Application of Just War Theory

Nuclear Weapons

U.S. Catholic Bishops.

In their 1983 pastoral letter on war and peace: The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops applied just war criteria to the use of nuclear weapons. (See pp. 26-34 for their statement of these criteria.) They offered their moral judgment on different kinds of use.

> *Counter Population Warfare.* "Under no circumstance may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass destruction be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly civilian targets." (p. 46)
>
> *Retaliatory Action.* "Retaliatory action whether nuclear or conventional which would indiscriminately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless action of their government, must also be condemned. This condemnation, in our judgment, applies even to the retaliatory use of weapons striking enemy cities after our own have already been struck." (p. 47)
>
> *Initiation of Nuclear War.* "We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear warfare, on however restricted a scale, can be morally justified. Non-nuclear attacks by another state must be resisted by other than nuclear means." (p. 47)
>
> *Limited Nuclear War.* "Our examination of the various arguments on this question makes us highly skeptical about the real meaning of 'limited.' One of the criteria of the just-war teaching is that there must be reasonable hope of success in bringing about justice and peace. We must ask whether such a reasonable hope can exist once nuclear weapons have been exchanged. The burden of proof remains on those who assert that meaningful limitation is possible." (pp. v-vi)

Regarding Nuclear Deterrence the U.S. Catholic bishops accepted the statement that Pope John Paul II made to the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1982:

> "In current conditions 'deterrence' based on balance, certainly not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable. Nevertheless, in order to ensure peace, it is indispensable not to be satisfied with this minimum which is always susceptible to the real danger of explosion." (p. iii)

United Methodist Bishops

In their 1986 foundation document and pastoral letter, In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace, the United Methodist Council of Bishops drew on several theological perspectives in stating their opposition to any use of nuclear weapons. Among these they cited three just-war principles (p. 34).

> First, we are convinced that no actual use of nuclear weapons offers any reasonable hope of success in achieving a just peace....

> Second, we believe that the principle of discrimination, whatever the intent of political and military leaders, is bound to be horribly violated in any likely use of nuclear weapons....
>
> Third, we cannot imagine that the norm of proportionality can be meaningfully honored in a nuclear war, since such a war could not be waged with any realistic expectation of doing more good than harm.
>
> These considerations posed by the still-valuable just-war tradition require us to say No, a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons.

The United Methodist bishops parted company with the Catholic bishops on the matter of nuclear deterrence. They stated:

> We believe, however, that the moral case for nuclear deterrence, even as an interim ethic, has been undermined by unrelenting arms escalation. Deterrence no longer serves, if it ever did, as a strategy that facilitates disarmament. (p. 47)

The United Methodist bishops further pointed out:

> Deterrence has too long been reverenced as the unquestioning idol of national security. (p 46)
>
> It is the idolatrous connection between the ideology of deterrence and the existence of the weapons themselves that must be broken. Deterrence must no longer receive the churches' blessing, even as a temporary warrant for the maintenance of nuclear weapons. (p. 48)

Gulf War (1990-1991)

The Gulf War began on August 2, 1990 when Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. The United States responded by deploying troops to Saudi Arabia and working with allies and the United Nations through diplomacy and economic sanctions to get Iraq to withdraw. When this did not happen, President H.W. Bush authorized military action, supported by resolutions from the United Nations and the U.S. Congress, the latter by a narrow margin. Allied bombing started on January 16, 1991, and land forces went into action in Kuwait on February 23. With their rapid success President Bush ordered a cease fire on February 27. Surviving Iraqi troops escaped into Iraq. All fighting ended on March 3 when Iraq accepted the terms of the cease fire.

During the fall of 1990 and into 1991 there was substantial opposition to immediate military action by many religious denominations in the United States and the Holy See. The peace churches were totally opposed to this war as well as all others. Denominations working with just war principles believed that not all peaceful alternatives had been pursued. They determined that by January 1991 *war had not become the last resort*. Pope John Paul II opposed the Gulf War because it didn't conform to just war principles. He spoke against it 56 times.

After the Gulf War was over two pairs of scholars examined the evidence to determine whether it was a just war. In the following books, the first concluded that just war criteria were not met. The second concluded that it was a just war.

- Alan Geyer and Barbara Green, *Lines In The Sand.* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.
- James Turner Johnson & George Weigel. *Just War and The Gulf War*. Washington: Ethics & Public Policy Center

U.S. Invasion of Afghanistan (2001)

Following the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush demanded that the Taliban, which governed Afghanistan, deliver Al-Quaida leaders located in that country to the United States. The UN Security Council made similar demands. When this did not occur promptly, U.S. and British air forces began bombing Al-Quaida and Taliban targets on October 7. Later in the month land forces moved in.

On October 13, 2001 the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society adopted a "Statement to the Church on the Terrorist Attack and the US Response." The Board mourned for those killed in the September 11 attacks and condemned "all acts of terrorism, with no exception for the target or the source." The statement also indicated:

> We claim the teachings of the Prince of Peace who instructs us to love and pray for our enemies and refrain from responding to violence with violence. As we join people around the world in our resolve to bring terrorists to justice, we understand that war is not an appropriate means of responding to criminal acts against humanity.

Later in October the directors of the Women's Division, United Methodist General Board of Global Ministries urged President Bush to use diplomatic means, rather than the bombing of Afghanistan, to bring those responsible for the Sept. 11 terrorists attacks to justice.
When the United Methodist Council of Bishops met in November, they adopted "A Pastoral Letter to the Whole Church". The letter went through several drafts as the bishops debated whether it should be pastoral or prophetic. In the end it was some of both. For example, the letter expressed " Our fervent and constant prayers are for those who grieve,... for the people who have been placed in harm's way" and for others affected by the emergence of terrorism They also noted: " We, your bishops, believe that violence in all of its forms and expressions is contrary to God's purpose for the world. Violence creates fear, desperation, hopelessness and instability." However, the United Methodist bishops could not agree on what to say about the Afghan War and other military action.

Meeting the same month, the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, while not indicating whether the war was justified, adopted a statement that, among other things, called for "an early end to the bombing campaign and for all parties to collaborate with the international community to discern non-violent means that may be available by which to bring to justice those who terrorize the nations of the world."

In response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, Pope John Paul II "said that nations have a moral and legal right to defend themselves against terrorism. .He did not condemn the bombing of Afghanistan, although he did say that such military actions must be

aimed solely at people with "criminal culpability" and not whole groups of innocent civilians. (The New York Times, January 14, 2003)

At their semi-annual meeting in November 2001 the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops offered their views in A Pastoral Message: Living with Faith and Hope After September 11. In a section on "The use of military force", the Catholic bishops gave cautionary support for the Afghan War on the basis of just war principles. However, they noted: "The continuing priority must be to ensure that military force is directed at those who use terror and those who assist them, not at the Afghan people or Islam."

In January 2002 a majority attending a meeting of the Society of Christian Ethics agreed that the military effort in Afghanistan fits the just war principles. However, a minority of those present stood against the war.

Iraq War (2003-)

In the summer and fall of 2002 President George W. Bush and his administration increased the level of rhetoric and diplomacy against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. In October the U.S. Congress gave the president conditional authority to wage war against Iraq. In November the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution calling for renewed inspection in Iraq for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and stating that there would be "serious consequences" if the Iraqi government did not fully cooperate. President Bush claimed the authority of these two resolutions to attack and invade Iraq on March 20, 2003.

The build-up toward the Iraq War generated strong opposition from mainline Protestant denominations, the Catholic Church, and peace churches in the United States and from Pope John Paul II in the Vatican. The Catholics and some Protestants insisted that the pending use of military force against Iraq did not satisfy just war criteria. Others invoked other theological grounds.

On October 4, 2002 Bishop Sharon A. Brown Christopher, president of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, sent a pastoral letter to United Methodists in which she wrote: "A pre-emptive war by the United States against a nation like Iraq goes against the very grain of our understanding of the Gospel, our church's teachings and our conscience. Pre-emptive strike does not reflect restraint and does not allow for the adequate pursuit of peaceful means for resolving conflict. To be silent in the face of such a prospect is not an option for followers of Christ." The United Methodist Council of Bishops endorsed Bishop Christopher's letter in November. The General Board of Church and Society, the General Board of Global Ministry, and the Board of Directors, Women's Division also spoke out against going to war against Iraq.

In September 2000 Bishop Wilton D. Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, wrote a letter to President Bush on Iraq in behalf of the Conference's Administrative Committee. He stated, " Given the precedents and risks involved, we find it difficult to justify extending the war on terrorism to Iraq, absent clear and adequate evidence of Iraqi involvement in the attacks of September 11th or of an imminent attack of a grave nature."

In November 2002 the full U.S. Conference of Bishops issued their own Statement on Iraq. They indicated, "With the Holy See and bishops from the Middle East and around the world, we fear that resort to war, under present circumstances and in light of current public information, would not meet the strict conditions in Catholic teaching for overriding the strong presumption against the use of military force."

