux was actually aligning himself with the view of pacifists of the wider church - that pacifism was an individual vocation rather than a "normal practice in the Christian Church."¹² This illustrates the difficulties experienced by pacifist theologians in war time. In peace time most people would be more open to the ideals of "no more war", but faced with the real situation himself, even Cadoux was unable to expect that all should follow his lead. He was able to sustain his own individual witness and remain a pacifist, whilst recognising that non-pacifist methods were at least an effective means of "checking Hitler".

As we have seen, Vidler came under the influence of Reinhold Niebuhr. Writing at the same time as Cadoux, his contribution to the debate about pacifism is most important. He felt that the disagreements between pacifists and non-pacifists "that both sides have been more concerned with what we ought to do than why we ought to do it"¹³ had reached stalemate. He took as a working definition a position close to the present one: the word "pacifist" to describe those who say that as Christians they must not take part in war, and "non-pacifist" to describe those who say that as Christians they may."¹⁴

The stalemate resulted from the two sides, basing their actions upon the answers to two distinct questions. From the pacifist point-of-view, the right question to ask was "What is the intrinsically right thing to do? What is the absolutely ideal thing to do?"¹⁵ Vidler readily accepted that Christ's way of dealing with evil was non-violence and self-surrender; the pacifist view was that, this example thus given, "it requires no argument, to see it is to find it intrinsically binding - it is the specifically Christian way of dealing with evil."¹⁶

In contrast to this, Vidler saw that the non-pacifist asked a completely different question. Also, it was just as incumbent on Christians to ask it, but there was a less clear-cut answer than to the pacifist question. "What action must we take in order that the law and order, which are a necessary condition of there being any civilised human society at all, shall be preserved and improved?"¹⁷ This question takes into account the reality of human existence - that in a fallen world, law and order depend to a large extent on the use of coercion. Within the international framework, the implications of this question are clear. Vidler went on to say that "it is significant that pacifism is most

popular in those States which enjoy the greatest internal security."¹⁸

The develop the argument along theological lines, Vidler pointed out that "the law of pure love" may just be "a simple alternative to political action in this world." Following Niebuhr, he stressed the fallen-ness of the world - even after the redemptive work of Jesus. "Jesus was destroyed not because he was a sinner, but because he was sinless; that is what happens to sinlessness in history."¹⁹ However, if the determining consideration is the pacifists' citizenship in the Kingdom of God, then his actions are thus predetermined - whatever the consequences.

The non-pacifist argument develops in logical contrast - to take into account the consideration of his citizenship of this world. The difficulty which arises here is that of the non-pacifist attempting therefore to reconcile the "law of love" with the maintenance of coercion. Human justice replaces the love of God in decisions of a non-political nature. This, in the end, arrives at the Lutheran dichotomy between the two citizenships of the Christian.

Given these two positions, Vidler offered no solution to the problem, but his analysis is an excellent illustration of the differences. He felt that it was vital always to recognise the tension between Church and State:

"As members of the State we know that we have responsibility for the maintenance of the historical order; as members of the Church we know that the historical order is always under judgement, that its sinfulness is lit up by the Word of God and that our only ultimate hope lies in the ultimate mercy of God's forgiveness."²⁰

Even more important was his identification of the real implications which the pacifist position raises. The following insight is

perhaps the most important of his contribution to the debate:

"The way of life revealed in the gospel is an integral whole; it is arbitrary to select one of its precepts, for instance non-resistance to evil, as though it were a binding obligation in a sense that the others are not. Thus the most discerning pacifists see that the logic of their position requires them to embrace Franciscan poverty....and when they see this, they are on the way to seeing also that pacifism is impossible as a universal political programme."²¹

One further point which demonstrates a subtle weakness in the pacifist position was made well by G. C. Field. It arose from his experience in dealing with conscientious objectors, who, to his surprise, in thinking that "they can settle the question by saying that you cannot attain a good end by evil means never seem to have heard of the possibility of being faced with a choice of evils."²²

However, this is not to say that the pacifists themselves were not theologically well represented. The outstanding English pacifist theologian was Charles Raven, Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, and although he is dealt with more fully below, a short treatment of his position is necessary now.

His writing on pacifism is perhaps the most important in the Church of England, and began in 1935 with Is War Obsolete? Much of this is the account of Raven's personal reasons for pacifism. However, by 1937 he had refined his position into the logical outcome of a fully Trinitarian theology.

"Why then do we claim that pacifism is the inevitable corollary of our theological and religious convictions? Because for us, pacifism is involved in:

- a) our concept of God and of His mode of creative activity;
- b) our understanding of Jesus and the method of his redemptive and atoning work;
- c) our apprehension of the Holy Spirit and of the Koinonia established by Him

Put less technically these involve:

- a) a belief that in the nature of God, and therefore, in His dealings with man and in man's true way of life, love is always primary and justice derivative
- b) that in the teaching and atoning work of Jesus it is plain not only that those who take the sword must perish by the sword but that the sole redemptive activity is the power of the love that gives and suffers, that is of the Cross
- c) that worship and fellowship, the love of God and the love of men are inseparably united; that what is wrong for the individual cannot be right for the community, that the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace - a way of living of which modern warfare is a flagrant denial, and that it is only as this way of life is realised that the ministry of the Church can become creative, regenerative and inspirational."²³

In the later (1952) The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism little, if anything, is added to his earlier works. He was, however, able to comment upon the official commissions which produced The Era of Atomic Power and The Church and the Atom, which reports he found much less than satisfactory.

"In America there was indeed a strong expression of guilt and of condemnation of the "crime" of Hiroshima, but in Britain both the Commission set up under J. H. Oldham and the more ecclesiastical enquiry under the Dean of Winchester produced documents whose

effect was to whitewash the politicians and, while recognising the gravity of the issue, to acknowledge their helplessness in dealing with it."²⁴

Neither does he see the need to "repeat at length the plain evidence from Gospels, Acts and Epistles"²⁵ because of G. H. C. Macgregor's The New Testament Basis of Pacifism which was published in 1936.

The real debate about pacifism was worked out before and during the Second World War. Much space has been devoted to Vidler's contribution which, under the influence of Niebuhr, concluded that the two positions, whilst irreconcilable, might at least profitably see the basic differences in their respective starting points.

It is important to note the general conclusion that pacifism is possible as an individual vocation, but not as a general principle. This has led the Church into the need for a framework in which to comment upon war and which has existed for centuries in the shape of Aquinas' principles of the "Just War". It was generally assumed that World War II was a just war, to rid the world of the combined evils of Nazism and Japanese Imperialism. So, it is useful to view the principles of the Just War in connection with the more controversial events of the Falklands Conflict, in order to see their relevance in the modern day.

III) Just War Theory and the Falklands Conflict

The thought of an armed conflict on the small scale of the Falklands episode has escaped recent thinking on Christian attitudes to war. Much time has been devoted to "global" conflicts and nuclear weapons which has suggested that the tradition of the "just war" could not now be applied in the light of present developments in the conducting of hostilities. What the Falklands conflict

made clear is that not all modern warfare is "total" in the sense that the Second World War was "total". The efforts of the whole nation were not directed towards victory in the South Atlantic. It is clear then that some sort of distinction must be made between the sort of war envisaged in the event of an exchange of strategic nuclear weapons, and that experienced in the Falklands in 1982. If this distinction is allowed, then the principles of the just war theory - stated classically by Aquinas ²⁶ - may be usefully applied to the events presently under discussion.

"War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ."²⁷ In a discussion specifically concerning the Church of England, there is another source of material to which reference must be made. This is the Lambeth Conference, which produced the above statement in 1930, and has reaffirmed it at subsequent conferences. It may therefore be taken to be official Anglican policy. This is an important preface to an investigation of the application of the just war. Whatever else is decided is in the light of the fact that, in official Anglican terms, the Falklands conflict was "incompatible with the teaching...of Christ." Further to this, however, is the equally striking fact that international relations as a whole are not conducted on Christian terms. The conflict occurred as a result of a diplomatic breakdown: it was a governmental dispute, not a "holy war". And, however slender the truth may be, incompatibility does not preclude necessity: armed force may be considered to be necessary, though never desirable.

Just War theory is useful only in the sense that it can detect injustice. Or, as Paskins and Dockrill interpret Sydney Bailey: "(He) has drawn attention to the crucial fact that these principles

are largely negative in form, expressing prohibitions and restraints rather than permissions and mandates for war."²⁸ There are six basic principles in the present theory, although some may be taken to be more important than others.²⁹

First, the war must be undertaken and waged by a legitimate authority. This is because war as a political action could only be justified if undertaken by those in whose charge is the common good of the nation. In the cases of both Britain and Argentina, the decision to use military force came from the legitimate authorities. Had, for example, one of the members of the three-man "junta" in Argentina acted unilaterally, his actions would have been, in Christian terms, unjustifiable. The concept of a "legitimate authority" is interesting: Dag Hammarskjöld believed that there should be no use of the armed forces except by the authority of the United Nations.³⁰

Second, war must be fought for a just cause. This is a notoriously difficult principle to prove either way. In the case of the Falklands conflict both sides claimed that their cause was just. It must be said, however, that Britain had the political advantage of the UN Resolution, 502, which although calling for cessation of hostilities, demanded the withdrawal of Argentine forces. Argentina, which has maintained a long standing claim to the Islands, might claim that it was repossessing its own territory, although even this kind of aggression is not in keeping with modern Roman Catholic teaching (which might be expected to be heard in a Roman Catholic country).³¹ On the other hand, Britain, who had the advantage of international recognition of sovereignty in the Islands, was able to claim that she had a right to the self-defence of her own territory - under the UN Charter. According to these principles - and international law as it stands - Argentina was

not justified in its invasion of the Islands; by the same understanding the British cause was just. (Although Resolution 502, which called specifically for a cessation of hostilities, should not be cited in Britain's defence).

Third, war must be undertaken with the right intention. Again this seems difficult to interpret, as the notion of "right intention" is often claimed by both sides in a conflict. One line of interpretation, taken by the authors of The Church and the Bomb is that this involves making a formal declaration of war. "This puts the waging of war on a legal footing and defines the relationships of belligerents and third parties."³² That is, it is a "right intention" to wage war according to the international law of armed conflict. In this case, a problem exists for both sides in the conflict: there was no official declaration of war, although both sides understood that hostilities were more than likely. Certain declarations were made, however - the UN resolution and the announcement of the "total exclusion zone", which at least indicated the probability of engagement. It is also worth noting that there has been no official declaration of the end of hostilities: the state is merely one of abeyance. It may be said that the laws of armed conflict seem to have been upheld by both sides, so to that extent a "right intention" was observed. However the restraints of the theory are such that the conflict according to this principle was unjust. This is, then, not an entirely satisfactory view of the "right intention". It is unlikely that a formal declaration of war would have made the slightest difference either to the outcome of the conflict or to the conduct of the opposing forces. Another interpretation of "right intention" there-³³fore, is that this means a "just and lasting peace". Again, this

is not fulfilled by the Falklands conflict. As no lasting peace has been, or seems likely to be, agreed, this principle cannot be upheld. The trouble here, of course, is one of interpretation. The two quite different examples given show that this principle is open to a wide variation of opinion, which surely takes away some of its weight.

Fourth, recourse to war must be a last resort. That is, war is only permissible if all the available diplomatic means of resolving a conflict are exhausted. Talks between Britain and Argentina were first suggested by the UN in 1965, and transfer of sovereignty was first discussed in 1977.³⁴ The Islanders themselves, however, were hostile to any such proposals, and formal talks broke down as late as February 1982. For Argentina's part, therefore, it could be argued that, as diplomatic channels had effectively closed, their invasion was justified (although Roman Catholic theories have already been cited above to show that this is perhaps less than obvious). After the invasion, diplomatic moves were made by both the UN and the US Secretary of State, Alexander Haig. When it became clear that there would be no withdrawal of Argentine forces, the British task force took military action. Here again, there are different interpretations of the principle of the "last resort". However, as has already been pointed out, the identification of the last resort is not a theological task, and whereas the invasion was a provocative act of war, the same can hardly be said of the British action of "legitimate" self-defence.

Fifth, there should be a reasonable chance of success. Again, there is difficulty here, for it is a dangerous business to forecast the outcome of wars (e.g. the Franco-Prussian War of 1870). Argentina clearly did not expect the British reaction to the invasion.

All the signs (particularly, perhaps, the decision to withdraw "HMS Endurance") seemed to point to a British desire to leave the Islands alone. Therefore, on this interpretation, the Argentine forces had a reasonable chance of success. It could even be argued from this that the British response was unreasonable. The decision to send a task force must have been made with this clause in mind: Britain did have a reasonable chance of success. The decision, then, must by this principle be considered a correct one by Britain: the short-term result of hostilities was a military victory for the task force. Ruston makes a useful point on this particular clause:

"This is clearly a less stringent condition for nations fighting wars of national survival against an attacker than it would be for a nation making offensive war for some just cause."³⁵

Much of the British case was that the conflict amounted to a war of "national survival".

Sixth, the evil and damage which the war entails must be judged to be proportionate to the injury it is designed to avert or the injustice which occasions it. This is concerned with the idea of proportionality: a war may be just in itself, but unjust because of the "collateral" evils which accompany it. Neither of the two countries involved in the conflict could claim that all of their actions were proportionate. The most serious breach might perhaps be the sinking of the "Belgrano". Now, the notion of proportionality must take into account presumed British intentions. All reports are agreed that the cruiser was outside the "total exclusion zone" when it was attacked.³⁶ the understood intentions of the task force were overstepped. This show of strength may have been instrumental in the decision to attack "HMS Sheffield"

later which, in terms of intentions, could be said to have been in proportion. On the Islands themselves, it may be argued that the behaviour of the Argentine occupation force was disproportionate. Whilst it may be considered expedient to have locked the local population at Goose Green into the village hall, the acts of vandalism and looting may not.³⁷ Indeed such practice is against the International Law of Armed Conflict (to which Argentina is at least a partial signatory). "It is forbidden....to commit pillage, even if the town or place concerned is taken by assault."³⁸ The conflict was a full-scale military operation which resulted in around a thousand deaths (225 British). The lives were lost in the defence of 1,813 Islanders. The casualties were relatively light, for an armed conflict, but it may even yet be too early to decide with certainty upon the uncomfortable issue of proportionality.

Just War thinking is not an attempt to legitimise war. Yet, unless the Church adopts a wholly pacifist policy, which is unlikely, it remains a useful theoretical tool. It is a recognition in Christian tradition that recourse to the use of armed force is not necessarily unjustifiable. War may be "incompatible with the teaching and example of Christ", but in the present world it is equally arguably inevitable. This gives the Church the choice of total condemnation of war, or the opportunity to try to ensure humanitarian conduct in war, by acting hopefully as a sort of "national conscience".

As the Army padre said "our aim was to seize the objective and not to kill the enemy."

To apply the principles of the theory strictly gives an unusual conclusion: neither side can claim to have fought a just war.

For example, the conflict was not made legal, and both sides seem to have transgressed reasonable bounds of proportion in their conduct of hostilities. However, the role of the UN must not be forgotten. The Islands are considered to be British under International Law, therefore the Argentine invasion was an unjustifiable act of aggression. The UN Charter allows self-defence of territory, although Resolution 502 apparently ruled out the use of force. Therefore it may be said that the decision to send the task force was a just decision - made under UN policy and just war theory. The right intention in the short term was to free the Islanders from a system of government imposed against their will; the use of force may fairly be said to have been a last resort, in military terms. The origin of the conflict hinges upon differing interpretations of the territorial rights to the Islands - this is quite plain. Any conclusion as to the justice of the conflict must take into account the current state of International Law, and in that case the discussion may be concluded simply. The British reaction was fair, in the face of Argentine aggression. But the Church must deplore some aspects of the conduct of hostilities; after all, even if the Church cannot make decisions of military policy, it is in a position to criticise those who do.

CHAPTER 2 (ii)

INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

I) Archbishop William Temple

The most outstanding contributor to the wartime debates was William Temple. As has been noted, he was admired by advocates of all shades of opinion, from militarist to pacifist, and his death in October 1944 was a tragic loss to the country as a whole.

During his Archepiscopacy at York from 1929-1942, he had become increasingly involved in the political life of the nations, insisting that the Church not only should, but must "interfere". This idea was classically stated in the Penguin book Christianity and Social Order published in 1942 as a companion volume to Bell's Christianity and World Order .

"So we answer the question 'How should the Church interfere?' by saying: In three ways - (1) its members must fulfil their moral responsibilities and functions in a Christian spirit; (2) its members must exercise their purely civic rights in a Christian spirit; (3) it must itself supply them with a systematic statement of principles to aid them in doing these two things, and this will carry with it a denunciation of customs or institutions in contemporary life and practice which offend against those principles."¹

So, Temple's belief was that "interference" would not extend to suggesting particular solutions to particular problems, but rather to encourage the active participants to act in a Christian spirit. He was, of course, aware that his expectations might lead to charges of Utopianism, but in the area of social order he was profoundly influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr, whose importance is noted above. Behind Niebuhr's thought was the pervasiveness of original sin, and Temple drew attention to this same idea, as a primary "Christian

Social Principle". "Its assertion of Original Sin should make the Church intensely realistic, and conspicuously free from Utopianism."²

Having this view of Christianity enabled Temple to speak positively when Britain entered the War in 1939. His views on pacifism actually moderated after 1935, when he had spoken of pacifists as "heretics".³ By the time he and Lang met an APF deputation in 1940, he was speaking in terms of pacifism as an individual vocation.⁴ His fundamental disagreement with pacifism was another product of his beliefs about original sin, believing that, in a fallen world, "the rightness of most acts is relative."⁵ Iremonger uses a syllogism to describe the pacifist position:

"It is not right for a Christian to do anything that is contrary to the mind of Christ: War is, by the consent of all Christians, contrary to the mind of Christ: Therefore it is not right for a Christian to take part in war."⁶

For Temple, this was just too simple to be relevant in a complex situation, and he believed in the present right of going to war: of course force was not good, but evil must be resisted:

"As the fact that we are right now does not obliterate our past sin, so our past sin in no way alters the fact that we are right now. No positive good can be done by force; that is true. But evil can be checked and held back by force, and it is precisely for this that we may be called upon to use it."⁷

Suggate points out the subtlety of Temple's arguments which distinguished between "sins for which a man is personally responsible and sins for which he is implicated through his membership of a sinful order."⁸ In this vein he was able to explain why he saw the War as "the judgment of God." This was not, of course, in

the simple sense that "God sent the war" as his critics said. Rather, he thought in terms of moral laws of cause and effect in God's order. "As in the physical realm, so in the moral realm, causes produce their effects. The law of gravitation does not control your will; you need not walk over the edge of the precipice; but if you do, you will fall to the bottom. So, too, you need not conduct your life on selfish principles; but if you do, you involve yourself and all others whom you affect in catastrophe. 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'

Now, when by operation of the law of God calamity comes upon us as a consequence of our neglect or defiance of His will, it is evident that this is properly called the judgment of God."⁹

Thus, Temple saw the war as a consequence of man's departure from the law of God. As a result, killing could be right, though still sinful, as a choice between two evils, and against the pacifists he could therefore state:

"And so we have got to do it and be penitent when we do it.... Where the method of redemptive suffering is possible and the people concerned are capable of rising to it, it is no doubt the best of all, but there is no way that I can see in which we could redemptively suffer so as to change the heart of Germany and deliver Poles and Czechs; and if there is, our country is not yet anything like prepared to do it. So once again we have to do the best we can, being what we are, in the circumstances where we are - and then God be merciful to us sinners!"¹⁰

In this way, Temple used present circumstances to add weight to his arguments. For him, the pacifist position was far too general, the war itself being all too specific. As Suggate says:

"It is difficult to convey the strength of Temple's conviction that pacifism as a universal principle was a serious error." ¹¹

He describes Temple's view of the war as a question:

"Is the Nazi threat to civilisation so serious that the evil of allowing it to develop is greater than the monstrous evil of war?"

To which, of course, the answer was "an unhesitating yes."

As well as being too general, pacifism, to Temple, lacked a truly coherent theology. He saw in his own position, the need for a theology of the State as well as of the Church, in the same way as Niebuhr. Pacifism lacked an adequate theology of the state and of citizenship, as Temple wrote to a pacifist correspondent:

"Though you cannot advance the Kingdom of God by fighting you can prevent Christian civilisation, or a civilisation on the way to becoming Christian, from being destroyed and that is what we are now engaged in. If you look at the New Testament carefully there can be no doubt that there is a theology of the State as well as of the Church, and that it is our duty to do as citizens in support of the State things which it would be inappropriate to do as a Churchman in support of the Church and its cause. The soldiers are therefore quite right when they say that war is not Christianity, but they would be quite wrong if they went on to say that therefore Christians ought not to fight. The duty to fight is a civic duty which, if the cause is good, Christianity accepts and approves, but it is not a duty which has its origin in Christianity as such." ¹²

In the same way he drew attention to the life of Jesus and his distinction between an earthly kingdom and spiritual truth:

"You seem to believe that Our Lord Himself was a complete

pacifist. I am sure that is not true. If it was, how did there come to be two swords in the little company of His disciples right at the end of His ministry? He Himself said that if He were concerned with an earthly kingdom His servants would be fighting. He seems to me plainly to recognise that it would be right to fight for an earthly kingdom or civilisation, but it cannot be right to fight for spiritual truth because that wins its way only so far as it is freely accepted, and to try to uphold it by force is in fact to betray it."

Temple was equally decisive in dealing with those who, by contrast, erred on the side of militarism. One priest who called publicly for reprisals against Germany in an article was told:

"I think its argument quite false and its ethics quite deplorable....The proposal that we should decree that for every civilian life taken here, we would take ten German civilian lives, represents just that descent to the enemy level which we must at all costs avoid if we are to be able to stand for any principles at all in the world of the future."¹³

In the matter of the prayer-life of the Church, Temple was always careful never to include direct prayers for victory. Garbett, at York, disagreed with this position but was prepared to concede the point that no official forms of prayer should depart from the 1928 words: "Grant us victory, if it be thy will." Over and above the conflict, Temple was always aware that "the primary concern in prayer must be the approach to the Father of all men, with recognition that all His other children have the same right of approach....I think the maintenance of the spiritual fellowship of all Christians is for the Church a concern that takes precedence even of the military defeat of Nazi-ism."¹⁴

The overall view of Temple during this period is thus of a fair-minded, though strident, commentator. His theology was based on a firm belief in original sin, and how this affected man as a citizen and a Christian. His approach to any problem always seems to have taken into account how things might seem with hindsight: whether the Czechs or Poles would appreciate the subtleties of non-violent actions on their behalf, or how much the government might seem like the priest and the Levite in the parable for neglecting to show mercy to the Jews when an opportunity presented itself.¹⁵

His vision was of a better future, a world made better by the end of Nazi tyranny, in spite of the achievement of this end by sinful means. In August 1939, in a broadcast address, Temple spoke of a future he made every last effort to persuade others to combine to win:

"And while we do our utmost to secure the triumph of right as it has been given us to see the right, let us steadily look beyond the conflict to the restoration of peace, and dedicate ourselves to the creation of a world-order which shall be fair to the generations yet unborn."¹⁶

II) George Bell, Bishop of Chichester 1883 - 1958

Of all the wartime bishops, Bell remains the most outstanding in his opposition to inhumanity in war. His position was made clear at the beginning of the war, in a speech in the House of Lords: "I am not a pacifist, nor am I one of those who ask that peace should be made at any price."¹⁷ On the contrary, his knowledge of events in Germany between 1933 and 1939 convinced him that Britain was right to go to war. He never wavered in the belief that World War II was a just war: "for freedom and justice against

18

violence and brute force." It would be true, of course, to say that he was more interested in the ecumenical movement than the affairs of war. As a statesman he was concerned with how European churches had coped in wartime, rather than particular events. However, as is well known, he found himself the only wartime Church leader prepared to speak out consistently against the Royal Air Force's bombing policy, perhaps as a result of his concern for the ordinary church going German civilian.

This opposition found its most public expression in the House of Lords (he became a member in 1938), in which he consistently maintained the attitude noted in November 1939:

"It is the function of the Church at all costs to remain the Church....it is not the State's spiritual auxiliary with exactly the same ends as the State....The Church ought to declare both in peace-time and war-time that there are certain basic principles which can and should be the standards of both international social order and conduct.... It must not hesitate, if occasion arises, to condemn the infliction of reprisals, or the bombing of civilian populations, by the military forces of its own nation. It should set itself against the propoganda of lies and hatred. It should be ready to encourage a resumption of friendly relations with the enemy nations. It should set its face against any war of extermination or enslavement and any measures directly aimed to destroy the morale of a population."¹⁹

So, although Bell believed in the Allied cause, he felt that the enemy should not be disregarded, and any opportunities for negotiation should be taken. His support of the Allies was even called into question by a Member of Parliament, Winterton, in his diocese, who

felt that Bell's speeches "minimised the moral strength of the country's cause."²⁰ This is a quite unjust accusation, of course. If Bell criticised any aspects of the war, they were precisely those aspects, such as terror-bombing, which undermined what "moral strength" the Allies could claim.

Theologically speaking, Bell set down his thoughts most clearly in the Penguin Special Christianity and World Order (1940). This stated that the goal of Christianity is not simply either justice, or peace, but "Order", from which both spring. "And by "Order" is meant "a system of right relations."²¹ War, therefore, springs from disorder, the breakdown of relations, and with this view, Bell combined a doctrine of sin:

"Just as sin is a fall and redemption is a recovery, so war is a fall and peace has to be recovered. Peace has to be recovered by rediscovering order."²²

He was close to Temple in seeing the war as a divine judgment, in the sense of an inevitable outcome of man's greed and selfishness:

"It is when men have broken God's law and have pursued their own interests, and have refused to share their goods with their brothers, that war comes. War descends as the judgment of God."²³

As has been seen, Bell was not a pacifist. On the contrary, he was convinced of the necessity to fight in the circumstances which presented themselves. Only if a Christian was convinced that his country's cause was unjust, was there any possibility of not bearing arms. This position had been backed up by the report of the Oxford Conference in 1937 which influenced Bell, who strongly believed that the Church should "at all costs remain the Church."²⁴ As a Christian, he felt passionately that the war, sinful though it were, was necessary.

"The clash which is now upon us is a clash of moralities. The war is not just the protest of the injured Germany people against the victors of 1918. It is the war of a barbarian tyrant against civilisation, and of violence against freedom. All the persecutions of Jew and Christian, and of political opponents; all the terror which finds expression in concentration camps and expelled the refugees, is gathered to a head in this cruel war. Woe indeed to the man who unloosed it on Europe! To be wholeheartedly at this crisis on the British side in view of the immediate acts of treachery and pillage, which set the world on fire, seems a very plain duty. This is a moment in human history when it is impossible for the just man to be neutral."²⁵

However, Bell is most famous for his prophetic criticisms of and warnings against specific allied military actions which he knew in hindsight would be deemed immoral. The war, though necessary, must only be fought within the strictest of limits. Again, he saw these limits in terms of order, which was for the Christian to bear in mind for the future:

"the objective consideration of such a strong guarantee as disarmament all round, as a guarantee which can actually be checked by the limitation of offensive weapons; particularly the abolition of the heaviest arms, especially suited for aggression - e.g. tanks and artillery - and the prohibition of the dropping of bombs on the civil population outside the real battle zone."²⁶

And in the present, the Church's prophetic role was clear:

"It must not hesitate, if occasion arises, to condemn the bombing of civilian populations quite outside the military zone by the military forces of its own nation."²⁷

So, constantly in his mind was thought for the future. For Bell, the concept of total war glossed over his own sincere belief in the "other Germany", made up of sincere Christians who saw as clearly as anyone the threats to civilisation posed by Hitler. He was convinced of the validity of praying for one's enemies, once more quoting the Oxford Conference:

"If Christians in warring nations pray according to the pattern of prayer given by their Lord, they will not be "praying against" one another. The Church should witness in word, in sacramental life, and in action to the reality of the Kingdom of God which transcends the world of nations. It should proclaim and obey the commandment of the Lord "Love your enemies."²⁸

His development of these ideas in the public domain was responsible for two attitudes towards Bell. The first, and short-lived, response was, as has been seen, to regard the Bishop as almost traitorous, and certainly mistaken in his moral thinking. The second, and abiding, response is more fair. Kenneth Slack, in a short biography, calls him "A Lonely Leader in Wartime", but also notes that "Bell, in a sense, fulfilled ecclesiastically the role that Churchill fulfilled nationally."²⁹ Indeed, Slack's work was one of a series on prominent twentieth-century Christians.

Above all, he strove to live up to what he expected of others, maintaining difficult links with European churches. As MacKinnon has said: "Bell's greatness in a measure corresponded to Bonhoeffer's: the master lived out in his own very different situation the moral and spiritual tensions articulated by the theologian, prophet, and martyr whose mentor he was."³⁰

Bell's relations with German Christians, notably Dietrich Bonhoeffer, persuaded him that the war was with National Socialism and not

Germany. To this end, he pressed the government to give assurances that Lord Vansittart's desire to punish the whole of Germany would not be followed up.³¹ Success in this matter came with the Lord Chancellor's announcement of 10th March 1943 "that the Hitlerite state should be destroyed and....that the whole German people is not....thereby doomed to destruction."³²

The famous speeches against bombing policy took shape first in his Diocesan Gazette in a statement which aroused much strong feeling:

"To bomb cities as cities, deliberately to attack civilians, quite irrespective of whether or not they are actively contributing to the war effort is a wrong deed, whether done by Nazis or ourselves."³³ His challenge to the government came on 9th February 1944, questioning the moral implications of such policies and reminding them again of its own distinction between Germany and the "Hitlerite State".

Although, as has been seen above, Bell was not the first to question both the wisdom and the morality of area bombing, he was the first to speak against it publicly, and in the heart of the government.

"It is no longer definite military and industrial objectives which are the aim of the bombers, but the whole town, area by area, is plotted carefully out. This area is singled out and plastered on one night; that area is singled out and plastered on another night; a third, a fourth, a fifth area is similarly singled out and plastered night after night, till, to use the language of the Chief of Bomber Command with regard to Berlin, the heart of Nazi Germany ceases to beat. How can there be discrimination in such matters when civilians, monuments, military objectives and industrial objectives all together form the target? How can

the bombers aim at anything more than a great space when they see nothing and the bombing is blind?"³⁴

Apart from the expected attacks from some quarters of the press, his reception was, surprisingly, most favourable, a testimony to his eminence as a bishop and statesman. Indeed, in spite of his great stature as an ecumenist, he is largely remembered, at least in Britain, for that one speech in the Lords on obliteration bombing.

After the war, he was able to devote himself to his diocesan and ecumenical interests, his last major engagement being participation in what was his fourth Lambeth Conference in 1958. He remains the single, leading Churchman who spoke out consistently for humanity throughout the war. In pointing out the Church's function in 1939 he showed an attitude which ought to be emulated by today's Church, and which is all too easily ignored. MacKinnon's tribute to him is fitting, though tinged with sadness at his treatment:

"The historians of the Church of England may yet recognise that the worst misfortune to befall its leadership in the end of the war was less the premature death of William Temple than his succession by Fisher of London and not by Bell of Chichester."³⁵

III) Charles Raven

Charles Raven's lifelong commitment to pacifism came in 1930, the year of the already noted Lambeth Statement. Like Dick Sheppard, he had been a chaplain in the Great War and it was his horrific experiences there which led him to embrace the cause. He stands above most pacifists of his time, however, because of the distinctive theological basis of his beliefs; his inspiration was theology and reason, rather than sentiment and emotion. As Wilkinson notes: "Raven was the first English pacifist to give a coherent theological basis to pacifism."³⁶ For him true Christianity, the way of the

Cross, was best expressed through pacifism as man's development continued through the twentieth century.

Indeed this evolutionary idea is perhaps the key to his distinctive position. His biographer called him "Naturalist, Historian and Theologian"³⁷ and Raven's understanding of all three areas of study was united by the common denominator of evolutionary theory. His stance, then, was that of the liberal modernist and explains much of his intellectual isolation from the church as a whole, which leant more towards neo-orthodoxy following the Great War.

In 1939 he became Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, a post from which he retired in 1950, and from 1945 until his death he was President of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The latter is an interdenominational organisation which has close links with A.P.F. but which stresses reconciliation as the positive witness of the pacifist. Although he was also a member and sponsor of the Peace Pledge Union, he thought that group was somewhat negative, involving merely a renunciation of war.³⁸ Nevertheless, Dillistone correctly identifies Raven as "the leading Christian intellectual in the whole peace movement."³⁹ Certainly his post as Master of Christ's was a public reinforcement of this judgment, even if the church was never to offer him any other preferment, so far as is known.

The basis of his theology can be seen in an essay of 1937, for the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State, in which he tried to show that Trinitarian theology implies pacifism in the whole church and not merely in individuals. It is ironic that this was written for an event of international Christian delegates, made more urgent by the absence of German contributors

through imprisonment. If his theology failed to convince or convert the rest of the conference, at least pacifism had been recognised as a legitimate vocation for Christians. Dillistone regards the most constructive result of the Conference to have been the setting forth of three positions

"which were held to be tenable within a full Christian witness. These were the commitment to complete pacifism, a readiness to participate in "just wars", and the willingness to obey the commands of the state unless the citizen is absolutely certain that the war is wrong."⁴⁰

In view of what has been said, it is therefore surprising that Raven's pacifism should embrace some non-pacifist policies pursued by the state. He was able to reconcile this because of his evolutionary beliefs: he could accept intermediate steps towards peace, which were less than pacifist, as being part of the inevitable progress towards general pacifism. Pacifism, of course, was the summit of man's evolution, and Raven could tolerate events which demonstrated that this peak was not yet achieved. In particular he felt that force could be a (sadly) necessary stop-gap, in spite of his absolutism about the theory of pacifism. As Wilkinson comments: "War between Christians is now as out of date as duelling, but we cannot simply withdraw troops from Palestine and the North-West Frontier, where force is the only practical restraint."⁴¹

Raven's relationship with Temple gives an interesting insight into the debates about Christianity and War. In 1935, Temple wrote that extreme pacifism was "heretical in tendency", giving three reasons:

"It tended to regard the New Testament as completely superseding the Old as Marcion had done; it tended to regard the material as incapable of being completely subordinated to the spiritual as had been the case with the Manichees; and it tended to regard man as a creature who was capable of directing and governing his life by love alone, a view associated in history with the name of Pelagius." ⁴² The law of love, Temple concluded, cannot be said to apply to nations "consisting in large measure of unconverted or very imperfectly converted citizens." Raven was deeply affected by this charge, in spite of the fact that Temple's attack was not intended to imply that individual pacifists were heretics. The "British disease" of Pelagianism was, however, uncomfortably close to Raven's evolutionary view of the progress of man, and the charges could not go unanswered. He responded particularly vehemently to Temple's comments about the law of love:

"If this be true the Apostolic Church was wholly mistaken in its missionary methods: the enforcement of law should have preceded the preaching of the Gospel. For Christian nations or Christian Archbishops to proclaim that "the law of love is not applicable" is not only heretical in tendency but definitely an act of apostasy."

In spite of such fierce attacks, the two adversaries respected each other greatly. In 1942, Raven felt able to address the Archbishop as "My dear William" and in 1943 they collaborated on a chapter for Temple's Penguin Special Is Christ Divided? In this they reached the same conclusion as Vidler in 1940, that the pacifist and non-pacifist positions could not be reconciled, although the common loyalty to Christ was a bridge between the two.

During the Second World War, Raven was a member of the A.P.F.

deputation to the Archbishops in 1940.⁴⁴ Unlike many meetings of "heretics and apostates", this was a civilised affair in which the individual vocation of some Christians to pacifism was recognised. This was less than the A.P.F. might have hoped, but along the lines which the church generally was acknowledging, recalling the Oxford Conference of 1937.

Also in 1940, Raven was asked by the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups to draft a reply to the call for a non-violence rather than war, from Gandhi, in which it was stated that:

"We have felt that a passive resistance to evil by non-cooperation was of itself insufficient; that inherent in any true pacifism was the duty to work for a radical reform of society by the abolition of economic and imperialistic exploitation."⁴⁵

This shows clearly Raven's idea of two-fold pacifism, which requires positive and active reconciliation, as well as non-violence.

In November 1940, Raven became involved in a controversy with the B.B.C. about religious broadcasting. He was to become a popular broadcaster from 1949 and, had he not been silenced by the authorities, might have been so earlier. The controversy, of course, arose from his pacifism, and that of others, whose sermons had been broadcast in the early months of the war. In November 1940 the B.B.C. decided that "religious broadcasting.... should be in full accord with the national effort, and with the view that the cause for which the nation is fighting is a righteous one, and that in religious broadcasting there should be no hesitation in praying regularly for victory for our forces."⁴⁶ The issues raised were clearly serious; if it were reasonable to exclude the preaching of direct pacifism, what was surely wrong was "to exclude a Christian minister from preaching the Gospel, only on the grounds that he was a pacifist."⁴⁷

Raven had previously been engaged to write and present four sermons on "The Christian's participation in War" which could only have been pacifist in content. He understood the embarrassment felt by the religious broadcasting directors who were bound to the directives from above, and would have withdrawn had it not been that "to do so would be to agree that the State has the right to dictate doctrine and use religion as an instrument of propaganda."⁴⁸ He was prevented from delivering the sermons, a move in which he considered that Christ had been dethroned for Caesar.⁴⁹

It is important to note that the Church disagreed with the B.B.C.'s policy. Temple himself was against direct prayers for victory, as has been seen, and he proposed to move a resolution in Convocation in January 1941. In the event, Convocation was unable to meet, but he wrote to the Chairman of the B.B.C., Sir Allan Powell, saying that twelve of the fourteen bishops would have supported his resolution that:

"Every opportunity should be taken to show unity of faith. In particular those who accept and those who reject the view that Christian discipleship is incompatible with the use of armed force, should respect one another's conscience and maintain their spiritual fellowship in the bond of charity.

That inasmuch as one chief means whereby the Church and the Gospel committed to it are presented to the public in the provision of broadcast services and sermons, no man should be excluded from the privilege of broadcasting the message of the Gospel on the ground that he is known to be a pacifist, provided that he undertakes not to use this occasion to advocate the pacifist position."⁵⁰ However, in spite of Temple's support, the B.B.C. had to follow

the ruling from the Ministry of Information; Raven and other pacifists were unable to broadcast for the duration of the war.

After the war, Raven was able to return to the public platform, being invited to the United States in 1950. There he delivered a series of lectures at Union Theological Seminary in New York on The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism. These were published by the F.O.R. in 1952. Wilkinson has pointed out how notable pacifists chose different targets in their attacks upon the theology of the day:

"Pacifist militancy was directed not towards potential aggressors but to targets nearer to hand: Barnes' towards Anglo-Catholics, Sheppard's towards the institutional church, Raven's towards Niebuhr and Barth."⁵¹

Raven's target was particularly noticeable in his Theological Basis, which was written precisely for the audience of which Niebuhr was Professor of Applied Christianity. He felt that neo-orthodoxy was gloomy and defeatist and that for Niebuhr "taking sin seriously means being content to continue in it."⁵²

One unusual event which demonstrates Raven's practical evolutionary view of pacifism shows also, and ironically, his value in the Allied war-effort. The Royal Ordnance Depot was suffering a shortage of buck-thorn, from which the pure charcoal necessary for time-fuses was obtained. Raven was Chairman of the Trustees of Wicken Fen where buck-thorn was in abundance, and shortly before the outbreak of war, he gave his consent to its use.⁵³ Such was the difficulty in attempting to uphold absolute standards within the relativities of history. But yet he remained convinced that absolutism must prevail. His beliefs are clearly summed up in the submission by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation

to the constituting assembly of the World Council of Churches, a statement of sincere Christianity and convinced intellectual pacifism:

"The true Church of Christ, the extension of the Incarnation, Atonement and Resurrection and the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, cannot ever be at war. It must be the universal supranational fellowship which refuses to participate in violence and war. It cannot do otherwise and yet remain Christian."⁵⁴

IV) Donald M. MacKinnon

It would be impossible to consider the question of war in a Christian context without making mention of the writings of Professor MacKinnon. His influence as a thinker in the particular area in question is considerable. By coincidence his first relevant article was published in 1939, his latest as recently as 1982. There is a distinct line of thought connecting these which illustrates a particular relationship between politics and theology and the role that the Church (and the individual Christian) must play in sustaining that connection.

MacKinnon was closely involved in the "Christendom Group" which had begun in 1930, and which was concerned with the Christian Church and the end of man.⁵⁵ In two articles published before the outbreak of war in the Group's journal Christendom he took as a theme: "The Task of the Christendom Group in Time of War." His belief was, however, that the "minimal requirement" was not only for the Group "but for the members of the whole Church."

"It seems to me that the minimal requirement....is the open avowal that the legitimacy of participation or non-participation on the part of Christians in such a war as that which seems imminent must remain an open question."⁵⁶

One of the apparent motifs in his thinking is "the more general question of the authority of the ends of the temporal kingdom." Also he repeats in subsequent publications the idea that:

"War is a means to an end, the valid end of the restoration of order, a mean that the Church has not refused to recognise as valid, when all alternatives are exhausted."⁵⁷

Thus he stands from the beginning, in the mainstream of the Church's teaching about war, seeking:

"not the unanimous signature of a pacifist pledge, but the conscious loyalty, in participation and absention alike, of the Christian to those standards which are his doctrinal heritage."⁵⁸

The idea of means and ends is crucial, because of the possibility of employing illegitimate means in pursuit of valid ends. Part of the Christendom Group's witness was therefore, as he saw it, to:

"secure the recognition by the secular power that the admission as valid of the ends of the secular power....does not involve the Church in a recognition of the validity of the means whereby it seeks to attain them."⁵⁹

This may be applied to the case of Bishop Bell, who, as has been seen, supported the war, whilst attacking some of the Allied policies. In fact, MacKinnon could be said almost to have foreseen the introduction of obliteration bombing, in 1939:

"There may be an obligation in certain circumstances to defend the nation-state of which one is a citizen, but there is never an obligation to do so by co-operation in the aerial bombardment of centres of civilian population. In fact there is a quite determinate obligation on the Christian to refuse such service."⁶⁰

In 1946, MacKinnon served on the commission which produced The Era of Atomic Power , under the chairmanship of J. H. Oldham

of the Christian Frontier Council. The Council's journal, The Christian News-letter (edited by Kathleen Bliss, who was also on the 1946 Commission) was the forum for a letter from MacKinnon reflecting upon the book Bomber Offensive by Air Marshall Harris. These reflections draw out some of MacKinnon's earlier thoughts about the place of power in society:

"The ultimate issue that the book raises is, of course, the issue of the power element in human life....still our world is threatened at all levels by collapse into the belief that ultimately power is the one thing that counts."⁶¹

What MacKinnon was seeking was a recovery of man's mastery of power through law, by which they would no longer "serve blind power."