Their objections were based upon considerations of *just cause* (it doesn't include regime change), *legitimate authority* (requiring specific United Nations endorsement), *probability of success and proportionality* ("must not produce evils and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated"), and *norms governing the conduct of war* ("the lives of Iraqi men, women and children should be valued as we would the lives of members of our own family and citizens of our own country"). In this same period Pope John Paul II spoke out repeatedly against waging war on Iraq. He and other Vatican leaders stated that just war theory does not allow for preemptive or preventive war. In January 2003 the pope told the diplomatic emissaries to the Vatican, "War is not always inevitable. It is always a defeat for humanity."

Many other religious organizations, -- Protestant, Quaker and Mennonite, Orthodox, Jewish -- opposed going to war against Iraq. Some used just war arguments, others offered other theological perspectives.

There has been, however, some religious support for the Iraq war from conservative Catholics and Evangelicals. The latter is represented by an article entitled "John Wesley & Just War" that appeared in *Good News Magazine* May-June 2003.

In Catholic circles support for the view that military action against Iraq would be just came from some of the participants in three public forums held since September 11, 2001. They are:

- Just War and Counterterrorism: Views from the Catholic Church, a debate sponsored by the Faith and Reason Institute on September 24, 2001
- Would an Invasion of Iraq Be a "Just War"?, a forum held by the U.S. Institute of Peace on December 17, 2002.
- War in Iraq: Is it Just?, a seminar sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center on February 3, 2003.

From Good News Magazine May/June 2003
John Wesley & just war
By Peter R. McGuire

In the case of Iraq, we are enforcing the UN treaties signed by Iraq in 1991. Those treaties allowed Saddam Hussein to remain in power, pending his willingness to meet the expectations of the world community and disarm. Iraq has not met those requirements. As Secretary of State Colin Powell argued on February 5, 2003, they continue to hide and produce weapons of mass destruction. “Saddam Hussein has used these horrific weapons on another country and on his own people. In fact, in the history of chemical warfare, no country has had more battlefield experience with chemical weapons since World War I than Saddam Hussein’s Iraq,” he said. “Second, as with biological weapons, Saddam Hussein has never accounted for vast amounts of

chemical weaponry: 550 artillery shells with mustard, 30,000 empty munitions and enough precursors to increase his stockpile to as much as 500 tons of chemical agents."

Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapons agent. That is enough agent to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets. Even the low end of 100 tons of agent would enable Saddam Hussein to cause mass casualties across more than 100 square miles of territory, an area nearly five times the size of Manhattan.

We also have sources who tell us that since the 1980s, Saddam's regime has been experimenting on human beings to perfect its biological and chemical weapons. A source said that 1600 death-row prisoners were transferred in 1995 to a special unit for such experiments.

An eyewitness saw prisoners tied down to beds, experiments conducted on them, blood oozing around the victims' mouths, and autopsies performed to confirm the effects on the prisoners.23

War is not a Christian response to violence. We cannot pretend that it is. It is our responsibility though, as the most powerful nation in the world to work towards freedom and peace around the world. As the world's leader in freedom and justice, though we are not perfect, we must share our blessings with others. We have for many years, fed, clothed, and provided healthcare for the world. We will continue to do so.

We will continue to live and act as the foremost beacon of republican government, which is to say the form of government most dissimilar to that of Iraq and Al Qaeda. Unlike Iraq and Al Qaeda, it is not the policy of our military to attack innocent civilians. Unlike Iraq and Al Qaeda, we help the victims of our military aggression rebuild. Unlike Iraq and Al Qaeda, we provide medical relief to those in need and feed the surrounding communities where our units are stationed. Unlike Iraq and Al Qaeda, we warn the innocent that they are in danger. The bearers of terror have acted in an unjust way, and we have chosen to not repeat their actions. Though we are sinful, we are still acting in a just cause. We are acting to bring freedom and security to the Middle East and to our own country. We are in a just cause. I believe Wesley would agree.

Peter R. McGuire is an ordained Elder in the United Methodist Church, and currently serves Center UM Church in Catawba, North Carolina. Rev. McGuire is the author of several articles, the recently released volume The Fruit of the Vine – A History of Methodism in the Southern Piedmont, and was co-editor of the 1999 book Theology From the Belly of the Whale – A Frederick Herzog Reader.

Armageddon

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armageddon
see Eschatology file

Book of Revelation
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Book_of_Revelation

Christian Eschatology
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_eschatology

Welcome to Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia

Articles Wanted on Theology of War and Peace

Methodists United for Peace with Justice has embarked on a project on the Theology of War and Peace. It is described at http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. We have posted articles on our website for use by local study groups. We are seeking additional articles on topics listed below.

The purpose is to provide information for members of local groups engaged in study of the theology of war and peace. An article might be 6-8 pages or 1,200 to 2,000 words in length. Because this is a low-budget project, we are asking authors to contribute their articles pro bono.

Reign of God
The nature of the Kingdom of God here and now as taught by Jesus in the Gospels.

Eschatological Writings of the Bible
A review of biblical passages dealing with eschatology (concerning final events), particularly as they relate to matters of war and peace. For example, Ezekiel 38 & 39, Daniel, Zechariah 12-14. Matthew 24:4-51, Mark 13:3-37, Luke 21:8-36, Matthew 25:31-46, Revelation

Reformation and Peace Churches
Approaches to war and peace by Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox (for example) contrasted to peace churches (Mennonites, Society of Friends, and Church of the Brethren) that emerged in the same period.

John Wesley's Views on War and Peace
What John Wesley wrote and preached about matters of war and peace.

Armageddon
Beliefs associated with the final battle of Armageddon and how those beliefs influence views on current events in the Middle East.

Black Theology
An article on Black theology as it has emerged in the past 40 years, particularly related to social change, war and peace, and whether violence is appropriate in certain situations.

If you are interested in writing one of these articles, please contact Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. E-mail: hhallman@mupj.org. Telephone: 301 896-0013.

September 2005

Theology of War and Peace
A Study Group at Bethesda United Methodist Church

7:30 to 9:00 p.m., Monday evenings in September-November 2005
Discussion Leader: Howard W. Hallman
Study material available at http://www.mupwj.org/quadrilateral.htm

September 12 *War and Peace in the Old Testament*
Discussion article: "War and the Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible"
by Harold C. Washington
Other readings at http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#oldtestament

September 19 *New Testament Perspective on War and Peace*
Discussion articles: " Dealing with Adversaries: New Testament Teachings by Word and Deed" by Howard W. Hallman
"Bishops Analyze the New Testament"
Available at http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#newtestament

September 26 *Christian History: First Millenium*
Discussion articles: "Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace"
by D. Stephen Long. Available at http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm
"The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity"
by Albert Hernández. To be available as handout.

October 3 *Christian History: Second Millenium*
Discussion articles to be available:
"Non-Violence and Peace Traditions in Early & Eastern Christianity"
"Reformation and Peace Churches"
"Evangelical United Brethren Tradition"
"Methodism"

October 10 *Theology of Pacifism*
Discussion articles: "A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism"
by George Hunsinger (available at http://www.mupwj.org/hunsinger.htm)
"Christological Pacifism" by Stanley Hauewas (to be available)
Other readings at http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#articlesontheweb

October 17 *Just War Theology*
Discussion articles: "The Just War Tradition and Christian Discipleship"
by Daniel M. Bell, Jr. Available at http://www.mupwj.org/danielbell.htm
"Contemporary Application of Just War Theory"
available at http://www.mupwj.org/application.htm
Other readings at http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#articlesontheweb

October 24 *Eschatology and Armageddon*
Discussion articles to be developed.

over

October 31 *Liberation Theology*
Discussion articles: "Feminism and the Challenges of War"
by Beverly E. Mitchell (to be available)
Under development: "Liberation Theology in Latin America"
"Black Theology"

November 7 *Experience with Nonviolent Action*
Discussion articles: "The Global Spread of Active Nonviolence"
by Richard Deats. Available at
http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/0900_73deats.html
"The Year 1989" by Pope John Paul II
Available at http://www.mupwj.org/TheYear1989.pdf
"Nonviolence as a Legitimate Means toward Peace in Palestine"
by Mubarak Awad. Available at http://www.mupwj.org/awad.htm
Readings on nonviolent principles and techniques available at
http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#principlesandtechniques

November 14 *Experience with Diplomacy and International Law*
Articles to be developed.

November 21 *Review and Synthesis*

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at 301 897-3668 or at hhallman@mupwj.org.

Bishop Kenneth Hicks
United Methodist Church
3909 South Lookout
Little Rock, AR 72205-2027
501-663-9670
January 30, 2003 NCC letter on Iraq to President Bush
http://www.ncccusa.org/news/03news4.html

United Methodist bishops sharpen focus on making disciples of Christ
http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=3190#more

"Can the world wait for us to get to transformation?" asked retired Bishop Kenneth Hicks of Little Rock, Ark. The world can't wait another quadrennium or two, he said.