"Here is our religious crisis, religious because here every element of human existence is staked."⁶²

The position of master/servant is updated as recently as 1982, in relation to the question of nuclear weapons which became, after 1948, his prime concern as regards war. So in Creon and Antigone he states:

"We are, in fact, in a situation in which weapons systems do not serve the institutions which claim to control them, but rather by their internal dynamism quite largely determine the way in which the institutions in question operate."⁶³

So, in 1948, he was still drawing to notice the important distinction between legitimate ends and illegitimate means, accepting that pacifism is the courageous choice of the few:

"Few of us have the moral courage or folly enough to embrace a thorough-going pacifism, but we do maintain some kind of rough and ready distinction between just and unjust war. We are encouraged

by our tradition not to repudiate war itself (that is sometimes a tragic necessity) but only war that is unjust: and injustice of course attaches to much more than the mere circumstances of its beginning."⁶⁴

As he had seen the effect of the misuse of power in society, so MacKinnon became convinced of the psychological effects of the atomic bomb:

"What shocks us in Hiroshima then is the fact that it thrusts on us....our dubious cultural predicament."⁶⁵

This was necessarily bound up with his view of politics and theology, and it is in this area in which he detected the failure of The Church and the Atom where, "in its theological sections it is often lame and hesitant."⁶⁶ This is illustrated again in the area of "Christianity in an Age of Power" with which the report concludes:

"But the question is always stated in terms of abstract principle: there is never an attempt to state it in personal terms, in terms of Christian existence today....We are far too seldom reminded that for us Christianity is a way that is ultimately one with our whole life."⁶⁷

This means, of course, that the task of theology is not to give spiritual legitimacy to the workings of politics. Here MacKinnon speaks in terms of "revolt". Thus the task of moral theology is one of "interpreting spiritually and strengthening the revolt against such things as atomic war that is surely there in the world."⁶⁸ And, to show that this task is rooted both in theology and spirituality, he reminds us that:

"We must never forget in our enthusiasm for something we call Christian civilisation that it was from the rootless and the outcast that the Christ called his own, and that upon a gallows-



tree, between two criminals, He was content to die."⁶⁹

By 1954, the question of the Hydrogen Bomb was paramount. In his "Reflections" upon this theme, MacKinnon takes further some of the themes already discussed.⁷⁰ The individual is reminded that participation in the democratic process makes the bomb something that "we have chosen to develop", and that "if we are prisoners, the cage is one of our own making."⁷¹ This is important theologically because this grounds the debate in reference "to human action, and not to an impersonal fate."⁷² This latter point appears, nearly thirty years on, in the conclusion of The Church and the Bomb . He refers to "revolt" as "an important category" which need not be a revolt against tradition. As with the bomb itself, the argument is again grounded in the individual:

"And what is this revolt in terms of the individual? Is it, to come to brass tacks, conscientious objection? There the individual must choose for himself."⁷³

The question also comes up of man's relationship to power, this time in terms of warfare. "Modern methods of war are not a kind of sovereign source of moral principles; they are methods, not lords."⁷⁴ This is totally bound up also with his illustrations of war as a means to an end, for if weapons become "lords", then the means of war become the ends. "If we have converted means into ends....we must learn to effect a drastic reconversion."⁷⁵

Of the rest of his relevant material, two items refer to Bishop Bell. The two remaining pieces are both on the same topic of "Ethical Problems of Nuclear Warfare" published respectively in 1963 and 1982.⁷⁶

The earlier essay takes as its starting point the actual meaning of "deterrence" which MacKinnon sees as "belonging to the

life of the mind."⁷⁷ His appraisal of the subject is wide-ranging and accurate, and he moves to a position criticising those who see deterrence as "a context in which international relations may be carried on."⁷⁸ He also, importantly, notes the development of so-called "tactical" nuclear weapons and the resulting problem of escalation. The official policy of "flexible response", which involves use of these smaller weapons, was adopted four years after this essay, in 1967.

The "myth" of the great deterrent is precisely that which writes off the moral problems of nuclear weapons by supposing that they provide a "system in which international relations are effectively transacted."⁷⁹ It is a myth, he writes, because this "idealises" the weapons into something that they are not. Characteristically, then, he deflates the argument and brings it down into the context of a real, human, problem. Again the idea of revolt appears; his picture of a true democrat is that of "the irreverent man who asks awkward questions...."⁸⁰ The individual is responsible and accountable, even in such an important question as that of nuclear weapons, and, referring to the Nuremberg Tribunals he says:

"Do we, or do we not believe that defence of superior orders absolves a man from listening to the voice of his own conscience?... If this be so, then the mere command of a superior....does not acquit us from the duty of considering for ourselves whether on any count the use of thermo-nuclear weapons is justified."⁸¹ Finally, he sees the myth as being simply this. That the balance of terror, which has a partial validity, is dependent upon readiness to use nuclear weapons:

"The whole system collapses as soon as that readiness is written off."⁸²

In his most recent writing, Creon and Antigone, he merely underlines what has gone before, seeing "the ethical problems of nuclear warfare" as raising "in the most acute way the question of the relation of the individual to the state."⁸³ He reiterates the myth which he identified in 1963 and reminds the reader that it masks "the most frightening element in the whole situation, and that is its built-in instability."⁸⁴ Underlying this is the necessity that deterrence involves willingness to use the weapons, and therefore to achieve a decisive victory: "We deceive ourselves if we deny that in the last resort our fabric of deterrence is partly woven of our desire to do just this."⁸⁵

He finally states "the bias of my argument is in a unilateral direction",⁸⁶ but yet this is always in terms of his desire to root the problem in the human condition. In using a passage from "Paradise Regained", he thus concludes:

"Milton saw Christ tempted impatiently to escape the burden of his human existence. We live in an age in which such a temptation is not far from every one of us, for we have to learn anew what it is to be human."⁸⁷

MacKinnon's is a distinct theological position, as coherent as any thorough going pacifism, but rooted primarily in the individual's response to a real problem. If he sees pacifism as turning away from it, his own position is one of revolt, of asking questions, of demanding just means as well as a just end. Above all, his importance lies in the constant desire to use theology which relates to the practical problems of the issues, and to expose "great myths"; "there is no escape from the tragic dimension."⁸⁸

V) The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

The pacifist witness in the Church of England is the work of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. After a series of exploratory meetings, it was inaugurated on St. Barnabus' Day 1937 with the first General Secretary, C. Paul Gliddon, being quick to point out that pacifism was important politically, as well as religiously:

"The awful responsibility of Anglicanism is being brought home daily. It is perfectly clear that the only authority that can speak peace to the nations instead of finding security in arms, arms and yet more arms, is the Church, and that, as far as Europe and America is concerned, means the Church of England. A bunch of Bishops who had renounced war could do more to establish peace than all the King's horses and all the King's men."⁸⁹

It may be noted from the proceedings in Convocation, however, that such a position was unlikely.

Particularly sought was a theological witness. The A.P.F. throughout the war did not see its task as one of trying to influence the Government's policy, but rather of awakening the Church to its true nature - identified as pacifist. For any witness to be successful, however, numbers can be vital. Gliddon set the membership target at a minimum of five thousand, including five hundred priests, for "much attention to be given to our views."⁹⁰ At the beginning of the war, this seemed quite possible, membership rising by a thousand to 2,507 between June 1939 and June 1940.⁹¹ For the A.P.F.'s third anniversary (June 11th, 1940), a deputation to the Archbishops was arranged, by which means it was hoped that the official sanction of the Church might be gained. The - perhaps predictable - outcome was that pacifism was an option for individuals, but was not binding upon the Church as a whole:

"Pacifism is a genuine vocation for some; the point of disagreement is that pacifists claim that pacifism must be the normal practice in the Christian Church."⁹²

This allowed, then, a theological witness which was seen however to cause much official embarrassment.

Since its foundation, the A.P.F. had held a weekly Wednesday morning Eucharist in St. Paul's Cathedral. By January 1940 the Dean and Chapter were "naturally anxious to avoid the impression in wartime that they are sponsoring a pacifist organisation."⁹³ The services were allowed to continue, but were not officially advertised, and the A.P.F. was responsible for the provision of a celebrant. By July, embarrassment was such that the Eucharist had to cease, "for staffing and other reasons."⁹⁴

The wartime role of the A.P.F. was not restricted to the holding of religious services, however. By the end of 1940, eighteen men were being paid as full members of a "War Service Unit" which took its first aid skills to needy areas such as Coventry and Bristol.⁹⁵ Counselling aid was given to conscientious objectors, who were shown that there were types of service which could be offered during wartime, as a positive contribution to society. The main "positive contribution" of the A.P.F. Service Unit was the Hungerford Club. This was a night shelter for down and outs and catered for between sixty and seventy men a night. By the time an independent council took over its running in July 1944 it was firmly established, with money raised by an A.P.F. concert given by Benjamin Britten and Michael Tippett,⁹⁶ as well as council grants. The Service Unit was wound up in August 1944 having shown that pacifism was by no means a negative belief set apart from the real world.⁹⁷

Membership peaked in July 1941 when it stood at 2,727, with 374 priests.⁹⁸ It remained steady around the 2,500 mark throughout the 'fifties and 'sixties, maintaining a consistent witness against the horrors of war. This was in marked contrast to groups like Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament who were (and are) not distinctly pacifist. Canon Collins, a famous Aldermaston marcher, was a member of A.P.F. and C.N.D., a posture adopted by many who desire both a specific religious and anti-nuclear stand. In contrast to the official statements, A.P.F. hit out at the systematic devastation of South Vietnam in 1965: "This war is a scandal to the human race and a disgrace to the Church."⁹⁹ From 1969, membership began to fall, though slowly, and in 1976 the "Seven Year Rule" began to be applied whereby names of members out of touch for that period were removed. This left about 35% as active members, 853, the number having grown by 1980 to 976.

It must be stressed that, in spite of small numbers, the A.P.F. is an extremely important group in peacetime as well as wartime which sees its role as prophetic.¹⁰⁰ The organisation is such that every Church of England clergyman was contacted in 1970.¹⁰¹ In 1974, the Week of Prayer for World Peace was inaugurated, which was first conceived at an A.P.F. General Meeting in 1972,¹⁰² an extraordinary achievement for such a small group.

The extent to which the A.P.F. has been able to exert influence is best illustrated by the events leading up to the 1978 Lambeth Conference. "It has been a historic year, the climax of all that has been achieved by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship since its foundation."¹⁰³ In March 1978, all the bishops expected to attend the Conference were told that "Seven Reasons" would be nailed

to the door of Canterbury Cathedral on August 2nd.¹⁰⁴ As a result of this, six American bishops attended an A.P.F. meeting and took their concern back to the Conference, which had no specific provision for a debate on war. An organisation of less than a thousand influenced the bishops enough to produce Resolution 5,¹⁰⁵ which is a most notable achievement. To mark the centenary of the birth of Dick Sheppard in 1980, the A.P.F. produced an attractive supplement to the Church Times entitled "Christianity - A Pacifist Faith",¹⁰⁶ which featured many closely related groups such as Pax Christi, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Conditions for membership require only the ability to sign the following declaration:

"We, communicant members of the Church of England, or of a Church in full communion with it, believing that our membership of the Christian Church involves the complete repudiation of modern war, pledge ourselves to renounce war and all preparation to wage war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world."

Even if membership remains at a low level, it is likely that the A.P.F. will continue to put forward successfully an alternative attitude to war, a contribution which is very valuable in the life of the Church as a whole.

CHAPTER 3THEOLOGY IN LITURGY: REMEMBRANCE LITURGY

"Remembrance Services" began in Britain in 1919 although at the time the commemoration was on the actual anniversary of the peace, 11th November. However, reference will have to be made to examples which may fairly be regarded as "Remembrance" services, even though some actually took place at different times of the year. Many, whatever the date, contain the traditional two minutes' silence which was the focus of the first Armistice Day liturgies in November 1919. Also, it could scarcely be correct to ignore the most widely publicised Remembrance service of recent years in Britain - the so-called "Falklands Service" which caused so much comment in the press and elsewhere.

The origins of what may be called Remembrance Services (under the above qualifications) are usually connected with the annual ritual at the Cenotaph in London, which memorial was unveiled in 1920. Memorial services were held apart from on Armistice Day, even during the course of the war, as will be seen. As might be expected, certain hymns occur time after time, even to the present day. Some examples which will be quoted do not appear in any hymn book and are, presumably, products of enthusiastic hymn-writers who were in a particular area at the time. Others come from the well known and popular books used in churches today. Hymns can play an extremely important part in Remembrance liturgy, especially those with words directly applicable to the idea of death in conflict. It will prove useful, therefore, to take examples and examine the type of "lesser-calvaries" theology which is often found and is certainly less acceptable to today's Church. The

choice of readings (and the theology behind their selection) is also of interest. There are some common trends which may be discerned, and mention must be made of the contribution of the Alternative Service Book to Remembrance liturgy.

A large selection of services has been consulted, ranging in date from 1916 to 1982. It is hoped that this will indicate a common purpose in the content, which has changed little. If the emphasis thought correct today is not to glorify acts of war, then this should be found to have been no less the case in the past. Working from these examples, common and useful factors may be discerned which are worthy of retention in present day services - services which are appropriate for the Church, for those who have fought and for those who have been bereaved.

It is impossible to include "Remembrance" without referring to its origins, even though these are outside the limits of the dates. This is, however, balanced by the fact that much of the older material is often still used today.

The Beginning of Remembrance

The mystical tone which has often been found in Remembrance Services has its roots in the very origin of the phenomenon. This came about through the signing of the Armistice on the stroke of "the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month" which has an almost mystical air about it, like the seventh son of a seventh son, perhaps. The Church of England at the end of the Great War found itself with a situation not faced before, which was the natural and painful desire of the many bereaved to pray for their dead. There was no such tradition in the Church and indeed was popularly identified with the excesses of Rome.

Randall Davidson, then Archbishop of Canterbury, was aware of this tremendous pastoral and liturgical need and issued in 1917 a Form of Prayer for use on August 4th and 5th (the anniversary of the outbreak of War), which included a prayer for the dead:

"Almighty and Everlasting God, unto whom no prayer is ever made without the hope of thy compassion: We remember before thee our brethren who have laid down their lives in the cause wherein our King and country sent them. Grant that they, who have readily obeyed the call of those to whom thou hast given authority on earth, may be accounted worthy of a place among thy faithful servants in the kingdom of heaven; and give both to them and to us forgiveness of all our sins, and an ever increasing understanding of thy will; for his sake who loved us and gave himself for us, thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen."¹

Two Bishops, Chavasse and Knox (Liverpool and Manchester) protested, but the Form including the above prayer, which was included "at the discretion of the Ordinary" stood as it had been intended. It seems, by today's standards, quite an ordinary prayer, containing elements of remembrance and petition in the name of Christ. By 1919, William Temple was able to declare in Westminster Abbey, on All Saints' Day: "Let us pray for those whom we know and love who have passed on to the other life...."² This was a great step forward, and one which set the tone for much of the content of Remembrance Services.

One of the features common to most Remembrance Services was popular from the start: the use of lines from Lawrence Binyon's poem "For the Fallen".

"They went with songs to the battle, they were young,
 Straight of limb, true of eye, steady and aglow
 They were staunch to the end against odds uncounted,
 They fell with their faces to the foe.
 They shall grow not old as we that are left grow old:
 Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
 At the going down of the sun and in the morning
 We will remember them."

In some services the last four lines are especially popular and even form part of the liturgy as a sort of lesser litany, with alternate lines as versicle and response.

After the War, the country was left to find a way to express its grief at the loss of so many. Local memorials appeared, with the names of the dead carved beneath statues of soldiers or St. George. Certain familiar texts were also popular, the most notable being, surely, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15,13). Such a great number of war memorials was a natural expression of the national grief - every village and street lost numbers of its young men in what was considered to have been the "war to end all wars." This sort of feeling was felt only to a lesser extent after World War Two - the names of the dead were added to existing memorials, and the mystique of a "Final War" was no longer apparent.

The first Armistice Day memorial was in 1919, and was observed throughout the Empire, at the instigation of King George V.

"I believe that my people in every part of the Empire fervently wish to perpetuate the memory of that Great Deliverance, and of those who laid down their lives to achieve it.

To afford an opportunity for the universal expression of this feeling it is my desire and hope that at the hour when the Armistice came into force....there may be, for the brief space of two minutes, a complete suspension of all our normal activities. During that time....all work, all sound and all locomotion should cease, so that, in perfect stillness, the thoughts of everyone may be concentrated on reverent remembrance of the Glorious Dead."³

Thus the two minutes' silence entered the tradition and ritual of Remembrance, and often provides the focal point of the service. In 1919 the normal course of the service was interrupted by the silence; the timing of services to come to a pause at eleven o'clock was a later development. The suggestion for the ritual came from a South African leader, Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, in October 1919. He had experienced a similar opportunity in Africa, where there had been a daily three minutes' pause at noon. The silence was a kind of communion with the dead, a recollection of personal suffering and was to become one of the most emotional parts of the service.

Two additions were made to the paraphernalia of Remembrance in 1920. The first was the unveiling of the Cenotaph in Whitehall. The idea of an empty tomb had arisen as early as 1916, when discussion began concerning a suitable war memorial in Liverpool Cathedral. In the end, the north east transept contained the first Great War cenotaph in the country - a marble memorial on top of which was the Roll of Honour, which contains 40,000 names. At first the Whitehall cenotaph was meant to be a secular affair, and Randall Davidson became involved in some controversy.

"They (Lloyd George and the Cabinet) had wished, or the Prime Minister had wished, that the proceedings should be wholly secular,

alleging as reason that Mohammedans and Hindus were among those to whose memory it stood....But I prevailed, and we had prayer and "O God our help." Instead of anybody disapproving, there was unanimous expression of thankfulness that we had thus marked our Christian fellowship."⁴

So, the Cenotaph was included in the Church's Remembrance ritual, even though there was intentionally no text inscribed upon it. More explicitly religious was the burial of the "Unknown Warrior", which Randall Davidson called "one of the most stirring (scenes) in English history."⁵ There is a whole mystique surrounding the selection of the body which captures well a view of the desire for ritual in Remembrance which was current at that time. Four bodies of unknown soldiers were disinterred in France, and taken to a chapel at St. Pol. There, at midnight on 7/8th November, one body was chosen by a blindfolded officer, and taken by destroyer to Dover, along with six barrels of earth from Ypres Salient. In London it was taken in procession on a gun carriage, behind which the King walked, to Westminster Abbey. It was buried according to the Prayer Book rite, the hymns including "O Valiant Hearts", the Russian Contakion for the Dead, "Lead Kindly Light", "Abide with me", and Kipling's "Recessional". A year later the marble tombstone was unveiled: all the texts were biblical, and included the particularly appropriate (for the time) words from 2 Chron. 24.16:

"They buried him....among the kings, because he had done good....toward God and toward his House."

The foundations laid in 1919-21 were to become standard features of Remembrance services. Even today, Remembrance Sunday attracts extra people to the churches; for many of them it is the one church

service they will attend in the year. The service at the Cenotaph is perhaps the only consciously national, regular feature of the Church's calendar. There are relatively few occasions when the Church finds itself the focus of national feeling. It would be tragic then if these foundations were to be ignored: Remembrance can, if presented well, be an opportunity for evangelism, as well as nationalism, the latter being unnecessary if enough care is given to the contents of the service.

The Hymnody of Remembrance

Many of the most popular hymns associated with Remembrance Services date from the early post-war years. Before 1914, there was little shaping of nationalistic feeling through the singing of hymns. By far the most popular collection, "Hymns Ancient and Modern" (A & M) first appeared in 1861, and the subject index contains no specific grouping of "National" hymns. This contrasts well with the later appearance of "A & M Revised" (A & M R) in 1950 which has both "National" and "In Time of War" in its table of contents. The other major pair of hymn books is the "English Hymnal" (E H) (1906) and "Songs of Praise" (S P) (1925) which were both connected with Percy Dearmer and Ralph Vaughan Williams. There is a distinct line of development between these two collections: EH has one hymn "In Time of War" and a "National" section, similar to A & M R; S P has large "National" and "International" sections amongst its many categories (e.g. "Songs for Camps and Meetings") and a section entitled "The Life Beyond: Funerals and Commemorations" which includes "O Valiant Hearts". This latter section in S P reflects directly the increase in popularity, after the First World War, of prayers for the dead. Indeed, S P caught the religious atmosphere of the time with its liberal, non-sectarian tone (unlike

E H) and its feeling of international brotherhood was very much in tune with the League of Nations enthusiasm. Mention should also be made of the "Public School Hymn Book" (P S H), if only for the following sentence from the Preface to the revised edition of 1949:

"It is hoped that the new book will make an even greater contribution than the old both to Sunday and to week-day services, and that many who use it will carry into their lives a lasting affection for those hymns which are a vital part of our national religious tradition."

The "tradition" to which it refers was possibly at most thirty years old in 1949 and some of the "vital hymns" are precisely those which the Church is now trying to excise from its present services!

It comes as no surprise that all four of the books which are being investigated contain both the National Anthem and Jerusalem, although it only came into E H in 1933. A notable example which omits the former is the original A & M but, as has been said, this has no "National" hymns to speak of. Perhaps the most popular of the First World War hymns, "O Valiant Hearts" and "I Vow to Thee my Country" appear in the two later books, A & M R and S P. E H, however, contains one hymn which at first sight is not found anywhere else, perhaps because its theology of war was not to the tastes of post-war compilers. This is "O Lord of Hosts, who didst upraise" (539) by A. C. Benson. However, it is only the first verse which, for some reason, was not acceptable. The rest of the hymn is of the "lesser calvaries" type and indeed, verses two to five are found in P S H 298, as "Lord, must we battle yet?"

If anything in verse one could possibly have been thought inappropriate to post-war ears, it could only be the line "In darker years and sterner days", which, in an age of glorification might seem to set the wrong tone. It does, however, seem to be a curious piece of editing.

Of the new books, A & M R has the smallest number of hymns of note. (For the present purpose, that is, of investigating the type of "vital hymns" which have been suggested for Remembrance services). One reason for this is that by 1950, the atmosphere which had produced S P and P S H was all but gone, along with a crop of hymns to be discussed below.

It contains one hymn, however, a later addition to Remembrance Hymns: "O Lord of Life, whose power sustains" by J. R. Darbyshire, who was Archbishop of Capetown, 1938-48. It is entitled "For the Fallen" and contains explicit prayer for the dead in the first verse:

"To thee with thankfulness we pray

For all our valiant dead today" (A & M R 585)

The general tone is of healing and remembrance, but couched in extremely sentimental and even hearty terms:

"Not names engraved in marble make

The best memorials for the dead,

But burdens shouldered for their sake

And tasks completed in their stead;

A braver faith and stronger prayers,

Devouter worship, nobler cares."

The last verse asks finally for God's blessing to be "richly shed on our communion with the dead." It is really out of keeping with the other "National" hymns in A & M R apart from, perhaps,

"O Valiant Hearts", and is a strange throw-back to the Songs of Praise mentality which has so influenced much more than a generation of worshippers.

One hymn in S P's section "The Life Beyond" is not in any of the other three books. It is specifically a "Commemoration" hymn of the same sort of tone as A & M R 585, but deals more with the nature of those "Free from the fret of mortal years" (v 4). "For those we love within the veil" (S P 289) is a somewhat sentimental vision of bliss and although the compilers intended it for commemoration, it does not seem to have been popular as a remembrance hymn, although the theology is close to other, more popular, hymns.

There is a small group of hymns in E H, S P and P S H which were not included in A & M R in 1950. Of these, two are by recognised authors of the time, Kipling ("O God of our fathers, known of old") and G. K. Chesterton ("O God of earth and altar"). The former contains the famous line "lest we forget", but apart from that is of little interest, and would be of little use in a modern day Remembrance service. Chesterton's stands the test of time well, however, and deals with the dangers of nationalism without turning into doggerel:

"From all that terror teaches,
From lies of tongue and pen,
From all the easy speeches,
That comfort cruel men,
From sale and profanation
Of honour and the sword,
From sleep and from damnation,
Deliver us, good Lord."

The last hymn in this small group, "Once to every man and nation" is Victorian, but became popular because of its idealisation of the choice facing "every man and nation" between "the good or evil side." The choice to take the good side is the path of the brave and sharing truth's "wretched crust" is akin to "toiling up new Calvaries." This equation of the sacrifice of soldiers with Calvary was naturally very popular and there are two hymns containing this type of "lesser Calvaries" theology which remain popular today.

The two foremost exponents of this theology are, of course, "O Valiant Hearts" and "I Vow to Thee, my Country", which were products of the First War, were included in A & M R and are still sung today, albeit uncritically. "O Valiant Hearts" captures exactly the spirit of opinion in post war memorials. It is debatable whether Sir John Arkwright meant to deny the uniqueness of the Atonement by asking Christ to "Look down to bless our lesser Calvaries." It would be equally wrong, perhaps, to play down the value of individual sacrifices in wartime, and it is this which Arkwright intended to avoid, by calling them "lesser Calvaries." However, this is found less acceptable today and sometimes the parallelism is too much to bear:

"Proudly you gathered, rank on rank, to war....

....to save mankind - yourself you scorned to save." (v 2)

Indeed, it is suggested that "Christ our Redeemer passed the self-same way".

"I vow to thee" has a similar unacceptable tone. This is found especially in the concept of unquestioning (as opposed to unconditional) love:

"The love that asks no question, the love that stands the test,

That lays upon the altar the dearest and the best."

The "final sacrifice" is again the equation of death in wartime with Calvary. The false implication in this type of hymn is that all soldiers are saints, and therefore die a martyr's death. To deny this is not to deny that they are beloved of God, and to uphold it is uncritically to keep alive the atmosphere of grief and mysticism which accompanied early Remembrance liturgies. Therefore, in spite of the popularity of these and other hymns mentioned above, it is important to seek elsewhere for suitable material: the National sections of hymnbooks do not provide a good source of Remembrance hymns.

Two hymns are worthy of mention which are not to be found in any known hymnbook. The first is "Great God of Nations at Whose Will", which was sung, in Belgium, in 1916 at a Parade Service.⁶ It is quite simply the worst, most unacceptable kind of hymn which could give any otherwise sensitive Remembrance service a very bad press. It consists of three verses which ask God to give victory to the British Army and lacks theology of any kind. The climax is as follows:

"To Thee we turn, to Thee we cry,

O God lead on to Victory. Amen"

The second hymn is a celebration of England, with the unlikely first line "Where break the windy dawns on mountain heather." This was sung in 1953 by presumably home-sick soldiers at a Remembrance Sunday service in Tanglin.⁷ Although the tone is not offensive in the way of the first hymn, neither is it particularly stirring, and

it is again not the sort of thing designed to improve a Remembrance service.

There are of course many hymns in the "General" sections which have been and are used successfully for Remembrance services. For example, "O God our Help" which was sung at the unveiling of the Cenotaph and is still popular, as is the most famous metrical psalm, "The Lord's my Shepherd". "Praise my Soul", "For all the Saints" and "Now Thank we all our God" are also very popular. It would be true to say that it is this sort of general hymn which ought to be considered, in which no specific mention is made of sacrifice and "lesser Calvaries". The trouble with the type of hymn discussed above is that, in the desire to give thanks for the deaths of many in war, the too-easy parallel is drawn with Christ, at the expense of theology and indeed, perhaps, common sense. The choice of hymns, therefore, can be a precarious business, as can the equally important choices of prayers and readings.

Prayers and Readings 8

It is an easier task to discard unsuitable hymns than inappropriate readings. The Canon of Scripture contains much material which at first sight seems ideal for inclusion in Remembrance services; the historical books of the Old Testament especially. The immediate danger here is obvious, and is again one of parallelism. The choice of reading can so easily lead to the idea that, somehow, God is on the side of an army, as he fought for Israel against her enemies. At the other extreme, it would be possible totally to alienate a congregation by choosing a "neutral" reading such as the story of the good Samaritan, which would be quite irrelevant in the context. Prayers for the dead seem to have been an accepted part of Remembrance liturgy from the beginning. Where these are

taken to be unacceptable, prayers of thanksgiving may be easily substituted. In either case, it is important always to avoid petitions for the favouritism of God, for example, which may seem immediately appropriate, but could conceivably give a false long-term picture of the Christian God.

The obvious starting point when looking at the types of prayer (suitable or otherwise) which might be used in connection with Remembrance services is the Book of Common Prayer. In the section of "Prayers and Thanksgivings" is a prayer for use "In time of War and Tumults":

"O Almighty God, King of all kings, and Governor of all things, who power no creature is able to resist, to whom it belongeth justly to punish sinners and to be merciful to them that truly repent; Save and deliver us, we humbly beseech thee, from the hands of our enemies; abate their pride, assuage their malice, and confound their devices; that we, being armed with thy defence, may be preserved evermore from all perils, to glorify thee, who art the only giver of all victory, through the merits...."

This prayer has its good points. The preamble is an acknowledgment that God's justice is fair and irresistible. However, the main section is clearly a request for deliverance from enemies and for God's confounding of "their devices." As a precedent for the prayer of the Church of England, though it is quite reasonable, in its context. Today, it would be inappropriate to make that sort of request and it is unlikely that it was used during the recent Falklands conflict. Worse prayers have been used, however, particularly during the first World War.

"Oh, Almighty God, Lord of Hosts, look down, we beseech thee, with favour upon our troops now engaged in war and crown them with victory. Cover their heads in the day of battle. Give them

the valour which comes from faith and the mercy which beseems Christian soldiers.

Have compassion on those who suffer - the sick, the wounded, the dying, and the mourners for the fallen. Bring the war, if it pleases thee, to a right and lasting peace, and over-rule all things in this world of sin and sorrow to give enlargement of thy blessed kingdom, for the sake of Him who is our peace..."

The possibility of using this in a Remembrance service held whilst war was in progress is quite unthinkable. The following prayer used in a Remembrance Sunday Service in Portsmouth in 1939 is more appropriate and in far better taste than the above:

"Let us remember before God our brethren who laid down their lives in the cause wherein their King and Country sent them. O Almighty God, who canst bring good out of evil, and makest even the wrath of man to turn to Thy praise: we beseech Thee so to order and dispose the issue of this war, that we may be brought through strife to a lasting peace; and that the nations of the world may be united in a firmer fellowship for the promotion of Thy glory and the good of all mankind."

Here the remembrance is simple, and in the context of a future hope of fellowship. The request of God is not for victory, but peace and an end to strife. In the first prayer, the phrase asking for the end of war "if it please thee" is an interesting one, and could not be heard today. The Lambeth Conference 1930 declared that: "War....is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." Any suggestion, then, that it could possibly please God to allow the continuation of the war is ruled out: warfare results from man's sin, rather than God's pleasure.

If the Book of Common Prayer sets an example which is not

altogether appropriate to modern theology and liturgy, it would seem obvious to look to the Alternative Service Book. It was not thought correct, however, to include provision for Remembrance Sunday services in the A S B. There are no prayers for use in time of war, although the implication can scarcely be that there should be no prayer at such times. To find suggestions for Remembrance prayers, then, it is necessary to look elsewhere.

David Silk includes two sections from a 1968 service in his Prayers for use at the Alternative Services where the talk is of thanksgiving for peace rather than the glorious remembrance of heroes.⁹ This is a far cry from the above First World War prayer, as are some examples of Frank Colquhoun's Parish Prayers series:

"On this Remembrance Day we come, O Lord, in gratitude for all who have died that we might live, for all who endured pain that we might know joy, for all who suffered imprisonment that we might know freedom. Turn our deep feeling now into determination, and our determination into deed, that as men died for peace, we may live for peace for the sake of the Prince of Peace...."¹⁰

"Grant us grace, O Lord, to learn of your judgments which overtake us when we set brother against brother and nation against nation. Give us wisdom and strength to fashion better instruments for our common life, so that we may dwell in concord under your providence, and may your kingdom come among us...."¹¹

"Lord of the nations, we remember before you with grateful hearts the men and women of our country who in the day of decision ventured their all for the liberties we now enjoy. Help us to recognise the incalculable debt we owe them, that we may strive in our own time to maintain true freedom in our nation, and to safeguard the peace which was won at so great a cost."¹²

There are certain basic premises which should be taken into account in Remembrance prayers. Thanksgiving is for those who died in the attempt to uphold justice and truth. It is certainly the belief of governments that their causes are just and truthful and therefore men and women die for those beliefs, regardless of what history says about the real nature of a past conflict. An element of regret, and repentance of sins committed, is desirable, as in the second prayer from Colquhoun's series. Above all, however, it must be recognised that defensive war is usually a last resort. In international relations, war is a tragic sign that man is unable to live in peace and will fight for what he believes in. Asking for the grace of God to learn the way of peace is not an empty phrase, therefore, but a desperate plea, and the Church must give a lead in this area.

The Bible is an almost bottomless source of readings for almost any topic. It is not surprising, then, that a survey of various Remembrance services shows a wide diversity in the choice of readings, from Joshua to the Beatitudes. The problem with scriptural sources, as has been suggested above, is that the authority of God in the readings is projected as the choice of God for a particular side: "God is on our side." Careful selection is needed, then, and the examples below will show that that is not always the case.

In the 1916 service referred to, there was only one lesson, Joshua 1, 1-9. Even if it is accepted that this occasion was for war of active service, the choice is, by our standards, a bad one. The climax comes in the last two verses:

"This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may be careful to do according to all that is written in it; for then you shall

make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success. Have I not commanded you? Be strong and of good courage; be not frightened, neither be dismayed; for the Lord your God is with you wherever you go."

As an exhortation it is quite successful, but it should not be regarded as a sensible use of scripture: the implication that God is not with the enemy destroys the value of the reading completely.

A more useful passage is to be found in the Apocrypha, in Wisdom 3, 1-10. The immediate difficulty of the equation of "souls of the righteous" (v.1) with all war dead is overcome in the sheer poetry which follows.

"In the eyes of the foolish they seemed to have died, and their departure was thought to be an affliction, and their going from us to be their destination; but they are at peace."

This passage, whilst not explicitly Christian, gives a picture of resurrection in poetical terms which could easily be strengthened by a New Testament reading. There is certainly a case to be made for having two lessons in a Remembrance service, which is not always the case except when Memorial is combined with normal Sunday worship. (This latter point of making the Sunday Eucharist into a Remembrance service will be dealt with later).

The other popular Apocryphal source is, of course, Ecclesiasticus. One example is 2, 1-11, the final verse of which is:

"For the Lord is compassionate and merciful; he forgives sins and saves in time of affliction."

The reading as a whole is a call to trust in the Lord and is rather general in outlook, with only the last verse recalling comfort to those who remember. Again, a carefully selected New Testament reading could emphasise the message of salvation. Perhaps the

classic Remembrance reading is, however, Ecclesiasticus 44, 1-4 and 7-15, "Let us now praise famous men." With reference to the prayer quoted above - "Help us to recognise the incalculable debt we owe them" - this is an extremely apt reading. Remembrance is about both past and future, and this provides a respectful and dignified memorial of the dead. Verse 14, "and their name lives to all generations" is a reminder that Remembrance provides a necessary service. Remembrance Sunday is an opportunity not to glorify war, but to recall its horrors; to be reminded of the past is also to hope that the future will be somehow better.

In the New Testament the range is no less great, and a few examples will serve to illustrate this. A popular reading is, of course, John 15, 9-17, which contains verse 13, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." In the right setting this is a powerful and moving passage. The danger here would be the stressing of a "lesser Calvaries" interpretation at the expense of Christ's own sacrifice. In a Remembrance service, however, the congregation is there to remind itself of the death of people in war, and the parallel is not entirely inappropriate. For a military congregation, Ephesians 6, 10-20, is a useful lesson. The language of the armour of God and the sword of the Spirit is a reminder that there is a greater call than the call to fight for King and country. Finally, Revelation is a popular source for Remembrance lessons, if not for anything else. The classic here is John's vision of the new Jerusalem in 21, 1-7. This would be a good companion to the passage from Ecclesiasticus 44, giving a useful balance of memorial and future hope.

The A S B at least has suggestions to make in the area of readings for Remembrance services. However, it would be fair to say that the majority of Remembrance Sunday services in ordinary parish churches are simply the regular Eucharist with appropriate readings. This would not, perhaps, be the case with something like a "Civic Service" which might be expected to be more of a "hymn sandwich". In this case, it is extraordinary to find that there is a special section for "Civic Occasions" (p.975) but none for Remembrance Sunday. The reasons for this are set out in Appendix VII, which is a letter from the former head of the Liturgical Commission, the Dean of York. The idea that Remembrance Sunday and "Animal Sunday" come into the same category is surely unthinkable. So, suggestions for readings are relegated to the tables for Morning and Evening Prayer, and Holy Communion (pp 984, 1014 and 1049) after the ordinary readings for the Seventh Sunday before Christmas. (There is, interestingly, a section for "The Peace of the World", if not one for Remembrance of those who fought to attain it).

To be fair to the A S B, the selection of readings, when it is finally unearthed, is balanced and useful. There are three Old Testament readings, two from Isaiah and one from Ezekiel. These are what might be expected. Isaiah speaks of "beating swords into ploughshares" and the leopard lying down with the kid. The Ezekial passage is the vision of the valley of dry bones. Unfortunately the popular readings from Apocrypha are not included, but the New Testament selection has four suggestions. Two of these, John 15, 9-17 and Rev. 21, 1-7, have been discussed above. The others are the Beatitudes in Matthew, and Romans 8, 31-39, which shows that "nothing will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord." The A S B list is useful, then, even though it could be wished that a special section, reflecting

the Church's interest in Remembrance Sunday, had been included.

The sources used for memorial inscriptions provide an interesting postscript to the above discussion of readings. Perhaps the most widespread is John 15, 13: "Greater love hath no man...." The choice is almost endless, of course. The Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey has John 15, 13, along with other similar texts:

2 Corinthians 6,9 - "Unknown and yet well known"

- "Dying and behold we live"

2 Timothy 2,19 - "The Lord knoweth them that are his"

The passage from Ecclesiasticus 44 is a rich source of inscriptions, such as "Their glory shall not be blotted out" (v 13) or "Their name liveth forevermore" (v 14). It is too late to deplore this sort of glorification of death in war. Rather it is better to accept and try to understand the atmosphere in which these memorials were erected. A fine example, which directs the reader to the concept of everlasting life, is in All Saints', Cuddesdon:

"He asked life of thee and thou givest him a long life: even for ever and ever" (Psalm 21, 4)

Almost as popular is the quotation from Binyon's "For the Fallen", "They shall grow not old...." This first appeared as early as 1914, and captured exactly the sentiment which was expressed after the war. Indeed, it is invariably a part of Remembrance services today, and is quoted in Silk's book (see above) for use in Alternative Services.

The choice of prayers and readings then, can be a difficult task. Judging by some past examples, it can also be an uncritical exercise. There can be hardly any justification today for using hymns such as "O Valiant Hearts" and "Once to every man and nation".

The thought that these hymns could be "a vital part of our national religious tradition" is simply ridiculous. Similarly, prayers and readings which dwell too much on sacrifice and victory are to be avoided. The A S B is some help here although not as much as could be desired; but tasteful prayers are available and could be especially composed, if the matter were given careful thought and consideration.

In an international atmosphere which is far from peaceful, the churches cannot pretend that "real" wars are no longer fought. As long as there are armed forces, then some sort of liturgical recognition of their work is important. Not, as has been said, to promote "lesser Calvaries" theology, but more realistically to be used as a reminder that the world is imperfect, and that the purging of sin is a future, not a present phenomenon.

The Falklands Islands Service ¹³

The service in St. Paul's Cathedral on 26th July 1982 was the most important, and the most public, expression of the Church of England's response to the Falklands conflict. As such, a great responsibility was laid upon the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral. In spite of criticisms and misgivings in the press beforehand, the service has come to be seen as an excellent example of the Church's correctly interpreting the mood and wish of the nation. It is clear that some service was wanted, and it was important that as many people as possible were able to witness it. Thus, it was broadcast live, both on radio and television - a truly national event given national coverage.

The actual formal request for a service to be held came from the heart of the Government itself. The Dean of St. Paul's was

contacted by a senior civil servant in the Ministry of Defence, who cannot but have operated upon the orders of the Prime Minister. Although the suggestion came from the Government, the structure and content of the service was left in the hands of the Cathedral clergy; the Dean also received some guidelines from Archbishop Runcie which were eventually to be incorporated into the service. The most universally approved suggestion was that the service should have an ecumenical tone, indeed it should be "fully ecumenical". There was a little public misgiving about this, as will be seen, but not so much as to affect the tone. Also important was that the Church should not be seen to be offering a triumphal celebration; the desired tone was to be of ecumenism and reconciliation.

An interesting question which arose early in the planning stages was of a title for the service. Possibilities such as "A Service of Thanksgiving and Reconciliation", or perhaps "...for Victory" were considered to be either too specific and exclusive, or offensive. So although the reason for the service was that the conflict had ended, the title was rightly totally neutral: "The Falklands Islands Service". As news of the likely contents of the service appeared, various public and private suggestions were made as to how it should be compiled. One such suggestion, which aroused public discussion, but which was not taken up, was that the service should be "a great service of memorial for the dead on both sides, conducted in English and Spanish by Catholic and Protestant together."¹⁴ This would have included the saying of the Lord's Prayer in Spanish, and the use of an Argentinian representative at the service. The Dean received a small number of letters: 33 either supported or demanded the type of service which the Chapter intended to produce; 10 wanted more of a celebration of victory, and disapproved of the theme of reconciliation.

One such correspondent said: "...if the service takes place as stated, the power of God will come down on St. Paul's. The holy shall be at peace." The prophecy remains unfulfilled. The ecumenical element was very important, and Cardinal Hume and Dr. Kenneth Greet were invited to compose and read their own prayers. (Some criticism was directed at the inclusion of Dr. Greet, who is a noted pacifist, but this again was ignored). One proposal which greatly encouraged the fully ecumenical service was that of Pax Christi and others to hold a "counter-service" on the Cathedral steps, at the same time as the main service. The main reason for the service being as it was, however, was quite simply that it was felt to be the most appropriate Christian expression.

Groundwork for the service began on 30th June, with a meeting at St. Paul's Deanery. Present were representatives from the major denominations who were to take part, Lambeth and Buckingham Palaces, the Ministry of Defence and the Chapter. It was decided that the three themes of the service should be thanksgiving, remembrance, and peace and reconciliation, and that militarism should be kept to a minimum. (It was largely on the basis of these acceptable contents that Hume and Greet agreed to take part). An important emphasis which was also borne in mind was that it was, primarily, a St. Paul's occasion. This meant that the contents were ultimately in the hands of the Dean and Chapter, and outside pressures could be justifiably ignored. As the Dean said, it was not going to be a Guards Chapel service, but a genuine Christian service.

Clifford Longley, writing in The Times seems to have anticipated well the contents of the Falklands Service. It had to transcend "the limitations and indeed dangers of a victory celebration... and patriotism too."¹⁵ A fully ecumenical service was also expected

which, besides including church leaders other than Anglicans, "ought also to mean rising above the differences in the nation on the wisdom of the South Atlantic operation: a celebration of peace rather than of war." Introduction of the theme of reconciliation would set a "severe brake on any tone of self-congratulation: at least half the job has not yet been done." The article, though short, anticipates much of what was to be included, and reflects a more balanced tone than, say, Andrew Alexander's in the Daily Mail, whose article "Why I won't be going to St. Paul's" was far less satisfactory.¹⁶

After the opening hymn, "Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven", the Dean set the three-fold tone of the whole service in his bidding prayer:

"We meet to worship God. We thank Him for the cessation of hostilities in the South Atlantic and for the courage, determination and endurance of those who took part, and for the safe return of so many.

We remember the fallen and commend them to God's keeping. May he work in them the good purpose of his perfect will. We pray for the wounded and all who care for them. We seek to share the sufferings of those who mourn, and pray that God may strengthen them now and in the years ahead.

We pray for reconstruction in the Falkland Islands and for the reunion of divided families. We pray for peace and reconciliation in the South Atlantic. Let this service unite us, strengthen our spirit and sustain our hopes so that we commit ourselves to be makers of peace in a divided world."

Prayers of Thanksgiving were led by the Chaplain of the Fleet; who used the General Thanksgiving in its alternative form¹⁷ and the hymn "All my hope on God is founded" was followed by the first

lesson. This was Micah 4, 1-4, an Old Testament vision of peace, and was read by the Moderator of the United Reformed Church.¹⁸

The second section, for Remembrance, began with a sentence read by a member of the Task Force: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." (Deut. 33,27). After the hymn "Let saints on earth in concert sing", the second lesson, Matthew 5, 1-12 (the Beatitudes) was read by Rev. David Cooper, Chaplain to "2 Para." Then, before the sermon, was Bainton's setting of St. John the Divine's vision of peace from Revelations 21, 1-4. Prayers for those wounded "in recent conflict" were led by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland;¹⁹ Cardinal Hume led the prayers for remembrance:

"God our Father, in whom the dead find life, listen we beseech you to our prayers. Grant that all who have fallen in battle may find in you the peace which this world cannot give, and enjoy eternal life."

The section ended with one of the most characteristic features of Remembrance liturgies - the Last Post and Reveille, interrupted by two minutes' silence.