Pulaski Heights United Methodist Church 3,600 members
REV. VICTOR H. NIXON, Senior Pastor
He was a reserve delegate to the South Central Jurisdiction Conference in 1976, and a delegate to the World Methodist Conference, Nairobi, Kenya, in 1986. The summer of 1988 he participated in a study tour on "Peace, Development and Disarmament" in the Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic. He was elected as a delegate to the 1992 and 2000 South Central Jurisdiction Conference and as a reserve delegate to the 1992 and 2000 General Conference. In July 2001 he served at the 18th World Methodist Conference in England.

Bishop Hicks, retired bishop in residence
khicks@phumc.com

Bishops Analyze the Old Testament

During the 1980s when U.S. Catholic and United Methodist bishops conducted studies on nuclear weapons, they established a strong biblical basis for their conclusions. Much of their analysis applies to broader issues of war and peace. Here we summarize their observations on the Old Testament and provide referral to their documents.

U.S. Catholic Bishops

In their 1983 Pastoral Letter on War and Peace the National Conference of Catholic Bishops offered an analysis of how war and peace are portrayed in the multi-layered accounts of the Old Testament. They recognized: "Violence and war are very much present in the history of the people of God, particularly from the Exodus period to the monarchy." But the image of a warrior God "was not the only image, and it was gradually transformed, particularly after the experience of the exile, when God was no longer identified with military victory and might."

Thus, "the images of peace and the demands upon the people for covenantal fidelity to true peace grow more urgent and more developed." "It was part of fidelity to care for the needy and helpless....Furthermore, covenantal fidelity demanded that Israel put its trust in God alone and look only to him for security."

This led to a portrayal of hope for eschatological peace. In the final age, the Messianic time, creation will be made whole and "justice will dwell in the wilderness." "There will be no need for instruments of war." "A messiah will appear, a servant of God upon whom God has placed his spirit and who will faithfully bring forth justice to the nations."

For the U.S. Catholic bishops' full exposition on the Old Testament, read pp. 10-13 in The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response.

United Methodist Bishops

In their 1986 document In Defense of Creation the United Methodist Council of Bishops observed, "At the heart of the Old Testament is the testimony of shalom, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace....Shalom is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, and well-being in all human relationships....It is harmony between humanity and all of God's good creation." "To be sure," the bishops wrote, "the Old Testament tells of much violence and warfare. In Israel's earliest traditions Yahweh is often portrayed as a warrior. God's victory over Pharaoh and the Egyptians to liberate Hebrew slaves discloses God's implacable opposition to oppression and injustice, which violate shalom. Exodus is liberation."

"It is when the elders of Israel forsake their moral covenant for warrior-kings that the nation begins its dismal descent into generations of exploitation, repression, and aggression -- and then into chaos and captivity." The great prophets of Exile offer a renewed vision of shalom: "Swords into plowshares, arms converted to food and death to life, no more wars or training for wars, peaceable kingdoms,...new covenants written on the heart." "The images forecast the coming of One who will be the Prince of Peace."

Read pp. 23-27 in In Defense of Creation for the United Methodist bishops' full discussion of the Old Testament.

The United Methodist bishops offer further analysis of the Old Testament in their 2004 study guide, In Search of Security. Topics include the promise of God, to walk securely, the redemption of Israel, the question of justice, trust and security, and against false security.

Regarding the "wars of the Lord", the bishops point out that God destroyed the Egyptian army without any help from soldiers or weapons on Israel's side. "Even in the battles for the conquest of the promised land and its defense against its enemies we have many stories that seek to show rather graphically that God is not 'always with the largest battalions'. " The bishops conclude, "In the Bible, taking up arms is never the way to real security and peace."

The United Methodist bishops' Old Testament analysis is found on pp.7-11 of In Search of Security from the perspective of security.

Bulletin announcement for Sunday, September 11, 2005

THEOLOGY OF WAR AND PEACE. A new study group on the Theology of War and Peace holds its first session at 7:30 p.m., Monday, September 12 in Room . It is open to all interested persons. Led by Howard Hallman, sessions will occur each Monday evening until November 21. Topic for the first session is "War and Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible". A background paper on this topic and the 11-week agenda are available in the Narthex after each worship service on September 11. To indicate that you will participate or for further information, contact Howard at 301 897-3668 or at hhallman@mupwj.org.

Bulletin announcement for Sunday, September 18, 2005

THEOLOGY OF WAR AND PEACE. The study group on the Theology of War and Peace holds its second session at 7:30 p.m., Monday, September 19 in Room 209. It is open to all interested persons. Led by Howard Hallman, sessions will occur each Monday evening until November 21. Topic for this week's session is " Dealing with Adversaries: New Testament Teachings by Word and Deed." A background paper is available at http://www.mupwj.org/DealiingwithAdversaries.pdf. For further information, contact Howard at 301 897-3668 or at hhallman@mupwj.org.

For the October 2005 Messenger

THEOLOGY OF WAR AND PEACE. The study group on the Theology of War and Peace will meet at 7:30 p.m. each Monday evening in October. All interested persons may attend. Topics for the month are:

October 3 Christian History: Second Millenium
October 10 Theology of Pacifism
October 17 Just War Theology and Application
October 31 Liberation Theology

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at 301 897-3668 or at hhallman@mupwj.org.

BUMC Study Group on Theology of War and Peace

Jack Fisher <jrfisher57@excite.com>, "Reuben Alexander" <hochstrd@cs.rose-hulman.edu>, "Tamara Alexander" <tamara017@comcast.net>, Janet Edmonds <j.edmonds@erols.com>, Connie Louy <conniechon@yahoo.com>, Haven North <willnorth@aol.com>, India Hook-Barnard <igh215@msn.com>, Travis Barnard <tJbb23@msn.com>, Becker Kathy CDR <kbecker@COMFORT.NAVY.MIL>, HolRonFost@aol.com <HolRonFost@aol.com>, rachel cornwell <rachelcornwell@earthlink.net>

Church Agencies Create Picture of Young People's Programs

More than 30 adults from seven agencies of the UMC, staff members who work with young people, gathered Oct. 4-5 for an interagency consultation to work on ways agencies can collaborate and partner with one another and share the work each is doing as it relates to young people. One of the most significant outcomes of the meeting was "the articulation of a shared mission and vision related to ministries with youth and young adults and identification of opportunities for collaborative ministry," said Lillian Smith, associate general secretary for the Division on Ministries with Young People. Smith said the interagency gathering, while the first since the beginning of the division, builds on the groundwork laid by the Shared Mission Focus on Young People. "For eight years, staff colleagues from all the boards and agencies worked together," she said.

One of the outcomes of the meeting will be the creation of a "resource hub" providing a complete picture of all the resources, seminars, Web sites, and work the church's agencies do related to young people. "The idea is that any United Methodist anywhere in the world will be able to use this [hub] to find resources to use in ministry with young people," said Michelle McCorkle, director of leadership development for adult workers at the division. "The dream is that eventually we will have sections in different languages," she added.

The resource hub will be a printed catalog in addition to being available on the Web. Agency staff members will send a list of the work their board does with young people to McCorkle by Dec. 1, and the plan is to have the resource well under way by the next interagency meeting in November 2006. Agencies represented at the meeting were the General Board of Discipleship, which houses the young people's division, the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, the General Board of Global Ministries, the General Board of Church and Society, UM Communications, UM Men, and the UM Publishing House. - Kathy L. Gilbert (UMNS)

Go to http:://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#crusades

Add the following:

Crusades

The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity

by Albert Hernández

"There must be war! God wills it! This is the rallying-cry of the crusader forces that control Jerusalem during the late-1100s in Ridley Scott's acclaimed 2005 film *Kingdom of Heaven*, one of the few Hollywood portrayals of the Crusades ever praised by Muslim and Arab-American groups. Ironically the Bible, Qur'an and Torah texts of those who fought in the Crusades proclaimed the Word of a God in whose image and likeness the first human, Adam, was created.

Indeed as descendants of both Adam and the Children of Abraham all Jews, Christians, and Muslims had much more in common than most of the instigators and soldiers were willing to admit. Even amidst the violence and turbulence of the Crusades, some remarkable examples of toleration and mutual edification have come down to us through the centuries. Some medieval Jewish, Muslim, and Christian thinkers asked a timeless theological question: What did God intend by the multiplicity of faiths?

Read more....... [http://www.mupwj.org/hernandez.htm]

Also see:
From Wikipedia
Religious War [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_war]
Crusades   [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crusades]
Reconquista [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reconquista]
Crusades [http://www.answers.com/crusades#Encyclopedia]

Christological Pacifism

by Stanley Hauerwas
Duke Divinity School

[box]
VIEW OR PRINT PDF
THIS SECTION

John Howard Yoder is the great representative of Christological pacifism. He developed his account of Christian nonviolence in his great book *The Politics of Jesus*, but his account of the distinctiveness of Christological pacifism is perhaps best found in his book *Nevertheless*. In that book he outlined over twenty types of pacifism, each of which he describes for their virtues as well as their limits.