"Peace and Reconciliation" began with another sentence (John 14, 27) read by a member of the Task Force. Then "The Lord's my Shepherd" was followed by the third lesson, Ephesians 4, 25-end, which was read by Canon Douglas Webster, being Canon-in-Residence. The Bishop of London introduced the Confession and gave the Absolution, before the prayers for Peace, written and led by the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council:²⁰

"God of all nations, we thank you for the concern for peace which grows in the hearts and minds of ordinary people the world over. Use that concern to create structures of peace and a new

atmosphere of co-operation. Help us to identify the common enemies of all mankind and to work together for the eradication of poverty, hunger and disease. Give us the will to build defences against these instead of against each other."

The service concluded with the Lord's Prayer, the Blessing, from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the National Anthem.

The Archbishop's sermon appeared next day in The Times under the headline "Runcie praises courage in the Falklands and remembers Ulster and Argentina." He began by picking up the first points of the Dean's bidding prayer. Referring to eye-witness accounts he praised the restraint with which the battles were fought and said of the soldiers, in no uncertain terms: "It is right to be proud of such men." In fact the whole sermon was constructed around the same three themes that made up the service. Moving on to Remembrance he said: "We must not forget: our prayers for remembrance will not end this day." Clifford Longley, in the article already referred to, had noted that "If the theme were to be peace and reconciliation, no better text exists than the Pope's address at Coventry."²¹ It came as no surprise, therefore, to hear this same reference - "war should belong to the tragic past...." To those who thought that the service should have been a victory parade, the Archbishop pointed out strongly that "War is a sign of human failure and everything we say and do in this service must be in that context. The problem is that war belongs to the tragic present as well as to the tragic past." In the same breath, then, he had also shown that it is as naive to deny the reality (and perhaps the inevitability) of war today as it is to glorify it. The arms trade is another mark of the tragic present which it is impossible to ignore. The whole sermon turns upon the concept of man's relationship to God:

"War springs from the love and loyalty which should be offered to God being applied to some God substitute, one of the most dangerous being nationalism."

So, the prayers of the service had not been simply for the British dead and wounded: "The parent who comes here mourning the loss of a son may find here consolation, but also a spirit which enlarges our compassion to include all those Argentinian parents who have lost sons." Thus there could be no charge of nationalism in the service, which underlines the theme of man and God, giving a powerful end to a most apt and moving sermon: "Man without God is less than man....he can choose life in partnership with God the Father of all..."

Today we bring our mixture of thanksgiving, sorrows and aspirations for a better ordering of this world.

Pray God that he may purify, enlarge and re-direct these in the ways of his kingdom of love and peace. Amen."

Reaction to the service was mixed. As the Church Times reported:

"....several Conservative Members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister, were angry about the service, which they felt should have been a more rousing one of national rejoicing. The MP's (though not, apparently, Mrs. Thatcher) were also annoyed with the Archbishop of Canterbury for preaching a sermon that condemned war, appealed for reconciliation and mentioned Argentinian as well as British grief over casualties."²²

This seems to be a fair summary of the details. The Dean received over 250 letters after the service, of which 90% were full of praise - in the face of much press criticism. The 10% of critical letters are a mixed bag, and echoed the remarks of Julian Amery MP that the whole service was disgraceful and the sermon "more suitable for Buenos Aires than here."²³ One short note said simply:

"You hypocritical sanctimonious traitor. What happened to loyalty and love of country, and pride? To hell with your bloody religion, if it exists may you rot there." The many favourable letters received a reply from the Dean as did the sometimes unkind letters of criticism.

It is interesting to recount a well-attested report of the handling of the service in news reports. These tended to be critical at first, in the period immediately following. However, the next day the reports suddenly changed to accounts praising the service for the way it was appreciated by the families of those who died (and for whom the service was primarily intended). It is suggested that the Prime Minister received a telephone call from Buckingham Palace - possibly from Prince Philip - which spoke favourably of the service, especially its effects upon the bereaved.

Whether or not this is true is not particularly vital. What remains for inspection is the service itself. As a reaction to the conflict it contained nothing which could cause reasonable complaint. It showed the Church of England, in co-operation with the other denominations, providing a truly National (as opposed to nationalistic) service in a Christian context. It is worth saying again, that it was the single most important, and the most public, expression of the Church's response to the Falklands conflict.

Some Features of Remembrance Services

Although the point is debatable, it would seem correct to assert that most commemorations on Remembrance Sunday take place in the context of normal Sunday worship. The publicised services, in "civic" churches for example, or cathedrals, which are attended by the British Legion in large numbers are, of course, special

non-eucharistic occasions, of the sort which could not be staged by an ordinary parish church. Such an example is the Falklands Service in St. Paul's in 1982. This was clearly a special service of Remembrance, even though it was not held during "Remembrance-tide", and is referred to above.

As with any "special" service, it is difficult to avoid the appearance of a "hymn sandwich". There certainly seems no way round this in the case of Remembrance services, but certain liturgical acts help to liven an otherwise sombre occasion. For example, the "Act of Remembrance" is likely to consist of ex-servicemen, perhaps one from each of the armed forces, solemnly laying a wreath at the altar or memorial. If this takes place during a hymn, the movement can enhance the singing of what might otherwise have been "yet another" hymn. The other characteristic feature of these occasions is the two minutes' silence which, as has been seen, first occurred in the original Armistice service in 1919. Whatever the timing and content of the service it is an excellent piece of dramatic liturgy to have a complete halt in the proceedings on the stroke of eleven. In the case of a eucharistic setting, of course, extreme care would have to be taken to ensure that, for example, the "Eucharistic Prayer" was not disrupted. The two minutes' silence is more properly a part of the liturgy of the word. A popular inclusion in Remembrance services, mentioned above, is a form of litany derived from Binyon's "For the Fallen", the response being "We will remember them."

The general tone of Remembrance services has changed little since their inception. On the whole there is thanksgiving for the sacrifice of soldiers rather than glorification of what they have done, and this is surely more palatable. Such a feature

as in the 1916 service already referred to: "The Troops will give three cheers for the King" seems fortunately not to have found favour and is not a regular feature of Remembrance liturgy. Similarly, the type of prayers used to commemorate the end of the War in 1945 were of an unusually jingoistic tone. This may be understandable under the circumstances, although this is no excuse:

"By God's grace we have been chosen to achieve Victory in this War. Trampled under our feet lie the evil powers that aimed at the overthrow of God's rule, and before us lie the diverse paths of peace." (April 1945, Thanksgiving Service)

By coincidence, the same service was based around an extremely useful threefold structure which is a good basis for any Remembrance service. The three sections are Confession, Thanksgiving and Dedication; these themes relate present experience to the work of others and in a non-eucharistic setting could make a sensitive and palatable service.

The sermon is a vital part of any Remembrance service. If the liturgy is presented well, a good address can bring it together and give the service a distinctively Christian tone which might not be discernible from the lessons and hymns. This can be seen in the sermon for Remembrance Sunday 1982, by Alan Wilkinson, who concludes:

"We do not lose hope, because God still hopes. We can only believe that there is a meaning and purpose in the prolonged passion of mankind if we believe God finds a purpose in it. And just occasionally....we get a fleeting glimpse of what that meaning might be - that, intolerable as it might seem evil, while remaining evil, has an indispensable part in the creation of good."²⁶

1982 saw the remarkable events which led to the tragedy of hostilities in the Falkland Islands. As has been seen, the service of Thanksgiving in St. Paul's Cathedral on 26th July 1982 was of the same threefold structure seen above, the sections being Thanksgiving, Remembrance and Reconciliation. Although derided by some right-wing Members of Parliament and journalists, the Service seems to have caught perfectly the wishes of the nation as a whole, and it provides a good example of what ought and ought not to appear in a Remembrance Service of today.

Certainly, hymns such as "O Valiant Hearts" are best forgotten. General hymns, such as "Praise my soul", "All my hope on God is founded" (both in the Falklands Service) and "O God our help" are far better, in terms both of theology and sensitivity. The choice of readings is, as has been seen, extremely wide, and the A S B goes some way to providing suggestions. Whatever is chosen, of course, can be explained through the sermon, which is a vital part of the service. Prayers are worthless if they become a glorification of war, or suggest that those defeated in war were God's enemies all along. A Collect for Remembrance would be a very useful prayer, but the A S B lacks this inclusion, for the reasons Dr. Jasper has suggested, albeit unsatisfactorily. David Silk suggests the following which might be used as a collect:

"Almighty and eternal God, from whose love in Christ we cannot be parted, either by death or life: hear our prayers and thanksgivings for all whom we remember this day: fulfil in them the purpose of your love, and bring us all, with them, to your eternal joy."²⁷

Traditional parts of Remembrance liturgy, such as those noted above, are what gives a service a sense of continuity with the past.

As such, their inclusion is correct. (If laying of wreaths at the altar is perhaps a little inappropriate, some form of procession is still to be encouraged, to add to the "colour" of the service).

It is clear that the Church must necessarily come to terms with Remembrance Sunday. There is still a desire in some, to recall what may have been the most memorable events of a lifetime, and it is all too easy to cause offence. If criticism of war is justifiable, denigration of those who have given their lives is not. The Church must decide how it wishes to remember the victims of war, in spite of the doubts of the liturgical commission. And if events like the Falklands Conflict are to remain a feature of the national life then the Church has a duty to help people set their thoughts and feelings in a truly Christian context.

CHAPTER 4THEOLOGY IN PRACTICE: ARMY CHAPLAINCY

The question of the churches' involvement in the armed forces is a very present one. With the existence of many denominational "peace groups" it is increasingly recognised that the existence of Army chaplains indicates a dichotomy in the presentation of the gospel as a whole. Thus a consideration will be given of the general aspects of chaplaincy work, followed by the differences between peacetime and wartime roles. Obviously many points will arise, questioning the role and operation of the Army Chaplain. It is proposed to try and deal with these together at the end; in this way, the whole area can be discussed at once, and the possible criticisms balanced with recognition of successful ministry.

A few notes may be useful about the organisation of chaplains in the British Army. Under the present system the RACHD is divided into two separate sections: Roman Catholic and Other Denominations. In the latter category the largest body represented is the Church of England, but there are large numbers also of Church of Scotland, Methodist, United Reformed and Baptist ministers. This means that non-Roman Catholic congregations can expect to have a padre from any of the denominations and, conversely, an Anglican chaplain is likely to have representatives from many churches. This can lead to a greater experience of ecumenical co-operation than might be possible in a civilian church, and it gives a rich first hand view of the Christian church as it has diversified in Britain. Of course, where possible, the RACHD tries to link chaplains with the units where their denominations are strongly represented. Thus, for example, the Scots Guards would ideally have a padre from the Church of Scotland.

During the discussion and description of the Army Chaplain's role, it will be useful to consider some of the immediate anomalies which come to mind. The chaplain wears a military uniform, yet claims the office of priest. Moreover, he is an officer, but should be an equal. It is suggested that the ministry of an army chaplain is, as far as possible, the same as that of a parish priest, but these military considerations may be thought to be of particular hindrance.

General Aspects of Army Chaplaincy

All types of chaplaincy work have in common the fact that the minister is involved with people in their work-place as opposed to their dwelling-place. In the case of Army chaplaincy, the responsibility is in both areas. As chaplain to the regiment, his function is to minister both to soldiers and their families, at work and at home. Regulations regarding chaplains may not be quoted, but general principles derived from these can at least be suggested.

The point has already been made that padres consider themselves to be parish priests who just happen to be in uniform. This is more than merely fantasy. The practice and observance of religion are regarded as extremely important, and it is a matter of duty to ensure that an individual is able to carry on his religious life. Further to this, the padre is helped by the fact that he is not the only officer whose brief is to encourage religion in a garrison. Part of a Commanding Officer's duty involves setting a good example in religious observance, and encouraging it in others. Limited experience has suggested that, if no particular faith is professed by a Commanding Officer, there is at least no reduction in support given to the padre. In theory, under

regulations,¹ it would be quite out of the question for a Commanding Officer to hinder the priestly functions of a padre. Also, the "seal of the confessional" is as sacred in military life as in civilian. Accordingly the Commanding Officer is expected to realise that his chaplain may receive information to which he cannot be a party. It is evident, therefore, that a chaplain remains first and foremost a priest or minister in his own church.

Uniforms and badges of rank are not in themselves a hindrance to the chaplain's work. On the contrary most would say that they are an advantage. In the first place, it is worth noting that chaplains are not referred to by their rank. That is to say that, whether captain or colonel, the ecclesiastical title is used not only by preference but by regulation also; the most common title is, of course, "Padre". This practice helps to break down barriers of rank, and puts "the padre" somewhat apart from the everyday rank structure. Also, access to the padre is unrestricted: any soldier wishing to see the padre can do so without permission from anyone, and in confidence. It could be said that, further to break down barriers, a necessary step would be to abolish uniform for padres. The reasoning behind this would presumably be that it would make a padre's role as a clergyman more apparent, and he would therefore be more approachable. This is not felt to be a worthwhile suggestion, however. A society where all structures are of a particular type would become uneasy if one of those structures were to change dramatically. The army's society is bound up with uniforms. Doctors, lawyers, drivers, managers - all these wear uniform. It is a means by which different people know immediately how to respond to each other and the padre fits well into this situation. The saluting of officers includes padres: to this

extent they participate in the rank system. However, this does mean that the army's society recognises the need to involve padres in an equivalent role to those in command. Thus, uniform and badges of rank present something of a paradox. At one level, the chaplain is an officer - he is saluted because of his rank. Of more importance, however, is the fact that in dealing with soldiers of any rank, the chaplain's own relative rank is disregarded. For a clergyman to adopt the army uniform, therefore, is not the hindrance to ministry which it might seem. In civilian life, the clerical collar is little other than a uniform/rank indication. So, it may be said in a uniformed society, uniform is necessary, for acceptance into that society. Soldiers know how to react to other soldiers; a chaplain can receive immediate respect because he is, like them, in uniform; he is "the padre".

A reflection of this "dual status" may be seen in the reporting system which is a normal part of army life. Reports upon a chaplain's work are made annually, by two people. One is his senior chaplain, the other is his commanding officer. This leads to the surprising position of a clergyman's work being reported upon by a secular superior. Although it is expected that CO's support their padres, it is possible that an atheist CO may have to make a report on a Christian padre. It is not likely that a similar situation occurs in civilian life!

Within a given situation, the chaplain's function, apart from making and sustaining Christians, can be said to fall into three broad categories - pastoral care, welfare and religious worship. In the first area, the prime requisite is that chaplains identify themselves with the units they are serving. It is important to get to know as many as possible of the soldiers and their families,

and visiting is as important to army families as it is to civilians. Welfare is a separate area, with its own officer. However, in conjunction with his pastoral duties, a chaplain may be able to identify specific welfare problems which could be brought to the attention of the CO (or appropriate authority) more quickly than normal. The fewer the welfare problems, the more efficient the unit. There is usually a separate welfare or "Families" officer in a garrison, and he and the chaplain find it to their mutual advantage to work together. The question of the time of services is left to local circumstances. The main emphasis is given to Sundays, when the Family Services should be timed to encourage the maximum attendance by all ranks and their families. If services are held during the week, they fit in with working and training schedules; some suggestions may be seen in A Book of Army Prayers which contain fifteen specimen forms.

The Army does not prevent its chaplains from maintaining a strong, personal spiritual life. Part of a CO's responsibility is to see that it is possible for the unit chaplain to spend two weeks in each year in retreat. Apart from this, there is ample opportunity to meet other chaplains, either at Bagshot Park, or Church House in BAOR. Adequate time is also ensured for private devotions and study - a feature which might often be quite impossible in civilian work. In most cases, because quarter areas are often widespread, the essential need for transport is met by the army, making urgent pastoral visiting no less possible than in an ordinary parish.

Most people would recognise the value of having chaplains in the armed services. There can be no serious objection to the fact that soldiers have as much right to Christian ministry as

anyone. As an Army Chaplain, there is the chance of total identification with those ministered to. Many civilian clergy have little means of contact with people at their places of work, and few opportunities of gaining a real insight into the industrial and commercial life of the neighbourhood. On the contrary, chaplains live and work with their men, having the opportunity to minister both at home and at work. A feature often given as a major delight for chaplains is that there are no restrictions on their ministry. That is no church quotas, endless committees, fund raising activities, fabric repairs, to worry about. In the booklèt designed to give information to prospective chaplains a very important point is made: that "not everyone is called to this work." It must be remembered that all forms of chaplaincy work involve response to a call, and Army chaplains are conscious that they are priests called to a particular ministry. As has been seen, uniform and rank are a help rather than a hindrance in the performance of their ministry, and the point may be made once again: the army chaplain is first and foremost a priest of the church. He brings Christ to the workplace (and battlefield) of the soldier, and to his home and family. An investigation into differing aspects of peacetime and wartime chaplaincy work is now necessary.

The Chaplain in Peacetime

A major difference between peacetime and wartime for the chaplain is that, in the latter, there would be no possibility of work with families. The reason for this is quite clear, and it is in this section that all "families" ministry will be discussed. However, the work with soldiers in the garrison is the most distinctive role for chaplains, and this will be investigated before the more "parish-like" families aspect of ministry.

The garrison is more than a workplace. Whilst this is its

main daytime role, it is also where all the single soldiers live, in barracks or messes. Thus a major part of the chaplain's work is taken up visiting these areas. Unlike, say, a factory, the garrison work areas vary considerably, from REME vehicle maintenance workshops to the gymnasium, from the cookhouse to the guardroom. Because of his uniform and status, the chaplain is able to walk freely around the garrison area, and is hopefully received in a warm manner by most soldiers. Because the army is such a structured organisation, based on interdependent units, it is not difficult to find points of contact between the padre and his men. He is by no means an outsider, but rather one of the men, with his own role, and who plays a part in the structure as a whole.

Visiting can work the other way, as well. Just as in many civilian parishes, a good idea is a "surgery" hour, when men may expect to find the padre in his office on the camp. A chaplain is unique amongst officers in that he may be approached without reference to a superior - unlike the CO for example. The proper channel of access to the chaplain is direct, containing no Sergeant Majors, Platoon Commanders and so on. On the other hand, a soldier may be ordered to see the chaplain, if it is felt that his particular problem falls within his brief. So, marital problems, sexual problems, emotional problems, might all come under this category, to say nothing of the man who has to explain to the chaplain why he wants to change his religion!

Many chaplains find themselves with other forms of chaplaincy work - in a military hospital, or dealing with offenders in the garrison detention areas (usually the guard room). These areas are thus also on the visiting list. Most hospitals carry only a small range of cases: long term illness would most probably be

referred to civilian hospitals. So, the turnover is quite rapid, as is that of prisoners in the guard room. Incidentally, although prisoners' recreational rights are withdrawn, they are allowed to attend church on Sundays, a situation which may lead to the most unexpected augmentation of a congregation!

A most important role for the chaplain is his teaching role. Part of the requirements of chaplains is that they will carry out a programme of character training for all ranks. CO's are responsible for arranging these hours, and all available personnel are encouraged to attend. The content of what is called "Padre's Hour" varies considerably and involves encouraging soldiers to think of questions like "What is a man?", or issues of "Rules and Behaviour". In Junior Training Units, the chaplain acts as a sort of school chaplain with "in loco parentis" responsibilities. Soldiers become adults from the age of 17½, but this training is still thought necessary.

Obviously, the padre will teach with a Christian bias but, as in all religious matters, there is no compulsion. The main intention behind the teaching programme is to stimulate discussion and to challenge assumptions.

Because the RACHD is constantly under-manned, non-Roman Catholic congregations are often quite diverse in their content. Similarly, the structure of the Department means that there are Senior Chaplains from different denominations. This is a positive form of ecumenical operation, rarely found in civilian life, with "recognised ministry" and "shared buildings" and so on. The atmosphere is very much one of Christians worshipping together, bound together not just by uniforms, but above all by a common faith. This unity in religious worship spills over into larger occasions such as Remembrance

Day. Properly conducted, this need not be dominated by militarism and is better (and frequently) seen as a reminder of all that is futile in war. The banners are paraded, but not at the expense of the Cross, which stands as the symbol of dedication and love. A similar focus of feeling may be seen at military funerals. Whether death results from war or other causes, it is always a tragedy in a community which lives as close to death as the army.

The chaplain, single or married, is entitled to a house in a quartering area, showing clearly the responsibility, recognised by the army, that he has for wives and families as well as soldiers. There are clearly practical and pastoral reasons for this dual responsibility, the main one obviously being that, as Christian ministry should be available to soldiers, it should also be available to their families. From the army's point of view, a soldier with problems at home is likely to be a bad soldier, and strong efforts are made to ensure that all is done to encourage a happy family life.

In matters concerning families, the role of chaplain is close to that of a civilian parish priest. This is especially true in overseas postings where clusters of British people in quartering areas have very much a parochial outlook, and see the garrison church as the parish church. Thus there has to be a great emphasis upon visiting. A particular matter for concern is, for example, the soldier who marries a young girl and brings her to a garrison, perhaps at the other end of the country from where she was brought up (e.g. the Scots Guards at Tidworth). To be aware beforehand of possible problems gives the padre a good opportunity to establish links with a family in its earliest days, which may last for the soldier's entire army career and beyond.

As far as marital problems are concerned, the army is an efficient structure for locating them early on. As has been mentioned above, the soldier with problems is likely to be a bad soldier. Thus if a superior notices a loss of performance at work, the chaplain can be contacted to check if the home situation is the cause. In working closely with the welfare side of the army's organisation, problems may be identified and solved at least as quickly as in civilian life, simply because it is in the army's interest to have a high level of morale. Of course, part of the chaplain's contact with families is made during hospital visits, which apply to both soldiers and their families.

On the educational side, the padre is expected to be seen in the schools with children, as much as soldiers in Padre's Hours. If it is convenient, then he may take lessons, or at least assemblies. With this inclusion it may be clearly seen that the chaplain is ministering to all those involved in army life - soldiers, their wives and families.