Most forms of pacifism in modernity developed after World War I. The assumption was that war, given the experience of WWI, was simply irrational. So pacifism named the rejection of war because war could not accomplish its declared purpose, that is, peace. Yoder, like Reinhold Niebuhr, was a relentless critic of that kind of pacifism. He was so because such an account of nonviolence was too easily defeated by showing the necessity of violence in this or that circumstances to produce limited ends.

In contrast, Yoder developed an account of Christian nonviolence which depends on the doctrine of God. Yoder certainly thought that there are numerous New Testament texts that require Christians to live nonviolently. We are expected to forgive our enemies, and Paul requires in Romans 12 that Christians do not retaliate. But Yoder's account of Christian nonviolence does not turn on any one text. Rather Christian nonviolence is made possible by the Son of God suffering on the cross, thereby revealing that the Father refuses to save the world through violence. Rather the Father in the Son takes upon himself our violence so that violence might be forever ended.

That is why in *Nevertheless* Yoder observes that his account of nonviolence is

> "the only position for which the person of Jesus is indispensable. It's the only one of these positions which would lose its substance if Jesus were not the Christ and lose its foundation if Jesus Christ were not the Lord.
>
> "Since Jesus is seen in his full humanity as responding to the needs an temptations of a social character, the problems for our obedience to him are not problems in the interpretation of texts. Nor is the question of our fidelity one of moralism, a stuffy preoccupation with never making a mistake.
>
> "The question put to us as we follow Jesus is not whether we have successfully refrained from breaking any rules. Instead we are asked whether we have been participants in that human experience, that peculiar way of living for God in the world and being used as instruments of the living God in the world, which the Bible calls agape or cross."

Therefore, Yoder speaks of the pacifism of the messianic community. Nonviolence names not just a response to the violence of the state, but rather a way of life of a community that lives through practices of reconciliation and forgiveness. So Matthew 18 becomes crucial for this account of nonviolence because Christians must be willing to expose and have exposed their sins to one another in a way that their community can live in peace.

The nonviolence that is Christologically displayed is also an ecclesiological position. Christians are called to a community of nonviolence in a world of war thereby creating the division between Church and world. Therefore, Christian nonviolence is not a strategy to end war, though of course it certainly wants to make war less likely. Rather Christians are called to nonviolence in a world of war because they can do nothing less as faithful followers of Christ. Christian nonviolence is an eschatological position that reminds Christians that we live in a new age begun by Christ yet not yet consummated. Accordingly, Christian nonviolence is the exemplification of God's patience as found in the cross to redeem us so that we might be for the world his promised people.

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

Christological Pacifism

John Howard Yoder is the great representative of Christological pacifism. He developed his account of Christian nonviolence in his great book The Politics of Jesus, but his account of the distinctiveness of Christological pacifism is perhaps best found in his book Nevertheless. In that book he outlined over twenty types of pacifism each of which he describes for their virtues as well as their limits.

Most forms of pacifism in modernity developed after World War I. The assumption was that war, given the experience of WWI, was simply irrational. So pacifism named the rejection of war because war could not accomplish its declared purpose, that is, peace. Yoder, like Reinhold Niebuhr, was a relentless critic of that kind of pacifism. He was so because such an account of nonviolence was too easily defeated by showing the necessity of violence in this or that circumstances to produce limited ends.

In contrast, Yoder developed an account of Christian nonviolence which depends on the doctrine of God. Yoder certainly thought that there are numerous New Testament texts that require Christians to live nonviolently. We are expected to forgive our enemies and Paul requires in Romans 12 that Christians do not retaliate. But Yoder's account of Christian nonviolence does not turn on any one text. Rather Christian nonviolence is made possible by the Son of God suffering on the cross, thereby revealing that the Father refuses to save the world through violence. Rather the Father in the Son takes upon himself our violence so that violence might be forever ended.

That is why in Nevertheless Yoder observes that his account of nonviolence is

> the only position for which the person of Jesus is indespensible. It's the only one of these positions which would lose its substance if Jesus were not the Christ and lose its foundation if Jesus Christ were not the Lord. Since Jesus is seen in his full humanity as responding to the needs an temptations of a social character the problems for our obedience to him are not problems in the interpretation of texts. Nor is the question of our fidelity one of moralism, a stuffy preoccupation with never making a mistake. The question put to us as we follow Jesus is not whether we have successfully refrained from breaking any rules. Instead we are asked whether we have been participants in that human experience, that peculiar way of living for God in the world and being used as instruments of the living God in the world, which the Bible calls agape or cross.

Therefore Yoder speaks of the pacifism of the messianic community. Nonviolence names not just a response to the violence of the state, but rather a way of life of a community that lives through practices of reconciliation and forgiveness. So Matthew 18 becomes crucial for this account of nonviolence because Christians must be willing to expose and have exposed their sins to one another in a way that their community can live in peace.

Accordingly the nonviolence that is Christologically displayed is also an ecclesiological position. Christians are called to a community of nonviolence in a world of war thereby creating the division between Church and world.

Therefore Christian nonviolence is not a strategy to end war, though of course it certainly wants to make war less likely, but rather Christians are called to nonviolence in a world of war because they can do nothing less as faithful followers of Christ. Christian nonviolence, therefore, is an eschatological position that reminds Christians that we live in a new age begun by Christ yet not yet consummated. Accordingly, Christian nonviolence is the exemplification of God's patience as found in the cross to redeem us so that we might be for the world his promised people.

Christological Pacifism

by Stanley Hauerwas
Duke Divinity School

John Howard Yoder is the great representative of Christological pacifism. He developed his account of Christian nonviolence in his great book *The Politics of Jesus*, but his account of the distinctiveness of Christological pacifism is perhaps best found in his book *Nevertheless*. In that book he outlined over twenty types of pacifism each of which he describes for their virtues as well as their limits.

Most forms of pacifism in modernity developed after World War I. The assumption was that war, given the experience of WWI, was simply irrational. So pacifism named the rejection of war because war could not accomplish its declared purpose, that is, peace. Yoder, like Reinhold Niebuhr, was a relentless critic of that kind of pacifism. He was so because such an account of nonviolence was too easily defeated by showing the necessity of violence in this or that circumstances to produce limited ends.

In contrast, Yoder developed an account of Christian nonviolence which depends on the doctrine of God. Yoder certainly thought that there are numerous New Testament texts that require Christians to live nonviolently. We are expected to forgive our enemies, and Paul requires in Romans 12 that Christians do not retaliate. But Yoder's account of Christian nonviolence does not turn on any one text. Rather Christian nonviolence is made possible by the Son of God suffering on the cross, thereby revealing that the Father refuses to save the world through violence. Rather the Father in the Son takes upon himself our violence so that violence might be forever ended.

That is why in *Nevertheless* Yoder observes that his account of nonviolence is

> "the only position for which the person of Jesus is indispensable. It's the only one of these positions which would lose its substance if Jesus were not the Christ and lose its foundation if Jesus Christ were not the Lord.
>
> "Since Jesus is seen in his full humanity as responding to the needs an temptations of a social character, the problems for our obedience to him are not problems in the interpretation of texts. Nor is the question of our fidelity one of moralism, a stuffy preoccupation with never making a mistake.
>
> "The question put to us as we follow Jesus is not whether we have successfully refrained from breaking any rules. Instead we are asked whether we have been participants in that human experience, that peculiar way of living for God in the world and being used as instruments of the living God in the world, which the Bible calls agape or cross."

Therefore, Yoder speaks of the pacifism of the messianic community. Nonviolence names not just a response to the violence of the state, but rather a way of life of a community that lives through practices of reconciliation and forgiveness. So Matthew 18

becomes crucial for this account of nonviolence because Christians must be willing to expose and have exposed their sins to one another in a way that their community can live in peace.

The nonviolence that is Christologically displayed is also an ecclesiological position. Christians are called to a community of nonviolence in a world of war thereby creating the division between Church and world. Therefore, Christian nonviolence is not a strategy to end war, though of course it certainly wants to make war less likely. Rather Christians are called to nonviolence in a world of war because they can do nothing less as faithful followers of Christ. Christian nonviolence is an eschatological position that reminds Christians that we live in a new age begun by Christ yet not yet consummated. Accordingly, Christian nonviolence is the exemplification of God's patience as found in the cross to redeem us so that we might be for the world his promised people.

____

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity

by Albert Hernández
Iliff School of Theology

[box]
VIEW OR PRINT PDF
THIS SECTION

"There must be war! God wills it! This is the rallying-cry of the crusader forces that control Jerusalem during the late-1100s in Ridley Scott's acclaimed 2005 film *Kingdom of Heaven*, one of the few Hollywood portrayals of the Crusades ever praised by Muslim and Arab-American groups. Ironically the Bible, Qur'an and Torah texts of those who fought in the Crusades proclaimed the Word of a God in whose image and likeness the first human, Adam, was created.

Indeed as descendants of both Adam and the Children of Abraham all Jews, Christians, and Muslims had much more in common than most of the instigators and soldiers were willing to admit. Even amidst the violence and turbulence of the Crusades, some remarkable examples of toleration and mutual edification have come down to us through the centuries. Some medieval Jewish, Muslim, and Christian thinkers asked a timeless theological question: What did God intend by the multiplicity of faiths?