There is a large area which covers under the overall control of the garrison chaplain, although he is of course responsible to his senior chaplain. This area may be dealt with in two brief sections, the garrison church and other, related, organisations. Sunday is observed as far as possible as a day of rest in the army. Part of the reason for this is specifically to allow Christian worship, and every encouragement and help is given to those who want it. It has already been mentioned that there are no worries about quotas, maintenance and the like. The army is as responsible for its churches as it is for its guardrooms. If it is difficult for people to get to the garrison church, transport is laid on by the army, free of charge. It must be said that few single

soldiers attend regular worship. The appeal seems to be to the older (by military standards) married men and their families, whose life is enriched by membership of the church. This of course begs the questions raised recently of the church's view of single people, which is often seen as inadequate. At least in the army the chaplain is able to minister to people who would be unlikely to have any contact at all with any church.

As with most parish churches, there is often a host of organisations attached to garrison churches, which come under the chaplain's control. Naturally there is usually a church council or its equivalent made up of members of the regular congregation. This has the same function as the PCC, although possibly has rather less to do, particularly with relation to fabric funds. Also closely involved with the congregation is the Guild of St. Helena, which is for army wives. Cubs, Scouts, Brownies and Guides are all regularly found in garrisons, as is the Sunday School. All these combine to give a picture not far removed from that of a typical parish in the Church of England. Yet the chaplain is minister to all, both in the garrison and in the home, at work and at rest. However, this picture changes somewhat in wartime, as will be seen.

The Chaplain in Wartime

By its very nature, the army is in constant readiness to fight if it is needed. This was illustrated relatively recently, tragically and dramatically, in the Falklands Crisis. Chaplains are expected to accompany their units, ministering full time to the needs of soldiers in combat. For the purpose of the present study, "wartime" should be thought of as "active situations". This includes the Ulster situation of Military aid to a Civilian power and operational exercises, which simulate a wartime scenario.

It is interesting to note the position of International Law regarding the role of a chaplain. The Law of Armed Conflict states the following:

"....Chaplains....are non-combatants. They may not take part in hostilities....They are protected from attack under the Geneva Conventions. Their protected status must not be used as a shield for military operations.

Chaplains attached to the armed forces have protected status and may not be attacked. They wear an armband showing the Geneva emblem and carry a special ID card. They may not be armed. If captured they may be "retained" to meet the spiritual needs of Prisoners of War of their own forces. They have direct access to the camp authorities and must be allowed access to Prisoners of War in outside detachments."²

This makes the point very clearly that chaplains are seen universally as ministers as opposed to ordained soldiers. Even as prisoners of war they are accorded special rights of access to camp authorities and others. An important phrase, however, is: "They may not be armed". If a chaplain were to take up arms against an aggressor, it would mean that his non-combatant special status would be forfeited. In the light of this it is possible to see the wide respect for the religious needs of soldiers, even in captivity.

So, at wartime, the basic role of a chaplain is the same as in peacetime: to administer the Sacraments, and cater for the spiritual needs of the congregation. This may mean prayers before going into or after battle. This must not be thought of as asking God "to be on our side" which is clearly untheological. Rather the idea is to remind men of their mortality, and to comfort them in the loss of their friends. War usually happens because

of the government's failure to achieve diplomatic agreements. It is easy to criticise the man who is sent to achieve agreements by other means, and to forget that he is a last resort. War obviously means killing and suffering, and it would be a spiritually poor church which refrained from ministering to those who are in the midst of it. In wartime, of course, the administration of last rites and performance of the Burial service would presumably be a feature of the regular work of a chaplain. Here the chaplain has the advantage of his calling and status (as a priest and non-combatant): when those around him have little time, he can devote himself to the needs of the wounded and dying.

The care of the wounded is not left solely to the chaplains, of course. There is a very close link between the RACHD and another non-combatant unit, the Royal Army Medical Corps. These soldiers are trained medical orderlies, nurses and doctors, who operate from Regimental Aid Posts to deal with wounded brought from the battlefields. Thus, hospital visiting is a part of wartime, as well as peacetime, chaplaincy work. This co-operation with the RAMC is emphasised in military exercises, designed to simulate a possible wartime scenario. Basic to the survival even of a non-combatant are certain military skills. The aim of training in "military skills" is to enable chaplains to move with their units on operations without endangering the lives of members of the units. There are five basic areas - First Aid; Map Reading; Radio Voice procedure; Survival and Vehicle Maintenance.

Most units and, therefore, most chaplains, are faced at some time with "Operation Banner". This is a six month tour of duty in Northern Ireland. One of the essential tasks for the chaplain is to maintain links with families at home, as much as it is to

accompany men on patrol, and be with them at all times. Northern Ireland is a situation where chaplain and men are together all the time and it is important to show that Christ can be represented on the Falls Road, and in a bomb attack, and so on.

The Falklands Conflict again illustrates the role of the church in modern warfare. Apart from spiritual strength, it was very much felt that chaplains should be totally integrated with their units. As Rev. David Cooper said:

"We must be part of the military set up. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't criticise it, but I think we must understand how the system works...."³

This involves the military skills mentioned before, as well as the performance of services and administration of Sacraments. In one day, Rev. David Heaver buried 18 members of his unit. Above all, it seems, there is a sense amongst padres that Christ has to be represented in wartime:

"Doing what you have to do, despite your fear, is what we should be doing....I have no doubt at all that we need good priests when we have a war; priests who can talk sensibly about Christ and show Him in their lives."⁴

Army Chaplains in the Falklands Conflict

The fact that the Church was represented in the area of the hardest fighting during the Falklands conflict is significant. The chaplains were there as a matter of military duty - they were attached to the units which were sent to the Islands. However, they were also there to represent Christ as far as possible: surely a difficult task on a battlefield. As the ships sailed, there was a general feeling that the conflict would have ended before the fighting broke out. The atmosphere at the send off, with

crowds cheering at Portsmouth, was very different from the reception at the Falklands. As Rev. David Cooper, attached to 2nd Battalion the Parachute Regiment, said:

"I was concerned in fact all the way down on the ship that people seemed to think it was going to be a bit like an exercise.... I had a feeling that it was not going to be as pleasant as everybody thought it was going to be."⁵

By the time the "QEII" sailed, on May 12th, serious fighting had already occurred - the "Belgrano" and "Sheffield" had been lost - and the atmosphere had changed, to "Padre, as long as we don't need you, we'll be alright."⁶

It was possible, during the voyage to the South Atlantic, to hold a regular round of Sunday services. For example, the "QEII" was well served with chaplains, having three, Church of England, Church of Scotland and Roman Catholic; services were held in the ship's theatre. Likewise the "Canberra", which had sailed from Southampton on 9th April, held interdenominational services in the ship's cinema: "The conflict with Argentina was hardly mentioned. But a Marine padre did read out a letter from a senior Royal Naval Roman Catholic chaplain in which he mentioned criticism by Cardinal Hume of Argentine aggression."⁷ On the Canberra, which had four chaplains on board, a daily mid-day service was also held which, although attended by only a small number - perhaps nine or ten - was much appreciated. By contrast with the luxury liners, the ferry, "Norland", had only one chaplain. There the main service was on the helideck, attended regularly by as many as two hundred men. This was followed by a smaller celebration of Holy Communion in one of the ship's lounges where the average number of communicants was fifty. Although the daily services

were attended by only a few, they were a very valuable witness.

Rev. Peter Brooke of the Welsh Guards had this to say:

"More significant for me was a small group of six or seven of us who met for prayer each morning between breakfast sittings. One who prayed with us did not return. How can we measure the spiritual importance of these sacred moments for him?"⁸

This brings home the reality of what the church was faced with during the conflict: preparing for the fact that what was about to happen would undoubtedly end in death for some of those present. (The Welsh Guards were severely hit in the Bluff Cove attack).

Sunday worship was not a priority after the landings on the Islands at San Carlos Bay. Regular services ceased in the confusion of activity - "Sunday as Sunday ceased to exist and I held services when I could."⁹ Rev. Derek Heaver was on the Islands for only two Sundays. The first was at San Carlos where a service was held and was attended by civilians from the settlement, as well as the few soldiers who were not under orders to move. On Sunday, 13th June, he and his regiment were in the thick of the fighting, on Mount Longdon:

"....where we lost 23 men. That was a full day of shelling where we were so busy with the wounded and the dead. I found myself looking after the dead, caring for them, making them decent, putting them to one side, preparing them, taking personal possessions from them, documenting them. I thought of taking a service, but with the constant shelling, it didn't arise on that Sunday. But one thing that I did do that day was to get back by helicopter to Teal Inlet in the late afternoon where I buried eighteen Paras, sharing the service with the Marines and in the end there were twenty-four of them buried at that service."¹⁰

The tragic importance of having a padre was shown at the very least by the need of funeral services. Also important, however, was the fact that the Task Force was an attacking force, likely to engage in battle with an "enemy". Rev. Cooper had plenty of time to try and focus men's thoughts on the possible realities of what lay ahead. One point to make was about casualties, which would have to be left behind whilst an "objective" was being pursued. An important point which arose from this was that: "our aim was to seize the objective and not to kill the enemy....a distinction we should always make."

Whilst fighting was actually taking place, the chaplains based themselves at their respective "Regimental Aid Post". For Heaven, this was a place from which, during the day, he could visit the trenches keeping the men up to date with information - about the wounded, for example. Similarly, Cooper, who at Goose Green and Darwin was mostly busy with casualties - "as hard a fight as I think you will find the British Army has ever been involved in."¹¹ (This was the battle in which Col. H. Jones was killed). The position was somewhat different for the Welsh Guards, who were attacked at Bluff Cove. When the injured were brought ashore, the chaplain was waiting for them: "As I recognised and spoke to some of the injured the value of being a pastor among men and of being known by them became blindingly obvious."¹² Helicopters took the injured to San Carlos Bay, where Cooper was organising their arrival at the surgical units. When hostilities ceased, and British troops moved into Port Stanley, a service was held in the Cathedral to mark their safe arrival.

It is very important to point out that the army chaplains felt able to maintain a Christian witness throughout the conflict.

Yet it must not be forgotten that Argentina is also a country with a strong Christian tradition. Tragically, it is more than likely that Christian killed Christian in the conflict: the quarrels of governments have a damaging effect upon our concept of the Body of Christ. Brooke, the Welsh Guards chaplain, had the opportunity to meet and talk with an Argentinian chaplain. "We exchanged greetings and insignia. When....we boarded for our return via Ascension Island, he left a note with the text from John 11,25: "I am the resurrection and the life says the Lord." It speaks for itself."¹³

However, it is inevitable that the chaplains' witness could not involve pacifism. As Heaver said: "...if we hadn't believed as Christians and as priests that somewhere along the line there might be a place where force has to be used we would not have been there. So we went and we stood there as a sign that Christ was present too. We stood there as representatives of Him."¹⁴

This would seem to be an accurate summing up of what many people felt about the conflict - that force may sometimes be necessary (e.g. Cardinal Hume). It was agreed that attendance at services was much less on the way back from the South Atlantic. However, the chaplains did far more than simply take services, as has been seen. The church provides chaplains to the forces, and they can be important above all as a constant Christian witness. Padre Cooper's words are worthy of repeat: "I have no doubt at all that we need good priests when we have a war; priests who can talk sensibly about Christ and show Him in their lives."¹⁵

Chaplains and Ministry

The above appraisal of the role and work of the army chaplain is, of course, not complete in itself. There are many vital and searching questions raised by such considerations, which relate

to the very ministry of Christ in an organisation ultimately geared to killing human beings.

A most useful background to these questions is provided by Alan Wilkinson, in "The Paradox of the Military Chaplain".¹⁶ He says, quite rightly, that "the chaplain's role is replete with ambiguities" and it is hoped to tackle some of these points below. To do this, it may be considered helpful to deal with different possible aspects of the ideal work of a priest, and to see if army chaplaincy in any way denies the chaplain full capability in any of these areas. Such aspects might include, for example, the priest as pastor, prophet, teacher, servant, and so on. (Alan Wilkinson's eight paradoxes must also be noted: 1) representing Jesus in a military institution; 2) the tensions of the non-combatant role; 3) catholicity and the national cause; 4) priest and officer; 5) the priestly and social roles; 6) the chaplain and the reinforcement of morale; 7) the prophetic role; 8) the churches' romanticising war. Clearly Wilkinson's paradoxes are based upon such aspects of ministry as have been mentioned and deal comprehensively with the questions raised in this study.

Certainly there are tensions in the ministry of the army chaplain which may be extremely difficult to resolve. As a chaplain, the padre can find himself involved in all kinds of activity but intimate with none. Is he an agent of social control or a catalyst identifying particular needs? An officer - thus unapproachable, or a spokesman for the other ranks - an agitator? The possible ways of easing these tensions may be less than attractive. He may, for example, play down one aspect - becoming primarily an officer, before all other concerns. He can, perhaps, ignore the tensions altogether, pretending blindly that they do not exist. Or he can live different lives for different situations, thus

ignoring the demands of the institution as a whole and negating any prophetic role.

Take, for example, the question of priesthood and military uniform. It can scarcely be ignored that there is a fundamental incongruity between Christianity and the military profession. Indeed, as has been mentioned above, the Lambeth Conferences since 1930 have spoken of war as "incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." The question here is whether the priest should wear the uniform of his colleagues. The advantages, stated above, are quite clear, but a little reflection shows at least equal disadvantages, for the uniform is that of an officer. Ideally this should be no hindrance, but in practice it is. In spite of his ecclesiastical title "padre", he is still "sir" as well; this is a tension which cannot be ignored. So, whilst there is a chance of total ministry, this is practically unachievable, and perhaps the question of rank is misleading: the fact of the priest in any uniform is surely central. Now, there can be no question that soldiers have a right to receive the ministry of Christ. Present rules seek to ease the tensions of being a priest and an officer by this very identification with the military establishment, but it is by no means the only way. Naval chaplains work well enough with no specific rank and occasionally ordinary civilian dress. Above all, the priest's role as 'servant' is made difficult by the uniform he wears; the only solution, if called to military chaplaincy, is to work under the difficulty.

In his role as Teacher, the chaplain has two areas of responsibility. In his first he is like any civilian priest, teaching Sunday by Sunday from the pulpit, the Word of God. In the second, he operates unlike the civilian, in the moral education of soldiers.

There is, of course, no way of knowing just how successful this is, especially as the sessions "Padres Hours" are all too often compulsory and perhaps, therefore, attended unwillingly. It must be said that the padre is obliged by the CO to provide these sessions, a difficult situation in which to teach.

As a pastor, the army chaplain could be at his best, having the opportunity to live and work amongst all of his flock. As has been seen, however, the rank is a possible hindrance, as is the fact that some of his ministry is forced upon a class of young soldiers in character training sessions. In fairness, of course, there is that side of the picture which emphasises the common link between the pastor and his flock - the same uniform, the same structures, and so on. It is the tension between these sides which must not be ignored, for it is to be hoped that there could be some way in which the priest might operate in the army as a prophet.

In practice, as might be expected, this is very difficult. As has been seen already, there is the obvious tension between being a part of a military set up, and criticising it. There is more to the Christian prophetic voice than just speaking about everyday moral conduct, and again it must be stressed that the tensions of the chaplain's role cannot be forgotten. In fact, for the army chaplain, to be prophetic means not only admitting the tensions to himself but awakening his fellow Christians to the fact that his tensions are theirs as well. This means the absurdity of taking up arms whilst subscribing to the gospel of love, in the face of the present realities of the international situation. The prophetic word is perhaps the most difficult to voice, as an army chaplain, and clearly shows the near-impossibility

to this particular vocation.

However, prophetically, the window in the Memorial Chapel of the RACHD, in its headquarters at Bagshot Park, Surrey, shows Christ flanked by soldiers of both sides in the Second World War. If the ministry of Christ is thought to be inappropriate for soldiers, it must be the same for others. If Christ is not present on the battlefield in that darkest, most sinful area of man's existence, then nor is he present in the town centre, the village green, or anywhere else. The call to serve Christ as an army chaplain is beset with difficulties, of rank and of role - man made barriers to the Word. But, it is the only way that soldiers in the British Army receive the service of the church and must, to that extent, be accepted.

Wilkinson quotes Hoskyns in his "Cambridge Sermons":

"The one fundamental moral problem is what we should still possess if the whole of our world were destroyed tomorrow, and we stood naked before God. The eschatological belief crudely and ruthlessly sweeps away all our little moral busynesses, strips us naked of worldly possessions and worldly entanglements, and asks what survives the catastrophe."

In a world which often talks of the nearness of the holocaust, the army chaplain is called to remind men of their nakedness before God, despite being fully clothed in the conference chamber. The Cross of Christ must be at the centre of a ministry which is always close to death, and the collect of the RACHD tries to sum this up:

"Blessed God, who hast committed the glorious gospel to our trust, have mercy upon the Royal Army Chaplains' Department and

grant that we may never glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in all things may approve ourselves as thy ministers, lest His Cross be made of non effect; through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen." ¹⁷

Smyth notes a second world war chaplain who saw his role and status in a way which would not be inappropriate today:

"A link with home and a link with God - and through his own non-combatancy - a link with peace." ¹⁸

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing material has used, as its context, a particular church, during a particular period of time. This is mentioned because the issues at stake are very much those which affect ordinary church people, even if the arguments of, say, deterrence, seem to lift it out of this arena. It would be impossible, of course, to define a single attitude as even approaching the whole mind of the Church of England. Sensitive intellectual arguments can lead in different ways, as the contrasts between Raven and MacKinnon show.

These differences lead to widely differing expectations of the role of the Church in relation to war. So often, critics of the Church seek only confirmation of their own beliefs, rather than a moral lead. This is certainly the case in the hostile reactions to the Falklands Service, or the suppression of pacifist broadcasts in the Second World War.

And yet, the desire for a "moral lead" can be easily misunderstood. The Church can be expected to disapprove of war, even to condemn it - indeed the 1930 statement requires this of Anglicans. Churches, however, are not governments, and the latter follow different rules, no matter how much the guidance of the Holy Spirit is sought for those in authority. Here, the influence of Niebuhr is much felt. To respond to a call to arms can be the duty of the Christian, who has two citizenships. If a nation is at war, the duty of the church is not to forbid its members from taking arms, but to urge the causes of justice and truth, of order in the midst of disorder.

There is no doubt at all that war is sinful. Certainly nothing in the present period of study could give any other

impression. The moral lead of the World War II period was in precisely the area of urging compassion, and praying for the enemy. And its ministry was as much to the conscientious objector as to the soldier and to the distressed civilians of both sides. The prophets of that time were those who, like Temple and Bell, saw the necessity of looking beyond the end of the war. Victory was not just the end of war, but also the beginning of peace, and the upset of peace needed careful preparation.

So, the role of the wartime church must be constantly to remind people of the future. In the present also, the church should not be afraid of unpopularity. To criticise, for example, the area bombing policy, could be seen as near-treason by some. In retrospect, of course, those who took this course are recalled as precisely those who were the authentic Christian voice. Although Bell is best remembered for this, both Lang and Temple were critics of that policy.

For the Church of England, the tension of Establishment is ever present. However, this has not, and should not preclude criticism of the government and its agents. It would be true to say that the strictures of Establishment are less felt towards the end of the present period of study rather than at the beginning. On the other hand, some views of history are, to say the least, ideal. Many who criticised the Falklands Service did so because it was not a Victory celebration. The survey of Remembrance liturgy shows that, at its most public, the Church does not pray for victory, but rather for an end to war. The origins of Remembrance are in reconciliation and forgiveness, not in the faded glory of the 1918 victory.

When the concerns of the Church in one particular field are investigated, there may always be the feeling that, if nothing was said publicly, nothing was actually being done. This could be true of the period immediately following the Second World War, when hindsight requires that particular events should have been noted and commented upon. However, to require this is to imagine that the Church is simply there to comment upon events. In fact, the Church of England's dealings with warfare largely reflect the interests of the general public. To have prolonged the debate about war in the middle of a welcome peace would have been both unusual and unnecessary. The future borne in mind by some Church leaders had become a fact, and the moral lead was in how to deal with the new peace. This attitude is vital in understanding the Church's response to the advent of nuclear weapons. There was, and is, no doubt that the end of the war was considerably hastened by the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs. If the long-term effects of the weapons were then less understood than now, the early Church reaction should not be criticised for naivety.

In the latter period, all sides of the nuclear debate have been well served by the contribution of the Church of England. Indeed, the General Synod is perhaps the only group which could have so publicly and successfully debated the important questions posed in The Church and the Bomb. The significance of this debate lies not so much in the resolutions that were passed, but simply in the fact that the debate took place and was widely - and favourably - reported. It showed that the Church was not the spiritual arm of the Government.

A great deal of space has been devoted to the Falklands Conflict and its aftermath. Again, it is demonstrated that the

Church was not there to pray for victory, but to urge compassion, to deplore excesses such as the "Gotcha"-mentality of the popular press. It was right that the nation should express its feelings through the medium of a religious service. The Falklands Service was the right expression of those feelings.

If any shift in the Church's attitude to war can be detected within the chronological context, it is surely in the public debating of its concerns. Allied to this is the development of an Established Church linked with, though not tethered to, the Establishment. Synodical Government has taken the Church a step away from Parliamentary Government, and today's leaders can be less wary of "what the Prime Minister would think" of the actions of the Synod and the clergy. The retention of episcopal voices in the House of Lords should be regarded as important, pending the requirement of the Church of another Bishop Bell. Just as important, however, are the representatives of all political parties in the Synod.

Behind the events lies the theology surrounding the Christian response to war. The analysis of the present study implies that, carefully studied, the theology of war changes little. If war, like the poor, is always with us, so are the apparently irreconcilable theological approaches. Niebuhr's influence cannot be stressed enough, and its working out in English theology is seen clearly in Temple, Vidler, and even in Raven's completely opposed position. The public expression of pacifism through the A.P.F. shows that its fate will always be that of a prophetic minority. Raven was mistaken in believing that man will by his own realisation renounce war. Rather, in MacKinnon's words, "we must learn to effect a drastic reconversion." The prophetic role of the church is of vital importance, of course. The prophets of

the Second World War were those who spoke the truth for its own sake - and for Christ's. Similarly today, the Church is called to be prophetic - to condemn where the law of God is blasphemed, but to strive always for that order from which justice and peace flow. It can be that this means the participation of Christians in the sin of warfare. In that sense the existence of Army Chaplains is prophetic. Nowhere else in the Church are the tensions of secular authority so strongly felt.