On a different note, I have never forgotten the descriptions of the Crusades in my old high school and undergraduate world history textbooks as having "beneficial effects" because "Europe was exposed to the scientific advancements of the Arabs" which
stimulated the economy and a revival of learning. However, the historical realities and unfortunate legacies of the various conflicts, known as the Crusades, are not as simple as the sentiments expressed by providential slogans about the Will of God, nor as such outdated educational materials would have us believe.

The truth is that on the receiving end of these chivalric campaigns, thousands of non-combatants died, towns were burned and communities shattered forever. Long before the Crusades, the Arabs and the kingdoms of the Latin West had economic and cultural ties that helped decrease the isolation and impoverishment known to Western Europeans as the "Dark Ages." The impact of the Crusades upon the development of medieval Europe and the legacy of these military expeditions for the future of Arab and Islamic civilization is one of the most misunderstood and neglected aspects of today's public and theological discourse.

What Were the Crusades?

Medievalists are divided as to what the defining periods and characteristics of the Crusades really were. Some regard the Crusades to the Holy Land, which lasted from 1095 to 1291 as the classic definition and example of this conflict. Another faction has argued that "crusading" was an integral part of European history from the 700's through the 1600's and was motivated much more by cultural assumptions about territorial, political, economic, and military issues than by

mere stereotypes about religious wars or by theological differences between Muslims and Christians.

Even in the case of the Albigensian Crusade, conducted by Christians against the Cathar heretics of Languedoc over a thirty-five year span and culminating in the infamous massacre at Montsegur on March 16, 1244, we find protracted disputes over economic, political, and territorial issues motivating leaders and participants on each side. This was a fight for control of southern France, in which both the Papacy and northern French nobility seemed as intent on centralizing power as on rooting out heresy.

Thus, the medieval idea of "crusade" was not just aimed at Arabs or Muslims in the Holy Land but extended to heretics and pagans, renegade nobles and kings, and enemies of the Pope across Europe.[i] In contrast, with the much more well-known Crusades to the Holy Land, which spanned only two centuries, Spain and Portugal waged a lengthy "Reconquest" for the future of Christendom, a cosmic battle that lasted from the Moorish invasion of Iberia in 711 to the fall of the Caliphate of Granada in 1492.

From these varied perspectives, the following article offers an overview of the Crusades to the Holy Land followed by a summary and analysis of the largely forgotten yet still smoldering historical legacy of the Spanish Reconquest. The need for a lasting peace with justice amidst the current global crisis necessitates that we revisit the lessons of the Crusades and the medieval legacy of religious toleration among Abraham's Children.

The Crusades to the Holy Land

The term "crusade" derives from the red crosses which crusader knights and soldiers inscribed on their white tunics. To Arab and Muslim chroniclers, the Crusades were known as "the Cross Wars" (*al-hurub al-salibiyya*). Cultural ignorance was rampant on both sides as the Europeans referred to all Arabs and Muslims as "Saracens" while most Arab chroniclers misrepresented the invaders as "Franks," after the Germanic tribe that settled the region of France. Considering how much of the Hebrew tradition and of Jesus' life is contained in the Qur'an, ignorance of each other's religious beliefs appears far deeper on the part of the European and Christian forces as their chroniclers often referred to mosques as "mahommedaries" and criticized Muslims for worshipping the Prophet Muhammad as a "god" while mistranslating his name with Latinized equivalents for "dog" and "devil."

In the post-9/11 era, almost all areas of medieval historical studies are booming but none more so than Crusade studies. On the surface this may seem odd to the general public but important reconsiderations of the political and theological ideas that led to the formation of European Christian ideologies of peace and holy war are being conducted.

Among these is Tomaž Mastnak's *Crusading Peace: Christendom, The Muslim World, and Western Political Order* (University of California Press, 2002), which examines the rise of the Crusading spirit in 1095 from the roots the church's attempt to curtail warfare and blood feuds among the nobility by enacting and enforcing sanctions like the Peace of God and the Truce of God. Converting and civilizing these Germanic warrior-princes became a top priority for the

medieval Church. Whereas Christ and the Apostles, and the early Church Fathers up through St. Augustine had clearly favored a pacifist tradition, as a result of becoming embedded in such political and military conflicts medieval Popes and Bishops gained great authority in promoting secular law and order.

This "new order" as directed by the Church set limitations upon feudal lords with respect to whom they were allowed to attack, the times of the liturgical calendar when they were allowed to take arms against one another, and the types of property and/or possessions they were forbidden to take. Mastnak's main thesis rests on the impact this restructuring of power and prohibition of war had upon the Church's political prominence in the Latin West: "The circumscription of violence opened the way for the Church not only to assert its control over the use of arms but also to direct violent action" (10). The stage was then set for crusading against Christendom's foreign enemies.

It was on the last day of the Council of Claremont, November 27, 1095, that Pope Urban II preached the sermon that inspired the First Crusade as a sort of "armed pilgrimage" to free Jerusalem from the infidels. Four years later the expedition succeeded in establishing the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, which existed until 1291. As much as we would like to have the text of that sermon, there is no surviving copy, nor do we even possess reliable accounts of what he told his audience on that fateful day. What little we do know about Pope Urban's rhetoric of war comes from a few clergy and nobles present but who wrote their accounts many years later. Most scholars agree that he discussed the need to re-take Jerusalem from the Muslims who denied the divinity of Christ, and that he probably promised God's salvation for those who took up the sword in the service of Christ and the Church.[ii] Hence the phrases "soldiers for Christ" and "Christian soldiers" (*milites Christi*).

By the mid-1100s, the Church had established religious orders of warrior-monks like the Templar Knights and the Order of Knights Hospitallers. As Abbot Odo of Cluny wrote: "Truly, no one ought to be worried because a just man sometimes makes use of fighting, which seems incompatible with religion" (as quoted in Mastnak, 17). Terms such as "peace war" and the "holy manner of warfare" are common among the French and Latin sources of this period. From our vantage point, we must ask whether focusing such aggression against a foreign foe, who just a few years earlier had been eagerly sought after as a trading partner with rich textiles and technological ingenuity, was motivated by a desire to decrease feudal violence in Europe while focusing Europe's feudal kingdoms against the Arabs and Islam to promote deeper socio-political unity back home.

While Arab and Muslim chroniclers interpreted the Crusades as ploys for colonization, the invaders employed divide and conquer tactics among rival local factions to weaken the Arab kingdoms of the Middle East.[iii] The Second Crusade began in 1145 after King Louis VII of France and Pope Eugenius III agreed that the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem needed their help once more. This time, St. Bernard of Clairvaux preached the sermon that unleashed the campaign and promised the participants absolution for their sins and the Lord's promise of salvation for their deeds of courage and sacrifice.

In 1187, the great Muslim leader Saladin recaptured Jerusalem and Philip Augustus of France together with Richard the Lion Heart responded with the campaign known as the Third Crusade that failed to re-take the Holy City.

The Fourth Crusade is regarded as one of the great military disasters of the Middle Ages when in 1204 the crusaders attacked Constantinople instead of the Turks and seriously weakened the Byzantine Empire. There was even an ill fated and dubious "Children's Crusade" followed by a "Shepherd's Crusade" to free the King of France who had been captured while crusading in the East.

By the time the French-Angevine King, St. Louis IX, led the Seventh and Eighth Crusades, the last remaining vestiges of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were soon to be expelled from the Middle East with the fall of Acre in 1291. Although European kings and Popes later dreamed of regaining control over Jerusalem, none were ever capable again of raising the financial and military resources to challenge the Islamic kingdoms of the Middle East. Also, feudal wars between England and France preoccupied the Latin West until the 1500's.

The Spanish Reconquest

About a month after the 9/11 attacks, al-Qaeda's leaders began making cryptic statements about medieval history that "the tragedy of al-Andalus will not be repeated in Palestine." Although President Bush later expressed regret through a spokesperson for his own description of the "war on terror" as a "crusade" to rid the world of evil, the two sets of comments seemed related to each other.

"Al-Andalus," was the Arabic term for Medieval Spain, a land where the Children of Abraham lived together in relative peace and economic cooperation for almost eight centuries of Islamic civilization on European soil.[iv] In the autumn of 2001, however, millions of otherwise well-educated men and women across the Western world had no idea what Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants were talking about. 911 days later when terrorists bombed the trains in Madrid on March 11, 2004 (aka: 3/11), a letter claiming responsibility for the murderous attacks stated, "This was part of settling old accounts with Spain, the Crusader…."

Once again, the use and abuse of historical memory in the twisted rhetoric of the attackers was lost upon many in the public because, in the numerous humanities courses and social studies textbooks included among our high school and university curricula, the Western nations have paid very little attention to the story and legacy of that Hispano-Muslim civilization of the Middle Ages.

The Spaniards never ignored this story but re-wrote the master narrative of this encounter among Abraham's Children with the aroma of an ardent nationalism and religious zeal as "*La Reconquista*," (The Reconquest) of their homeland from the invading Moors. One example of such national myths is the numerous depictions of St. Santiago Matamoros, (literally: "St. James, The Killer of Moors") on horseback slicing his way through the ranks of Arab and Muslim troops.

Despite Biblical and Quranic precepts promoting peace and dialogue, medieval civilization was a violent society in which warfare was a viable means of settling disputes and extending the range of one's political and economic influence, and in which successful campaigns of Holy War or jihad signified God's blessings upon the victors. Of such Divine favor, all of Abraham's Children who tasted victory seemed certain at one time or another.

Berber and Arab invaders from Morocco overthrew the Visigothic kingdoms of the medieval Iberian Peninsula in 711. It was an unusual invasion since due to Visigothic feudal excesses and cruelty some Spanish Christians and Jews welcomed the Islamic "invaders" as liberators preaching a message about the one, true God of Abraham along with ideas about justice and education for all. Then around 756, a surviving prince of the massacred Umayyad dynasty of Arabia, Abd al-Rahman I, crossed from North Africa into Spain and after a brief conflict declared himself Caliph (i.e. "Successor to the Prophet"). This began a "Golden Age" of Islamic civilization on European soil as the new Cordovan state fostered economic prosperity, established law and order, promoted literacy, and extended full rights of citizenship to tax-paying Christians and Jews across the Caliphate, who as the Abrahamic "People of the Book" were seen as theological kin. This was the land the Arabs called "al-Andalus."

The Spaniards and Portuguese retreated to the northernmost corners of the peninsula and from there launched the long series of intermittent "crusade" wars known as "The Reconquest." The knights, mercenaries, and crusaders who fought in this conflict were known as the "Conquistadors." It is hard to follow the ebb and flow of these conflicts spanning almost eight centuries. Suffice it to say that by the year 1000 there were clearly distinct Islamic and Christian territories across Iberia with embattled frontier regions changing hands frequently. A rich blending of Islamic, Christian, and Jewish cultural influences occurred in the art, music and poetry, architecture and literature of Medieval Spain which can still be seen and heard everywhere in Spain today.

The first turning point in The Reconquest came in 1085 when the Christian forces of King Alfonso VI of Leon-Castile retook Toledo from its Arab and Muslim rulers and hastened the demise of Cordova. A few more Muslim kingdoms and states would rise and fall in the ensuing centuries along with considerable feudal infighting among the Spanish kingdoms themselves. Then in 1212, the major turning point occurred when the Christian army of Alfonso VIII of Castile joined forces with the kingdoms of Navarre, Aragon, and Portugal and overwhelmed a sizable Muslim army at the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa. His son, Ferdinand III, then re-united Leon and Castile and by 1236 concentrated his military efforts on three of the remaining major Islamic centers of power: Cordova, Valencia, and Seville. Over the next eight years, all three cities fell to the crusading Spanish-Christian armies.

As in the Crusades to the Holy Land, divide and conquer tactics played a decisive role in weakening resistance among the Hispano-Muslim cities and kingdoms. For their loyalty and military support, Muslim emirs and commanders who fought for the Spanish kings were rewarded by being granted the right to retain and govern the southernmost Islamic region of Iberia, known as the Caliphate of Granada.

Christians, Jews, and Muslims living in those times prayed that the violent and turbulent Reconquest of Iberia had reached its conclusion. But it was not long before the House of Aragon superseded the supremacy of the other Spanish kingdoms by embarking on a very aggressive expansionist agenda, both at home and abroad. This revived "The Reconquest" as a struggle for national unity as well as for the expulsion of the Jews and Muslims from European soil. In their view, Aragon was carrying out the "Will of God." In the view of some clergy, Spain was to be the agent of a great transformation across Christendom.

These ideologies of power and exclusion culminated in the unification of Spain under the banner of the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabel of Castile in 1474 and in the conquest of Granada on January 2, 1492. The conclusion of this cosmic battle the same year that Christopher Columbus sailed off into the Atlantic in the name of these same Spanish Monarchs was proof enough for Spain and her leaders that this was "God's Will" for their new nation.

Given the well-known record of Spanish imperialism and exploitation in the "New World," readers of this article should note that the "explorers" who followed Columbus to the Americas were known as "Conquistadors." One might even argue that after 1492 the idea of "Crusade" took on new meanings as a new generation of "crusaders" dreamt of conquering lands across the Atlantic filled with gold and jewels, which some of them called "the New Jerusalem" and which was populated by natives tribes that some among the crusader-colonists compared to "noble-savages" in the "Garden of Eden." Thus failure to learn the hard lessons of multiculturalism and religious diversity during eight-centuries of conflict and coexistence among Christians, Muslims, and Jews living in medieval Spain culminated in yet another unfortunate legacy of violence and conquest for the indigenous and colonial peoples of what would become Latin America.

Religious Toleration During the Crusades

While modern-day radicals and terrorists have distorted and misused the past, we who live in the present have forgotten or ignored that the history of the Crusades to the Holy Land and the Reconquest of Iberia is also a story of broken kinship and failed coexistence among the Abrahamic family. Perhaps one of the most useful lessons from the many centuries medieval Christendom invested in these various Crusades may be gleamed from the scattered insights of medieval authors who wrote about religious toleration. Here is but a small sample from body of work they left us.

The Spanish Muslim theologian, Ibn Arabi (1165-1240), whose *Meccan Revelations* is probably the world's longest religious poem, offered a paraphrase and reflection of Sura 31:27 from the Qur'an. In summary, he stated that if all of the trees on Earth were pens and the seven seas ink. And, together began writing the names by which God had been known to His children across time and place, one could not possibly exhaust the list of these Divine names. This for Ibn Arabi was proof enough of God's mandate for religious toleration among human societies. If such imagination was possible at the height of the Crusades, then what are we modern men and women capable of envisioning during the present global crisis?

A former knight turned ardent missionary, St. Francis of Assisi (1181-1226) traveled through Spain, Morocco, Palestine, and Egypt seeking Muslims for conversion. Arriving in Egypt in

1219 at the time of the Fifth Crusade during a lull in the Battle of Damietta, Francis crossed over into the Sultan of Egypt's camp with the intent of converting Malik al-Kamil and his people to the Gospel. One of the medieval chroniclers of Francis' life noted that he was appalled at the brutality and lack of discipline among the Crusader forces and believed that the Saracens would defeat them. The Sultan was impressed with Francis' piety and courage, and renunciation of worldly riches but refused to convert. Instead the two men began a series of conversations about faith and salvation while their meeting passed into legend as a symbol of peace through a dialogue of mutual edification for both Christians and Muslims.

Around the year 1200, the German poet-knight Wolfram von Eschenbach composed an epic poem, *Parzival*, about one foolish knight's quest for a mysterious Grail-stone which he slowly learns cannot be won by the sword, nor by chivalric deeds, but only by faithful recognition that human nature is made whole in relation to God's saving grace. The saga also features the Muslim knight, Fierefiz described as the chivalric champion from the Middle East. Neither Parzival nor Fierefiz ever knew his real father but both know that their fathers were killed while crusading.

Events somehow lead the two young knights into a joust to the death on the afternoon of the evening before Pentecost. As their combat begins, Parzival's sword miraculously breaks and the two young knights discover that they are brothers born of the same father through different mothers: Parzival born of a French Christian queen and Fierefiz born of an Arab Muslim queen. The Will of God intervenes to spare each of them from the sin of killing his kinsman. Parzival then attains the Grail on Pentecost Sunday and rides to the Grail-Castle with his brother to claim their destiny. This climactic conclusion recalls all sorts of Biblical images about the Children of Abraham and reconciliation among enemies in times of war.

Conclusion

In closing, we must reiterate the question already posed above: If such imaginative constructions were possible for Muslims, Jews, and Christians at the height of the Crusades, then what possibilities for peace with justice might the imaginations of today's Christian men and women yield amidst our current global crisis?

Notes

---

[i] For more on this see the fine article by Norman Housley, "Crusades Against Christians: Their Origins and Early Development, c.1000-1216," (pp.69-98) in Thomas F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades: The Essential Readings.* (Blackwell, 2002).

[ii] For more on this see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade," (p.15-29) in T. F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades.*

[iii] For an excellent reference work on the other side's views see Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2000); I would also recommend Karen Armstrong's highly readable *Holy War: The Crusades and Their Impact on Today's World* (New York: Anchor Books, 2001).

[iv] See María Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain* (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 2002).

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

[end box]

The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity

by Albert Hernández, Ph.D.
Iliff School of Theology

"There must be war! God wills it! This is the rallying-cry of the crusader forces that control Jerusalem during the late-1100s in Ridley Scott's acclaimed 2005 film *Kingdom of Heaven*, one of the few Hollywood portrayals of the Crusades ever praised by Muslim and Arab-American groups. Ironically the Bibles, Qur'an and Torah texts of those who fought in the Crusades proclaimed the Word of a God in whose image and likeness the first human, Adam, was created. Indeed as descendants of both Adam and the Children of Abraham all Jews, Christians, and Muslims had much more in common than most of the instigators and soldiers were willing to admit. Even amidst the violence and turbulence of the Crusades, some remarkable examples of toleration and mutual edification have come down to us through the centuries. Some medieval Jewish, Muslim, and Christian thinkers asked a timeless theological question: What did God intend by the multiplicity of faiths?