The repository of Christian doctrine is most clearly seen in its worship. As such, those who produce services have a burdensome task. Remembrance liturgy is of particular importance because of its appeal to many otherwise irregular churchgoers. Those who believe the Church should pray for victory misunderstand the Church's world-wide mission. Those who think the Church should not be closely involved in war through, for example, Army Chaplaincy, misunderstand the Church's call to repentance. For the Church to be involved both in peace and war is a great challenge - which the Falklands Service met admirably, and which can be done, with sensitive thought and firm theology.

The task of the Church, then, is to put Christian theology and ethics into action - through prayer and work. As Habgood says: "No Christian can ignore the Sermon on the Mount. Equally, no Christian, if he carries social responsibilities, can live as if his more mundane obligations were of no account." This would, in the end, rule out pacifism as a calling for the whole church. Pacifism and Army Chaplaincy are equally valid callings. Taking up these obligations means being as fully acquainted with facts as possible - and reports such as The Church and the Bomb must be commended in being, among other things, a concentrated source of such information.

Prophets will continue to be heard. The church, if it is to be prophetic, must speak out and ask questions. The Dean of Canterbury's text cannot be bettered:

"I believed and therefore I spoke out" and we too, in the same spirit of faith, believe and therefore speak out."

Ultimately the church must bear in mind the fact that, since 1930, it has been understood that what it teaches is incompatible with war, and its attitudes must be reconciled with that.

"I am no theologian, but I laugh
That men can be so grossly logicless
When war, defensive or aggressive either
Is in its essence Pagan, and opposed
To the whole gist of Christianity!"²

RESOLUTION 5 OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1978

1. Affirming again the statement of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 and 1968 (Resolution 8(a)) that "*war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ*" the Conference expresses its deep grief at the great suffering being endured in many parts of the world because of violence and oppression. We further declare that the use of the modern technology of war is the most striking example of corporate sin and the prostitution of God's gifts.

2. We recognise that violence has many faces. There are some countries where the prevailing social order is so brutal, exploiting the poor for the sake of the privileged and trampling on people's human rights that it must be termed "violent". There are others where a social order that appears relatively benevolent nevertheless exacts a high price in human misery from some sections of the population.

There is the use of armed force by governments, employed or held in threat against other nations or even against their own citizens. There is the world-wide misdirection of scarce resources to armaments rather than human need. There is the military action of victims of oppression who despair of achieving social justice by any other means.

There is the mindless violence that erupts in some countries with what seems to be increasing frequency, to say nothing of organised crime and terrorism, and the resorting to violence as a form of entertainment on films and television.

3. Jesus, through his death and resurrection, has already won the victory over all evil. He made evident that self-giving love, obedience to the way of the Cross, is the way to reconciliation in all relationships and conflicts. Therefore the use of violence is ultimately contradictory to the Gospel.

Yet we acknowledge that Christians in the past have differed in their understanding of limits to the rightful use of force in human affairs, and that questions of national relationships and social justice are often complex ones. But, in the face of the mounting incidence of violence today and its acceptance as a normal element in human affairs, we condemn the subjection, intimidation and manipulation of people by the use of violence and the threat of violence and call Christian people everywhere:

(a) to re-examine as a matter of urgency their own attitude towards, and their complicity with, violence in its many forms;

(b) to take with the utmost seriousness the questions which the teaching of Jesus places against violence in human relationships and the use of armed force by those who would follow him, and the example of redemptive love which the Cross holds before all people;

(c) to engage themselves in non-violent action for justice and peace and to support others so engaged, recognising that such action will be controversial and may be personally very costly;

(d) to commit themselves to informed, disciplined prayer not only for all victims of violence, especially for those who suffer for their obedience to the Man of the Cross, but also for those who inflict violence on others;

(e) to protest in whatever way possible at the escalation of the sale of armaments of war by the producing nations to the developing and dependent nations, and to support with every effort all international proposals and conferences designed to place limitations on, or arrange reductions in, the armaments of war of the nations of the world.

Appendix II

Ten points set forth in a letter to "The Times" signed by the Arch-Bishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Hinsley and the Moderator of the Free Church Council, 21st December, 1940.

- 1 The assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence. The will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed upon another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, attacked or threatened, order demands that reparation shall be made, and the measure and extent of that reparation is determined not by the sword nor by the arbitrary decisions of self interest, but by the rules of justice and reciprocal equity.
- 2 This requires that the nations be delivered from the slavery imposed upon them by the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect the right, may become an overbearing and tyrannical master. The order thus established requires a mutually agreed organic progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material, and security for the effective implementing of such an agreement.
- 3 Some juridical institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of conditions agreed upon and which shall in case of recognised need revise and correct them.
- 4 The real needs and just demands of nations and populations and racial minorities to be adjusted as occasion may require, even where no strictly legal right can be established, and a foundation of mutual confidence to be thus laid, whereby many incentives to violent action will be removed.
- 5 The development among peoples and their rulers of that sense of deep and keen responsibility which weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal.
- 6 Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished.
- 7 Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education, suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities.
- 8 The family as a social unit must be safeguarded.
- 9 The sense of a Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work.
- 10 The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

Appendix III

PRICE 3d.

AN AGREED REPORT
on a Deputation of Pacifist
Clergy to the Archbishops
of Canterbury and of
York, Lambeth Palace
Tuesday, June 11th, 1940

ON behalf of those Clergy in the Church of England who hold what are described as pacifist opinions, the Deputation would express its deep sense of gratitude to the Archbishops for their unfailing courtesy and understanding in their treatment of a rather obscure minority.

THE DEPUTATION, arranged by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, had as its spokesmen The Ven. Archdeacon Hartill, Rector of Stoke-on-Trent; The Rev. R. H. LeMessurier, Vicar of Holy Cross, St. Pancras; and the Rev. Dr. Charles Raven, Master of Christ's College, Cambridge. The Deputation represented 2,571 Communicant Members of the Church of England, including 371 Priests. After thanking the Archbishops for receiving the Deputation, Archdeacon Hartill explained that it was not their purpose to argue the question of pacifism, but to lay before their Graces certain matters that seemed of grave importance.

The Deputation.

1.

Words used in the exhortation sent out in connection with the National Day of Prayer might have made people think that "The truth and charity which came by Jesus Christ" were at stake; whereas these are things which belong to God and cannot in their essence be defended by force of arms.

The Archbishops.

It is a complete delusion to suppose that the eternal values of God could depend upon the weapons of war. Yet a victory for Nazism would involve the Church being driven underground and the liberty for the public ordering of life on Christian lines would be gone,

perhaps for generations. Victory for the Nazis would be victory for that which trampled on Christian truth and charity, for their doctrine and their methods were a flagrant denial of both. If, then, they believed that such things were at stake, they must ask their Heavenly Father's help ; in praying for victory, they were praying subject to victory being God's Will for us.

The Deputation : 2.

When conscience ceases to be recognised by the State, we are moving towards a conception of the State as the final authority on moral issues, and thus to its deification.

The Archbishops :

The problem in statesmanship is how to reconcile the need for order with the claim of the individual conscience. That problem democracy has not solved. We have been inclined to be self-pleasing rather than to establish liberty.

The Deputation : 3.

The Deputation mentioned that the anti-Italian riots of the previous evening had no parallel in anti-German riots when war broke out ; that defects in the Treaty of Versailles were now generally ignored ; that there was an increasing hostility to conscientious objectors shown by the action of Borough and County Councils who were dismissing those men to whom exemption had been granted.

The Archbishops :

It is the Church's duty to stem the rising tide of hatred : but this can best be done by steady and persistent pleading for the maintenance of Christian charity.

The Deputation : 4.

Priests are being recommended to join the new Defence Corps, contrary to Canon Law.

The Archbishops :

Priests cannot in loyalty to Canon Law themselves bear arms ; but they might legitimately assist in organising civil defence work. A priest must always be ready to exercise his ministry for the benefit of friend or foe alike.

The Deputation :

5.

In the last war Archbishop Davidson had protested against the use of Poison Gas; yet he did not withdraw his support from the war when the use of Gas was continued. The Deputation asked whether the Archbishops would say what were the methods which, if employed by our military authorities, would involve the Church, not only entering its protest against them, but refusing to support a war in which such methods were employed. What was the point at which the Church would rather see the war lost than won by methods it deplored ?

The Archbishops :

Protest should certainly be made by the Church against reprisals, involving deliberate attacks upon civilians, but the moral issue involved in the victory of the allies is of greater importance than the harsh fact of fighting by methods that one deploras. The position would be different if the bombing of open towns were undertaken, not as a reprisal, but as a part of our national policy : as also if we deliberately violated the neutrality of another nation.

The Deputation :

6.

Broadcast talks and sermons by leaders of the Church of England appear to be deficient in two ways :

- (a) there is little stress on the importance of the means of Grace, and especially of the Holy Communion.
- (b) The importance of thinking things out should be emphasised, together with the need for grappling with all social, economic and international problems from the Christian point of view. We should be helped to clear our minds on those Christian conditions which must be fulfilled in the world after the war.

The Archbishops :

Broadcast talks and sermons have very likely been deficient in stressing the importance of the means of Grace. It is true to say that we must think out the shape of the Christian life of witness after the war.

The Deputation :

7.

Three years ago their Graces made a statement, reaffirmed in a letter early this year, that they "fully understood and appreciated, even though they could not wholly share, the position of the Christian Pacifist," and that they "entirely recognised their legitimate place in the fellowship of the Church, and the value of the witness which they often with great difficulty feel bound to

give." The Deputation asked whether, if that statement were still valid, the Archbishops would further help in certain directions; and chiefly by encouraging discussion between pacifist and non-pacifist Clergy, for of late there had been a growing feeling among the Clergy that pacifism must be barred from their thinking.

The Archbishops :

We have never ceased to recognise the sincerity of pacifists, nor have we retracted our declaration as to their right to hold and expound their views within the Church of England. Pacifist Priests should certainly be allowed to exercise their ministry : on the other hand they must show consideration for the feelings of their congregations and remember that these have no chance of reply to utterances from the pulpit. Pacifism is a genuine vocation for some; the point of disagreement is that pacifists claim that pacifism must be the normal practice in the Christian Church. It would be useful for the Clergy in general if the pacifist point of view put by the Deputation received wider consideration.

The Archbishops added that :—

Retreats and quiet times should not be abandoned on the grounds of national emergency. It is more and more important when things are crashing about us to secure our hold on things eternal.

There is news of Christians in Germany who are even now trying, as we are, to plan the lines of a revitalised Christendom. These Christians remain our brothers in Christ. We must look forward to the day when, not only in spirit but in one company, we can all pray together.

Before giving the Deputation his blessing, the Archbishop of Canterbury said that, when he recollected the great hopes many of them had had for a better world which was to follow the last war, it made him feel sick at heart to think of our failure : yet hope must not be abandoned, nor must we allow ourselves to say that the quest for that new world was no longer one in which we could share.

The Deputation referred to in this Report was arranged by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, of which full particulars will gladly be sent by the Secretaries,

A.P.F., 29 Great James St, London, W.1

*THIS Report has been submitted to the
Archbishops of Canterbury and of York
and is now published with their assent.*

(July 1940)

Appendix IV

The "Seven Reasons" nailed to the West Door of Canterbury Cathedral, 2nd August, 1978.

- 1 The will of God was supremely fulfilled through the perfect obedience of Jesus Christ to divine love on the cross, whereby he achieved the ultimate victory over the forces of violence and division. In doing so he made it possible for ordinary men and women to put their whole trust in the power of divine love alone, freeing them for ever from reliance upon the violent powers of this world.
- 2 When Jesus took the Cup at the Last Supper and inaugurated the New Covenant, with which he associated his New Commandment of love, he gave his followers the means by which they might share his own commitment to the supreme power of divine love. By this action he superseded the Old Covenant and the old law, opening the way for mankind to enter the new order of his kingdom on earth.
- 3 With the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead his perfect obedience was vindicated and the final victory of love over the forces of hatred, violence and death was manifested, ushering in the new order.
- 4 Hatred and fear, progenitors of conflict, can be overpowered only by love. Only out of love can true justice come. In the power of love lies our only defence. "He who dwells in love dwells in God." In loving one another we become aware, as St. John said, that we have passed from the realm of darkness and death, the era of Cain where brother slaughtered brother, to the era of Christ's kingdom, where the only sanction is the power of divine love.
- 5 By the power of the Cross, on which Christ "killed the enmity", God has made it possible, as St. Paul said, for "things low and contemptible, mere nothings, to overthrow the existing order." This is the true Christian revolution. Christ himself is our peace. He broke down the "dividing wall of enmity", creating out of the warring elements within mankind a "single new humanity, thereby making peace." Through no other means can the world's enmity be overcome than that made possible by Christ.
- 6 Those who commit themselves in faith to the victory of the cross have no choice but to live in terms of the new humanity: "When anyone is united to Christ, there is a new world; the old order has gone and a new order has already begun." Christians must in all things be true to this new order, being prepared to take up their cross and follow the same way as Christ, even while recognising that worldly governments and political groups will continue to act by the principles of the old order.
- 7 The true unity of the Church will remain unrealised so long as Christians are unable to agree on the implications of their commitment to the New Covenant in their encounter with the violence and hatred of this world. Only a complete faith in the victory of love on the cross will enable Christians from every background to kneel together in unity of commitment to the New Covenant.

Appendix V

Great God of nations, at Whose Will
Proud sceptred Empires wax and wane
Defend our Empire's people still
Unsheath Thy sword for us again,
For liberty and right we stand
O God arise stretch forth Thy Hand.

Great God of battle, steel their heart,
Who serve by land, and air and sea;
With honour let them play their part,
With duty let their service be,
Gainst cruelty and wrong we fight,
O God arise put forth Thy might.

O God of mercy be our shield
And hear our dear ones far away;
For them we stand on bloodstained field,
For us they wait at home and pray:
To Thee we turn, to Thee we cry,
O God lead on to Victory.

Amen

N.B. This was no doubt sung to the tune "Melita" (A & M 487), popular because of its usual accompaniment to "Eternal Father, strong to save."

Appendix VI

HYMN USED AT ST. GEORGE'S TANGLIN
REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY 8 NOVEMBER 1953

Where break the windy dawns on mountain heather,
Where hills of granite cleave grey skies above,
Where thundering waves assault the cliffs of England,
There walks the spirit of the land we love.

Dear Island Country, not alone we love thee,
From peak of snow to strange untrodden sea,
This thread of gold, this whispered word "This England"
Binds half a world in fellowship to thee.

Now to our hands has passed the torch undying,
Now in our keeping burns the sacred flame,
Great Lord of Hosts, God of our Ancient England,
Make thou our lives more worthy of her name.

Amen

YORK MINSTER

THE VERY REV. RONALD JASPER
C.B.E., D.D., D.Litt., DEAN OF YORK



THE DEANERY, YORK, YO1 2JD
Telephone: York (0904) 23608

4th February 1983.

Dear Mr Wilby,

Thank you for your enquiry. I think the arguments the Commission would want to make on the Lectionary for Remembrance Day services would be on these lines:

(1) Those particular occasions for which Collects and Readings are set out in full are clearly occasions when the main service is a Eucharist. The normal Remembrance Day services are not, in fact, Eucharistic. They may be in certain cases, but the normal services with representatives of the forces, etc., are not Eucharistic and certainly if they are in the open air.

(2) There has been considerable discussion on this point, not only with other Provinces in the Anglican Communion, but with other Churches. The question under discussion is how far one should go in making full liturgical provision for such non-liturgical occasions. The general feeling has been that the non-liturgical occasions should not be given official status in the church calendars. That, of course, is a matter on which many people would disagree. But the general feeling is that if recognition is given to one, you have created a precedent for giving recognition to others. There will be an Education Sunday, an Animal Sunday, and so on, which would in the end make havoc of any kind of official liturgical calendar.

Probably you would have guessed all this in any case, but feeling was pretty strong on this point and there was little enthusiasm for giving these occasions full recognition. Clearly these decisions were made some years ago and the situation might well be different in the future if these questions come up for discussion again.

With every good wish,
Yours sincerely,

Timothy D. Wilby Esq.,
2 Church Cottages,
Cuddesdon,
Oxford. OX9 9HF.

From: ALAN WEBSTER, M.A., B.D.,
Dean of St Paul's

Tel: 01 - 236 2827

THE DEANERY
9 AMEN COURT
LONDON EC4M 7BU

29 July 1982

Forgive a photocopied letter in reply to yours about the Falkland Islands Service. The Archbishop and others concerned with the Service have had an immense volume of supportive letters, and for this we are all grateful. In particular, at St Paul's, I am grateful for your letter as St Paul's is intended to be everybody's Cathedral and what goes on there is everybody's business, though the final responsibility rests with the Chapter of St Paul's. I have at all times welcomed the comments which have come.

From the insider's point of view, the Service was immensely moving. A third of the congregation were next-of-kin and we did our best to be alongside those who were experiencing such great suffering. They were supported by the presence of leaders of all parties and churches and fears that some groups might stay away were unfounded.

I realise that not everything in the Service can possibly have pleased everyone. After all, God is above us all and has made us into the individuals we are, with the separate attitudes and life histories which are our own. Be assured that we have tried very hard to have a Service which would help the largest possible number of people. Those who have come back from the Falklands and have talked to me about their experience have a sense of being able to see what are the things that really matter in life and what are the trivial things on which we waste so much time.

All of us who work and worship at St Paul's wish it to be a centre of prayer and meditation which is valuable to everyone. So I thank you warmly for your letter which I read and thought about, and am only sorry that I cannot personally reply to everything you said. May the Service do something to change and strengthen our attitudes so that faith and hope and love are the most important things in our lives.

Yours very sincerely,

NOTES

(pp 5 - 10)

CHAPTER 1 (I)

- 1 Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury (C.C.C.)
Presidential Address, January 1939
- 2 ibid. Presidential Address, May 1939
- 3 ibid. p436
- 4 cf. Appendix II
- 5 Chronicle of the Convocation of York (C.C.Y.) 1939 p86
- 6 ibid. p99
- 7 ibid. p105
- 8 C.C.C. January 1940, Presidential Address
- 9 C.C.Y. May 1940, Presidential Address
- 10 C.C.C. 1940 p6
- 11 ibid. p12
- 12 ditto
- 13 ditto
- 14 ibid. p107. Hartill's Motion was as follows:
"That inasmuch as there is an urgent need for the church to give clear guidance to Christian people on their duties in regard to peace and war, and inasmuch as there are difficulties in the interpretation of Article XXXVII; This House respectfully requests His Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House:
1) to declare that the English text of the Article should be interpreted in the light of the Latin text as referring only to "just wars" (justa bella); and
2) to appoint a Joint Committee to consider in the light of traditional moral theology and of modern conditions, what is the proper significance of the phrase "just wars."
- 15 C.C.Y. 1941 p10
- 16 C.C.C. 1941 p101
- 17 ibid. Presidential Address, May 1941
- 18 C.C.Y. 1941 p10
- 19 C.C.C. 1941 p131
- 20 ibid. p132
- 21 C.C.Y. January 1942

(pp 11 - 24)

- 22 C.C.C. Presidential Address, May 1942
 23 *ibid.* p305
 24 *ibid.* p309
 25 C.C.Y. Presidential Address. October 1942
 26 C.C.Y. Presidential Address. May 1943
 27 C.C.C. Presidential Address. May 1944
 28 C.C.Y. Presidential Address. October 1944
 29 C.C.Y. May 1945
 30 C.C.C. 1946 p10
 31 ditto
 32 *ibid.* p21
 33 *ibid.* p180
 34 *ibid.* p187
 35 Thomas, G. and Morgan-Witts, M. Ruin from the Air
 cf. pp220-221 and notes, p466
 36 C.C.C. 1946 p188
 37 *ibid.* p189
 38 For an exposition of Dewar's position on war, see his
An Outline of Anglican Moral Theology pp.103-107
 39 Iremonger, F.A. William Temple, his Life and Letters
 O.U.P. 1948. p540
 40 cf. Appendix II

CHAPTER 1 (II)

- 1 1948 Lambeth Conference Report (L.C.R.) Part 1 p29
 2 *ibid.* Part II p14
 3 Thrall, M. in Theology Vol.75 1972 p417
 4 *op.cit.* Chapter IX
 5 Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith. Report of a
 Commission of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ
 in America, Supplement March 1946
 6 *op.cit.* p43
 7 Conclusion 6 pp110 ff
 8 Thrall, *op.cit.* p419
 9 C.C.C. 1954 p27
 10 ditto
 11 C.C.Y. Presidential Address, May 1954
 12 Thrall, *op.cit.* p419
 13 Simpson and Story The Long Shadows of Lambeth X p140

- 14 1958 Lambeth Conference Report Part 2 p126
- 15 Quoted as in 1968 L.C.R. p80
- 16 1958 L.C.R. Part I p55 Resolution 107
- 17 B.C.C. 1959
- 18 op.cit. pl
- 19 B.C.C. 1961
- 20 B.C.C. 1963
- 21 C.C.Y. January 1962 p7
- 22 ditto
- 23 C.C.C. 1962 p200
- 24 ibid. p199
- 25 ibid. p207
- 26 Dillistone, F.W. Charles Raven p428

CHAPTER 1 (III)

- 1 1968 L.C.R. p80
- 2 ditto
- 3 ibid. p31 Resolution 8
- 4 cf. Appendix I for the whole text of Resolution 5
- 5 ibid. Clause 3
- 6 General Synod Report (G.S.R.) 1978 p1072
- 7 ibid. p1071, cf. especially Clause (iii) of the motion:
This Synod "asks the Standing Committee to appoint a
delegation....to take up these matters with....the World
Council of Churches at the earliest opportunity."
- 8 G.S.R. 1979 p721 Christians in a Violent World GS.414
- 9 ibid. p723
- 10 C.C.C. 1962 p203
- 11 G.S.R. 1979 p742
- 12 ibid. p748
- 13 G.S.R. 1980 p138
- 14 ibid. p173
- 15 G.S.R. 1981 p924
- 16 ibid. p935
- 17 ibid. 1982 p337
- 18 ibid. p338
- 19 The Times Letters 2.2.83

- 20 e.g. Sunday Times 6.2.83 "Bishops will clash in debate
on Bomb" by Judith Judd.
- 21 The Times Letters 8.2.83
- 22 The Times 11.2.83 carried a full report of the debate.
- 23 The report's sub-title.
- 24 op.cit. p159
- 25 ditto
- 26 ibid. pp154 ff
- 27 ibid. p155
- 28 ibid. p157
- 29 ibid. p162
- 30 ibid. p163
- 31 ibid. p164
- 32 G. R. Dunstan "The Substance of Things Hoped For", in
R. Harries (Ed.) What Hope in an Armed World? p134
- 33 B. Hanrahan and R. Fox I counted them all out and I counted
then all back p132
- 34 Dobson, Miller, Payne. The Falklands Conflict p28
- 35 The Times 1.4.82 p11
- 36 The Times 3.4.82 p11
- 37 Dobson et al. op.cit. p136
- 38 The Times 12.4.82 p4
- 39 The Times 12.4.82 p8
- 40 The Times 15.4.82 p6
- 41 The Times 19.4.82 p4
- 42 The Times 24.4.82 p13
- 43 The Times Letters 30.4.82 p11
- 44 The Times 3.5.82 p4
- 45 ditto
- 46 ibid. p10
- 47 The Times 8.5.82 p10
- 48 Dobson et al. op.cit.
- 49 Hanrahan and Fox op.cit.
- 50 op.cit. July-September 1982 p97
- 51 Article by Haddon Willmer, op.cit. p52
- 52 op.cit. Vol.7, no.2
- 53 op.cit. pp42, 46, 73
- 54 "The Prolonged Passion of Mankind" in New Fire Vol.7
No.54, Spring 1983.