On a different note, I have never forgotten the descriptions of the Crusades in my old high school and undergraduate world history textbooks as having "beneficial effects" because "Europe was exposed to the scientific advancements of the Arabs" which stimulated the economy and a revival of learning. However, the historical realities and unfortunate legacies of the various conflicts known, as the Crusades are not as simple as the sentiments expressed by providential slogans about the Will of God, nor as such outdated educational materials would have us believe. The truth is that on the receiving end of these chivalric campaigns, thousands of non-combatants died, towns were burned and communities shattered forever. Long before the Crusades, the Arabs and the kingdoms of the Latin West had economic and cultural ties that helped decrease the isolation and impoverishment known to Western Europeans as the "Dark Ages." The impact of the Crusades upon the development of medieval Europe and the legacy of these military expeditions for the future of Arab and Islamic civilization is one of the most misunderstood and neglected aspects of today's public and theological discourse.

What Were the Crusades?

Medievalists are divided as to what the defining periods and characteristics of the Crusades really were. Some regard the Crusades to the Holy Land, which lasted from 1095 to 1291 as the classic definition and example of this conflict. Another faction has argued that "crusading" was an integral part of European history from the 700's through the 1600's and motivated much more by cultural assumptions about territorial, political, economic, and military issues than by mere stereotypes about religious wars or by theological differences between Muslims and Christians. Even in the case of the Albigensian Crusade, conducted by Christians against the Cathar heretics of Languedoc over a thirty-five year span and culminating in the infamous massacre at Montsegur on March 16, 1244, we find protracted disputes over economic, political, and territorial

issues motivating leaders and participants on each side. This was a fight for control of southern France, in which both the Papacy and northern French nobility seemed as intent on centralizing power as on rooting out heresy. Thus, the medieval idea of "crusade" was not just aimed at Arabs or Muslims in the Holy Land but extended to heretics and pagans, renegade nobles and kings, and enemies of the Pope across Europe.[1] In contrast, with the much more well-known Crusades to the Holy Land, which spanned only two centuries, Spain and Portugal waged a lengthy "Reconquest" for the future of Christendom, a cosmic battle that lasted from the Moorish invasion of Iberia in 711 to the fall of the Caliphate of Granada in 1492.

From these varied perspectives, the following article offers an overview of the Crusades to the Holy Land followed by a summary and analysis of the largely forgotten yet still smoldering historical legacy of the Spanish Reconquest. The need for a lasting peace with justice amidst the current global crisis necessitates that we revisit the lessons of the Crusades and the medieval legacy of religious toleration among Abraham's Children.

The Crusades to the Holy Land

The term "crusade" derives from the red crosses which crusader knights and soldiers inscribed on their white tunics. To Arab and Muslim chroniclers, the Crusades were known as "the Cross Wars" (*al-hurub al-salibiyya*). Cultural ignorance was rampant on both sides as the Europeans referred to all Arabs and Muslims as "Saracens" while most Arab chroniclers misrepresented the invaders as "Franks," after the Germanic tribe that settled the region of France. Considering how much of the Hebrew tradition and of Jesus' life is contained in the Qur'an, ignorance of each other's religious beliefs appears far deeper on the part of the European and Christian forces as their chroniclers often referred to mosques as "mahommedaries" and criticized Muslims for worshipping the Prophet Muhammad as a "god" while mistranslating his name with Latinized equivalents for "dog" and "devil."

In the post-9/11 era, almost all areas of medieval historical studies are booming but none more so than Crusade studies. On the surface this may seem odd to the general public but important reconsiderations of the political and theological ideas that led to the formation of European Christian ideologies of peace and holy war are being conducted. Among these is Tomaž Mastnak's *Crusading Peace: Christendom, The Muslim World, and Western Political Order* (University of California Press, 2002), which examines the rise of the Crusading spirit in 1095 from the roots the church's attempt to curtail warfare and blood feuds among the nobility by enacting and enforcing sanctions like the Peace of God and the Truce of God. Converting and civilizing these Germanic warrior-princes became a top priority for the medieval Church. Whereas Christ and the Apostles, and the early Church Fathers up through St. Augustine, had clearly favored a pacifist tradition, as a result of becoming embedded in such political and military conflicts medieval Popes and

---

[1] For more on this see the fine article by Norman Housley, "Crusades Against Christians: Their Origins and Early Development, c.1000-1216," (pp.69-98) in Thomas F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades: The Essential Readings.* (Blackwell, 2002).

Bishops gained great authority in promoting secular law and order. This "new order" as directed by the Church set limitations upon feudal lords with respect to whom they were allowed to attack, the times of the liturgical calendar when they were allowed to take arms against one another, and the types of property and/or possessions they were forbidden to take. Mastnak's main thesis rests on the impact this restructuring of power and prohibition of war had upon the Church's political prominence in the Latin West: "The circumscription of violence opened the way for the Church not only to assert its control over the use of arms but also to direct violent action" (10). The stage was then set for crusading against Christendom's foreign enemies.

It was on the last day of the Council of Claremont, November 27, 1095, that Pope Urban II preached the sermon that inspired the First Crusade as a sort of "armed pilgrimage" to free Jerusalem from the infidels. Four years later the expedition succeeded in establishing the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, which existed until 1291. As much as we would like to have the text of that sermon, there is no surviving copy, nor do we even possess reliable accounts of what he told his audience on that fateful day. What little we do know about Pope Urban's rhetoric of war comes from a few clergy and nobles present but who wrote their accounts many years later. Most scholars agree that he discussed the need to re-take Jerusalem from the Muslims who denied the divinity of Christ, and that he probably promised God's salvation for those who took up the sword in the service of Christ and the Church.[2] Hence the phrases "soldiers for Christ" and "Christian soldiers" (*milites Christi*). By the mid-1100s, the Church had established religious orders of warrior-monks like the Templar Knights and the Order of Knights Hospitallers. As Abbot Odo of Cluny wrote: "Truly, no one ought to be worried because a just man sometimes makes use of fighting, which seems incompatible with religion" (as quoted in Mastnak, 17). Terms such as "peace war" and the "holy manner of warfare" are common among the French and Latin sources of this period. From our vantage point, we must ask whether focusing such aggression against a foreign foe, who just a few years earlier had been eagerly sought after as a trading partner with rich textiles and technological ingenuity, was motivated by a desire to decrease feudal violence in Europe while focusing Europe's feudal kingdoms against the Arabs and Islam to promote deeper socio-political unity back home?

While Arab and Muslim chroniclers interpreted the Crusades as ploys for colonization, the invaders employed divide and conquer tactics among rival local factions to weaken the Arab kingdoms of the Middle East.[3] The Second Crusade began in 1145 after King Louis VII of France and Pope Eugenius III agreed that the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem needed their help once more. This time, St. Bernard of Clairvaux preached the sermon that unleashed the campaign and promised the participants absolution for their sins and the Lord's promise of salvation for their deeds of courage and sacrifice. In 1187, the great Muslim leader Saladin recaptured Jerusalem and Philip Augustus of France

[2] For more on this see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade," (p.15-29) in T. F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades.*

[3] For an excellent reference work on the other side's views see Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2000); I would also recommend Karen Armstrong's highly readable *Holy War: The Crusades and Their Impact on Today's World* (New York: Anchor Books, 2001).

together with Richard the Lion Heart responded with the campaign known as the Third Crusade that failed to re-take the Holy City. The Fourth Crusade is regarded as one of the great military disasters of the Middle Ages when in 1204 the crusaders attacked Constantinople instead of the Turks and seriously weakened the Byzantine Empire. There was even an ill fated and dubious "Children's Crusade" followed by a "Shepherd's Crusade" to free the King of France who had been captured while crusading in the East. By the time the French-Angevine King, St. Louis IX, led the Seventh and Eighth Crusades, the last remaining vestiges of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were soon to be expelled from the Middle East with the fall of Acre in 1291. Although European kings and Popes later dreamed of regaining control over Jerusalem, none were ever capable again of raising the financial and military resources to challenge the Islamic kingdoms of the Middle East, and feudal wars between England and France preoccupied the Latin West until the 1500's.