CHAPTER 2 (i)

- 1 Moral Man and Immoral Society, Introduction
- 2 The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness p xiii
- 3 op.cit. p6
- 4 Dissent or Conform? p211
- 5 Moral Man and Immoral Society
- 6 "The Theology of Pacifism" in A.Sampson (Ed.) This War and Christian Ethics p22
- 7 Colquhoun, Contemporary Parish Prayers p80
- 8 Appleton, The Oxford Book of Prayer p96
- 9 op.cit. p3
- 10 op.cit. p ix
- 11 ibid. p210
- 12 cf. Appendix III, No.7
- 13 "The Theology of Pacifism" p17
- 14 ditto
- 15 ditto
- 16 ibid. p18
- 17 ditto
- 18 ibid. p19
- 19 ibid. p20
- 20 ibid. p25
- 21 ibid. p26
- 22 Pacifism and Conscientious Objection p19
- 23 Dillistone, Charles Raven p225
- 24 op.cit. p10
- 25 ibid. Preface
- 26 Summa Theologicae Vol.35, pp81-93 Blackfriars Edn. 1964
- 27 Lambeth Statement 1930
- 28 Paskins and Dockrill, The Ethics of War p194
- 29 These are listed e.g.in The Church and the Bomb pp84-86 and R. Ruston, Nuclear Deterrence - Right or Wrong? p15
- 30 The Church and the Bomb, p84
- 31 e.g. Rene Coste, "War" in K. Rahner (Ed.) Encyclopaedia of Theology
- 32 op.cit. p85
- 33 Ruston op.cit. p15
- 34 Dobson et al. op.cit. p22
- 35 Ruston op.cit. p70 note 15a

- 36 e.g. Hanrahan and Fox op.cit. p22; Dobson et al. op.cit p152 and the subsequent parliamentary controversy.
- 37 Hanrahan and Fox op.cit. p53
- 38 The Law of Armed Conflict, Section 4, paragraph 5.d

CHAPTER 2 (ii)

- 1 op. cit. p21
- 2 ibid. p38
- 3 Wilkinson, Dissent or Conform? p264; Dillistone, Charles Raven pp220 ff
- 4 cf. Appendix III
- 5 Iremonger, William Temple p542
- 6 ditto
- 7 ibid. p540
- 8 Suggate, William Temple's Christian Social Ethics p69
- 9 Iremonger op.cit. p542
- 10 ibid. p543
- 11 Suggate, op.cit. p81
- 12 Iremonger, op.cit. p544
- 13 ibid. p546
- 14 ibid. pp555-6
- 15 ibid. p556
- 16 ibid. p540
- 17 Jasper, George Bell p257
- 18 ibid. p283
- 19 ibid. pp256-7
- 20 ibid. p259
- 21 op.cit. p73
- 22 op.cit. p78
- 23 ditto
- 24 Oldham (Ed.) The Churches Survey their Task
- 25 Bell, op.cit. p83
- 26 ibid. pp85-6
- 27 ibid. p86
- 28 ibid. p87; Oldham op.cit. p183
- 29 Slack, George Bell pp75, 79
- 30 MacKinnon, Letter to Crucible, July 1969 p123
- 31 Jasper, op.cit. p274
- 32 ibid. p275

- 33 ibid. p276
- 34 Slack, op.cit. p95
- 35 MacKinnon, "Justice" in Theology 1963 pp97-104
- 36 Dissent or Conform? p107
- 37 Dillistone, op.cit. Sub-title
- 38 ibid. p228
- 39 ditto
- 40 ibid. pp.226-7
- 41 Dissent or Conform? p109
- 42 Dillistone, op.cit. p221
- 43 Wilkinson, op.cit. p107
- 44 cf. Appendix III
- 45 Dillistone, op.cit. p232
- 46 ibid. pp344-48
- 47 ibid. pp345-46
- 48 ibid. p347
- 49 ibid. p348
- 50 ibid. p349
- 51 op.cit. p127
- 52 Raven, op.cit. pp15, 22
- 53 Dillistone, op.cit. p237
- 54 ibid. p236
- 55 "The Task of the Christendom Group in Time of War", in Christendom IX (1939) p139
- 56 ibid. p140
- 57 ibid. pp141-142
- 58 ibid. p142
- 59 ibid. pp142-143
- 60 ibid. p201
- 61 Letter on "Bomber Offensive", Christian Newsletter No.283 (1947) p3
- 62 ibid. p4
- 63 op.cit. p21
- 64 "The Moral Significance of the Atomic Bomb" in Humanitas II, 3 (1948) p27
- 65 ibid. p29
- 66 "An Approach to the Moral and Spiritual Problems of the Nuclear Age", in Roberts G.W. and Smucker D.E. (Eds.) Borderlands of Theology p175. (This was originally a broadcast talk entitled "Where the Report Fails" on the Third Programme).

- 67 ibid. p177
- 68 ibid. p183
- 69 ditto
- 70 "Reflection on the Hydrogen Bomb" in Roberts and Smucker,
 op.cit. ppl84-192. (Also originally a Third Programme
 broadcast).
- 71 ibid. p185
- 72 ibid. p184. cf. also The Church and the Bomb p158:
 "....it is humanity that created the nuclear weapon crisis,
 not a malign Fate or some ineluctable evolutionary tendency...."
- 73 ibid. p191
- 74 ditto
- 75 ditto
- 76 "Ethical Problems of Nuclear Warfare" in God, Sex and War,
 1963. Creon and Antigone: ethical problems of nuclear
 warfare 1982
- 77 op.cit. p13
- 78 ibid. p16
- 79 ibid. p20
- 80 ibid. p25
- 81 ibid. pp24-25
- 82 ibid. p27
- 83 op.cit. p5
- 84 ibid. p11
- 85 ibid. p26
- 86 ibid. p27
- 87 ditto
- 88 ditto
- 89 Anglican Pacifist Fellowship (A.P.F.) Newsletter June 1939
- 90 ditto
- 91 cf. Newsletter for those months
- 92 cf. Appendix III
- 93 Newsletter January 1940
- 94 ibid. July 1940
- 95 ditto
- 96 June 21st, 1944
- 97 Newsletter September 1944
- 98 ibid. July 1941
- 99 A.P.F. Annual Report 1965 p3
- 100 ibid. 1969 p4

NOTES

(pp 107 - 136)

- 101 ibid. 1970 p5
 102 ibid. 1974 p4: "it is worth remembering that the original
 suggestion (for the Week of Prayer for World Peace) came
 from one of our own members at the A.P.F. Annual Meeting
 two years ago."
 103 ibid. 1978 p1
 104 cf. Appendix IV
 105 cf. Appendix I
 106 Church Times, 5th September 1980

CHAPTER 3

- 1 G. K. A. Bell, Randall Davidson pp830-831
 2 A. Wilkinson, The Church of England and the First World
 War p178
 3 R. Coppin. "Remembrance Sunday" in Theology Vol.68, 1965
 4 Bell, op.cit. p1037
 5 ditto
 6 Appendix V
 7 Appendix VI
 8 The material quoted is from the collection of assorted
 services of Remembrance at the H.Q. of the Royal Army
 Chaplains Department, Bagshot Park.
 9 op.cit. ppl00-102
 10 Colquhoun, Parish Prayers No.733, Leslie D. Weatherhead
 11 Colquhoun, Contemporary Parish Prayers No.196, Reinhold Niebuhr
 12 Colquhoun, New Parish Prayers No.155
 13 Thanks are due to the Dean of St. Paul's, Very Rev. Alan
 Webster, who gave access to his private papers and correspondence
 on the Falklands, and without whose help this section could not have
 been written.
 14 The Times Letters dated 17th June 1982
 15 ibid. 21st June 1982, p13
 16 op.cit. 25th July 1982
 17 Alternative Service Book p104
 18 Mrs. Rosalind Goodfellow J.P.
 19 Rt.Rev.Prof.John McIntyre, D.D. D.Litt.
 20 Rev. Kenneth Greet, D.D.
 21 above, note 15.
 22 Church Times 30th July 1982, p1
 23 ditto

(pp 137 - 170)

- 24 cf. Appendix VIII
- 25 This was confirmed in separate conversations with the Dean and the Chaplain-General.
- 26 Wilkinson, "The Prolonged Passion of Mankind" in New Fire Vol.7, No.54, Spring 1983.
- 27 Silk, op.cit. p101

CHAPTER 4

- 1 There are detailed regulations which deal with the work of Army chaplains. They are, however, "restricted" and were only made available on condition that they were not quoted.
- 2 op.cit. pp10 and 24
- 3 R.A.Ch.D. Journal Vol.27 No.2, December 1982, p15
- 4 Rev. D. Cooper, ditto
- 5 R.A.Ch.D. Journal Vol.27 No.2, December 1982, p6
- 6 ditto
- 7 Hanrahan and Fox, op.cit. p21, cf. The Times 30th April 1982
- 8 R.A.Ch.D. Journal op.cit. p6
- 9 ibid. p14
- 10 ibid. p9
- 11 ibid. p12
- 12 ibid. p6
- 13 ibid. p7
- 14 ibid. p14
- 15 ibid. p15
- 16 In Theology Vol.84, No.700, July 1981. pp249-257
- 17 A Book of Army Prayers p(vi)
- 18 Sir John Smyth, In This Sign Conquer, p243

CONCLUSIONS

- 1 J. Habgood, A Working Faith p89
- 2 Napoleon, in Thomas Hardy, The Dynasts Part III Act I Scene IV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anglican Pacifist Fellowship: Modern Warfare and Christian Responsibility 1962
Changing Christian View of War and Armed Violence 1968
- Annan, Noel: "Remembrance Sunday" in Theology Vol.64. 1961
- Appleton, George: The Oxford Book of Prayer O.U.P. 1985
- Bailey, Sydney D. Christian Perspectives on Nuclear Weapons BCC 1981
Prohibitions and Restraints in War O.U.P. 1972
- Bainton, Roland H. Christian Attitudes towards War and Peace
 Hodder and Stoughton 1961
- Barnes, John: Ahead of his Age
 - Bishop Barnes of Birmingham Collins 1979
 Letter comparing attitudes of Barnes and Bell to treatment of Germany in wartime, in Observer 9.3.69
- Bell, G. K. A. Christianity and World Order Penguin 1940
The Church and Humanity Longmans 1946
Randall Davidson 3rd Edition. O.U.P. 1952
- Best, Geoffrey: Humanity in Warfare
 - The Modern History of the International Law of Armed Conflicts. Weidenfield and Nicholson 1980
- Bidwell, S. (Ed.) World War Three Hamlyn 1980
- Booth, Alan: (with Edwards, D. and Jenkins, D.)
 "Christian Case for Disarmament" in Theology Vol.65 1961
Christians and Power Politics S.C.M. Press 1961
- Bridges, Francis (Ed.) The Cross and the Bomb
 - Christian Ethics and the Nuclear Debate
 Mowbrays 1983

British Council of Churches:

- The Era of Atomic Power 1946
Christians and Atomic War 1959
The Valley of Decision 1961
The Road to Peace 1963
Peace is the Prize 1965
The Future of the British Nuclear Deterrent 1979
The Churches and the Hydrogen Bomb 1955

Brittain, Vera: Testament of Youth Fontana 1980
Testament of Experience Fontana 1980

Cadoux, C. J. Christian Pacifism Re-examined Blackwell 1940

Cannadine, David: "War, Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain"
in Whaley J. (Ed.) Mirrors of Mortality
Europa Publications 1981

Carey, W. Thinking Straight about this War Mowbrays 1939

Ceadal, M. Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945 O.U.P. 1980

Church of England Board for Social Responsibility

- Modern War, What can Christians do Together? 1962
Force in the Modern World 1973
Christians in a Violent World 1979
The Church and the Bomb 1982

Church of England Church Assembly Commission

- The Church and the Atom 1948

Clark, Robert: Does the Bible teach Pacifism? Marshall 1976

Collier, Richard: 1940: The World in Flames Penguin 1980

Colquhoun, Frank: Parish Prayers Hodder & Stoughton 1967
Contemporary Parish Prayers Hodder & Stoughton 1975
New Parish Prayers Hodder & Stoughton 1982

Coppin, Ronald: "Remembrance Sunday" in Theology Vol. 68 1965

Coste, René: "War" in Rahner K. (Ed.) Encyclopaedia of Theology
Burns and Oates 1975

- Davies, S. J. In Spite of Dungeons Alan Sutton, 1954
- Dewar, Lindsay: An Outline of Anglican Moral Theology Mowbrays 1968
- Dillistone, F. W. Charles Raven Hodder and Stoughton 1975
- Dobson, C. Miller, J. Payne, R. The Falklands Conflict Coronet 1982
- Dowell, G. "Defence, Disarmament and Christian Obedience"
in Crucible June 1980
- Dyson, A. "Thinking against the Current"
in Modern Churchman Vo.25, No.2, 1982
- Ecclestone, G. "Words in Wartime"
in Crucible July - September 1981
- Edwards, D. L. Withdrawing from the Brink in 1963 S.C.M. 1963
- Ferguson, J. and Clark, F. War, Peace and Religion
Open University 1973
- Field, G. C. Pacifism and Conscientious Objection
Cambridge University Press 1945
- Fletcher, Colin: Banning the Bomb?
An Argument from the "Just War" position
Grove Booklets 1982
- Garrison J. From Hiroshima to Harrisburg
The Unholy Alliance S.C.M. 1980
The Darkness of God: Theology After Hiroshima S.C.M. 1982
- Gill, R. The Cross Against the Bomb Epworth Press 1984
- Gladwin, J. (Ed.) Dropping the Bomb The Church and the Bomb Debate
Hodder and Stoughton 1985
- Goodwin, G. (Ed.) Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence Croom Helm 1982

- Habgood, John: A Working Faith Darton, Longman and Todd 1980
- Hackett, General Sir John: The Third World War: August 1985
A Future History Sphere 1980
- Hanrahan, B. and Fox, R. I counted them all out and I counted them
all back. BBC 1982
- Hare, J. E. and Joynt, C. B. Ethics and International Affairs
Macmillan 1982
- Harries, R. (Ed.) What Hope in an Armed World? Pickering and Inglis
1982
"The Church and the Bomb: a reaction" in Christian
Vol. 7, No.2, 1982
"Nuclear Weapons: The General Synod Decision in the
Light of Day" in Crucible April-June 1983
- Hartill, P. Anglicans and War A.P.F. 1940
Article XXXVII and War A.P.F. 1940
- Hersey, J. Hiroshima Penguin 1946
- Howard, Michael: The Causes of War Temple Smith 1984
War and the Liberal Conscience Temple Smith 1978
- Iremonger, F. A. William Temple, His Life and Letters O.U.P. 1948
- Jasper, R. C. D. George Bell, Bishop of Chichester O.U.P. 1967
- Jobson, C. H. The Military Chaplain Durham M.A. Thesis 1982
- Kirby, Alexander: "A Study Guide to the Anglican Report"
Christian Action Journal Winter 1982-3
- Lowry, C. A. "William Temple" in Theology Vol. LXXXVIII 1985
- MacGregor, G. H. C. The New Testament Basis of Pacifism Clarke 1936

- MacKinnon, D. M. "The Task of the Christendom Group in Time of War" in Christendom IX (1939)
- "Moral Problems of Atomic Warfare" in Humanities
Vol. II, No.3, 1948
- "Bomber Offensive" in Christian Newsletter No.283
- "Ethical Problems of Nuclear Warfare" in
God, Sex and War Fontana 1963
- "Justice" in Theology Vol. LXVI (1963)
- "Soldiers" and Bishop Bell" in Crucible July 1969
- Creon and Antigone Menard Press 1982
- MacQuarrie, J. The Concept of Peace S.C.M. 1973
- Martin, D. and Mullen, P. Unholy Warfare Blackwell 1983
- Mason, Lancelot: ""Soldiers" and Bishop Bell" in Crucible March 1969
- Mayer, P. (Ed.) The Pacifist Conscience Penguin 1966
- Ministry of Defence: The Law of Armed Conflict Crown Copyright 1981
- Neild, Robert: How to Make Up Your Mind about the Bomb
Andre Deutsch 1981
- Niebuhr, R. Moral Man and Immoral Society Scribners, New York, 1932
- The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness
Scribners, New York, 1944
- Oldham, J. H. (Ed.) The Churches Survey their Task Allen and Unwin
1938
- Paskins, B.A. and Dockrill, M. L. The Ethics of War Duckworth 1979
- "Bibliography: the Ethics of Nuclear Deterrence"
in Modern Churchman Vol. XXVI, No.3, 1984
- Raven, Charles E. Is War Obsolete? George Allen and Unwin 1935
- War and the Christian S.C.M. 1938
- The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism FOR.1952

- Roberts, G. W. and Smucker, D. E. (Eds.)
Borderlands of Theology and other Essays
 - essays by MacKinnon, D. M. Lutterworth 1968
- Roberts, R. Ellis: H. R. L. Sheppard
 - Life and Letters John Murray 1942
- Ruston, Roger: Nuclear Deterrence Right or Wrong?
 Catholic Information Services 1981
- Sampson, A. (Ed.) This War and Christian Ethics Blackwell 1940
- Schell, Jonathan: The Fate of the Earth Picador 1982
- Scott, Carolyn: Dick Sheppard: a Biography Hodder and Stoughton 1977
- Sheppard, H. R. L. God and My Neighbour Cassell and Co. 1937
The Impatience of a Person Hodder and Stoughton 1937
What Can We Believe? Jonathan Cape 1939
- Sider, Ronald J. and Taylor, Richard K.
Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope Hodder and Stoughton 1983
- Sigmund, Elizabeth: Rage Against the Dying Pluto Press 1980
- Silk, David: Prayers for Use at the Alternative Services Mowbrays 1980
- Simon, Ulrich: A Theology of Auschwitz S.P.C.K. 1978
- Simpson, J. B. and Story, E. M. The Long Shadows of Lambeth X
 McGraw-Hill 1969
- Slack, Kenneth: George Bell S.C.M. 1971
- Smyth, Sir John: In This Sign Conquer
 The Story of the Army Chaplains Mowbrays 1968
- Stein, Walter(Ed.) Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience
 Merlin Press 1961

- Stephenson, A. M. G. Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences
S.P.C.K. 1978
- Suggate, A. M. William Temple's Christian Social Ethics:
A Study in Method Durham PhD Thesis
"William Temple and the Challenge of Reinhold Niebuhr"
in Theology Vol. LXXXIV (1981)
- Temple, William: Thoughts in Wartime Macmillan 1940
Christianity and Social Order Penguin 1942
and Raven, C. Is Christ Divided? Penguin 1943
- Thielicke, H. Theological Ethics A. & C. Black 1969
- Thomas, G. and Morgan-Witts, M. Ruin from the Air The Atomic
Mission to Hiroshima Sphere 1980
- Thompson, E. P. and Smith, D. Protest and Survive Penguin 1980
- Thrall, M. "The Bishops and Nuclear Warfare" in Theology Vol.75 1972
- Underhill, E. The Church and War A.P.F. 1940
- United States Catholic Bishops:
The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and our Response
Pastoral Letter on War and Peace in the Nuclear Age
C.T.S./S.P.C.K. 1983
- Utley, T. E. and Norman, E. R. British Churches and the Peace Movement
Alliance 1983
- Vincent, J. J. Christ in a Nuclear World Crux Press 1963
- Walzer, Michael: Just and Unjust Wars Allen Lane 1978
- Wignall, P. G. "Donald MacKinnon's published writings 1937-1980"
C.U.P. 1982 in Hebblethwaite and Sutherland (Eds.)
The Philosophical Frontiers of Christian Theology

- Wilkinson, Alan: The Church of England and the First World War
S.P.C.K. 1978
"The Paradox of the Military Chaplain" in Theology
Vol. LXXXIV 1981
"The Prolonged Passion of Mankind" in New Fire
Volume 7, No. 54. Spring 1983
Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English
Churches 1900-1945 S.C.M. Press 1986
- Willmer, H. "After One Year" in Crucible April-June 1983

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Lambeth Conference Reports, S.P.C.K.-Seabury 1930-1978

Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury 1939-1969

Chronicle of the Convocation of York 1939-1969

General Synod Reports 1970-1983

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship:

Monthly Letters and Annual Reports 1937-1981

HYMN BOOKS

Ancient and Modern 1861

Ancient and Modern Revised 1950

English Hymnal 1906

Public School Hymnbook 1937

Songs of Praise 1925

PRAYER BOOKS

Alternative Service Book 1980

Book of Common Prayer

Army Prayer Book. War Office 1961

A Book of Army Prayers. Ministry of Defence (Army) 1969