The Spanish Reconquest

About a month after the 9/11 attacks, al-Qaeda's leaders began making cryptic statements about medieval history that "the tragedy of al-Andalus will not be repeated in Palestine." Although President Bush later expressed regret through a spokesperson for his own description of the "war on terror" as a "crusade" to rid the world of evil, the two sets of comments seemed related to each other. "Al-Andalus," was the Arabic term for Medieval Spain, a land where the Children of Abraham lived together in relative peace and economic cooperation for almost eight centuries of Islamic civilization on European soil.[4] In the autumn of 2001, however, millions of otherwise well-educated men and women across the Western world had no idea what Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants were talking about. 911 days later when terrorists bombed the trains in Madrid on March 11, 2004 (aka: 3/11), a letter claiming responsibility for the murderous attacks stated, "This was part of settling old accounts with Spain, the Crusader…." Once again, the use and abuse of historical memory in the twisted rhetoric of the attackers was lost upon many in the public because, in the numerous humanities courses and social studies textbooks included among our high school and university curricula, the Western nations have paid very little attention to the story and legacy of that Hispano-Muslim civilization of the Middle Ages. The Spaniards never ignored this story but re-wrote the master narrative of this encounter among Abraham's Children with the aroma of an ardent nationalism and religious zeal as "*La Reconquista*," (The Reconquest) of their homeland from the invading Moors. One example of such national myths is the numerous depictions of St. Santiago Matamoros, (literally: "St. James, The Killer of Moors") on horseback slicing his way through the ranks of Arab and Muslim troops. Despite Biblical and Quranic precepts promoting peace and dialogue, medieval civilization was a violent society in which warfare was a viable means of settling disputes and extending the range of one's political and economic influence, and in which successful campaigns of Holy War or jihad signified God's blessings upon the victors. Of such Divine favor, all of Abraham's Children who tasted victory seemed certain at one time or another.

[4] See María Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain* (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 2002).

Berber and Arab invaders from Morocco overthrew the Visigothic kingdoms of the medieval Iberian Peninsula in 711. It was an unusual invasion since due to Visigothic feudal excesses and cruelty some Spanish Christians and Jews welcomed the Islamic "invaders" as liberators preaching a message about the one, true God of Abraham along with ideas about justice and education for all. Then around 756, a surviving prince of the massacred Umayyad dynasty of Arabia, Abd al-Rahman I, crossed from North Africa into Spain and after a brief conflict declared himself Caliph (i.e. "Successor to the Prophet"). This began a "Golden Age" of Islamic civilization on European soil as the new Cordovan state fostered economic prosperity, established law and order, promoted literacy, and extended full rights of citizenship to tax-paying Christians and Jews across the Caliphate, who as the Abrahamic "People of the Book" were seen as theological kin. This was the land the Arabs called "al-Andalus."

The Spaniards and Portuguese retreated to the northernmost corners of the peninsula and from there launched the long series of intermittent "crusade" wars known as "The Reconquest." The knights, mercenaries, and crusaders who fought in this conflict were known as the "Conquistadors." It is hard to follow the ebb and flow of these conflicts spanning almost eight centuries but suffice it to say that by the year 1000 there were clearly distinct Islamic and Christian territories across Iberia with embattled frontier regions changing hands frequently. A rich blending of Islamic, Christian, and Jewish cultural influences occurred in the art, music and poetry, architecture and literature of Medieval Spain which can still be seen and heard everywhere in Spain today.

The first turning point in The Reconquest came in 1085 when the Christian forces of King Alfonso VI of Leon-Castile retook Toledo from its Arab and Muslim rulers and hastened the demise of Cordova. A few more Muslim kingdoms and states would rise and fall in the ensuing centuries along with considerable feudal in fighting among the Spanish kingdoms themselves. Then in 1212, the major turning point occurred when the Christian army of Alfonso VIII of Castile joined forces with the kingdoms of Navarre, Aragon, and Portugal and overwhelmed a sizable Muslim army at the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa. His son, Ferdinand III, then re-united Leon and Castile and by 1236 concentrated his military efforts on three of the remaining major Islamic centers of power: Cordova, Valencia, and Seville. Over the next eight years, all three cities fell to the crusading Spanish-Christian armies. As in the Crusades to the Holy Land, divide and conquer tactics played a decisive role in weakening resistance among the Hispano-Muslim cities and kingdoms. For their loyalty and military support, Muslim emirs and commanders who fought for the Spanish kings were rewarded by being granted the right to retain and govern the southernmost Islamic region of Iberia, known as the Caliphate of Granada. Christians, Jews, and Muslims living in those times prayed that the violent and turbulent Reconquest of Iberia had reached its conclusion. But it was not long before the House of Aragon superseded the supremacy of the other Spanish kingdoms by embarking on a very aggressive expansionist agenda, both at home and abroad, which revived "The Reconquest" as a struggle for national unity as well as for the expulsion of the Jews and Muslims from European soil. In their view, Aragon was carrying out the "Will of God," and, in the view of some clergy, Spain was to be the agent of a great transformation across Christendom.

These ideologies of power and exclusion culminated in the unification of Spain under the banner of the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabel of Castile in 1474 and in the conquest of Granada on January 2, 1492. The conclusion of this cosmic battle the same year that Christopher Columbus sailed off into the Atlantic in the name of these same Spanish Monarchs was proof enough for Spain and her leaders that this was "God's Will" for their new nation. Given the well-known record of Spanish imperialism and exploitation in the "New World," readers of this article should note that the "explorers" who followed Columbus to the Americas were known as "Conquistadors." One might even argue that after 1492 the idea of "Crusade" took on new meanings as a new generation of "crusaders" dreamt of conquering lands across the Atlantic filled with gold and jewels, which some of them called "the New Jerusalem," and which was populated by natives tribes that some among the crusader-colonists compared to "noble-savages" in the "Garden of Eden." Thus failure to learn the hard lessons of multiculturalism and religious diversity during eight-centuries of conflict and coexistence among Christians and Muslims, and Jews living in medieval Spain culminated in yet another unfortunate legacy of violence and conquest for the indigenous and colonial peoples of what would become Latin America.

Religious Toleration During the Crusades

While modern-day radicals and terrorists have distorted and misused the past, we who live in the present have forgotten or ignored that the history of the Crusades to the Holy Land and the Reconquest of Iberia is also a story of broken kinship and failed coexistence among the Abrahamic family. Perhaps one of the most useful lessons from the many centuries medieval Christendom invested in these various Crusades may be gleamed from the scattered insights of medieval authors who wrote about religious toleration. Here is but a small sample from body of work they left us.

The Spanish Muslim theologian, Ibn Arabi (1165-1240), whose *Meccan Revelations* is probably the world's longest religious poem, offered a paraphrase and reflection of Sura 31:27 from the Qur'an. In summary, he stated that if all of the trees on Earth were pens and the seven seas ink. And, together began writing the names by which God had been known to His children across time and place, one could not possibly exhaust the list of these Divine names. This for Ibn Arabi was proof enough of God's mandate for religious toleration among human societies. If such imagination was possible at the height of the Crusades, then what are we modern men and women capable of envisioning during the present global crisis?

A former knight turned ardent missionary, St. Francis of Assisi (1181-1226) traveled through Spain, Morocco, Palestine, and Egypt seeking Muslims for conversion. Arriving in Egypt in 1219 at the time of the Fifth Crusade during a lull in the Battle of Damietta, Francis crossed over into the Sultan of Egypt's camp with the intent of converting Malik al-Kamil and his people to the Gospel. One of the medieval chroniclers of Francis' life noted that he was appalled at the brutality and lack of discipline among the Crusader forces and believed that the Saracens would defeat them. The Sultan was impressed with

Francis' piety and courage, and renunciation of worldly riches but refused to convert. Instead the two men began a series of conversations about faith and salvation while their meeting passed into legend as a symbol of peace through a dialogue of mutual edification for both Christians and Muslims.

Around the year 1200, the German poet-knight Wolfram von Eschenbach composed an epic poem, *Parzival*, about one foolish knight's quest for a mysterious Grail-stone which he slowly learns cannot be won by the sword, nor by chivalric deeds, but only by faithful recognition that human nature is made whole in relation to God's saving grace. The saga also features the Muslim knight, Fierefiz described as the chivalric champion from the Middle East. Neither Parzival nor Fierefiz ever knew his real father but both know that their fathers were killed while crusading. Events somehow lead the two young knights into a joust to the death on the afternoon of the evening before Pentecost. As their combat begins, Parzival's sword miraculously breaks and the two young knights discover that they are brothers born of the same fathered through different mothers: Parzival born of a French Christian queen and Fierefiz born of an Arab Muslim queen. The Will of God intervenes to spare each of them from the sin of killing his kinsman. Parzival then attains the Grail on Pentecost Sunday and rides to the Grail-Castle with his brother to claim their destiny. This climactic conclusion recalls all sorts of Biblical images about the Children of Abraham and reconciliation among enemies in times of war.

In closing, we must reiterate the question already posed above: If such imaginative constructions were possible for Muslims, Jews, and Christians at the height of the Crusades, then what possibilities for peace with justice might the imaginations of today's Christian men and women yield amidst our current global crisis?

The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity

by Albert Hernández
Iliff School of Theology

"There must be war! God wills it! This is the rallying-cry of the crusader forces that control Jerusalem during the late-1100s in Ridley Scott's acclaimed 2005 film *Kingdom of Heaven*, one of the few Hollywood portrayals of the Crusades ever praised by Muslim and Arab-American groups. Ironically the Bible, Qur'an and Torah texts of those who fought in the Crusades proclaimed the Word of a God in whose image and likeness the first human, Adam, was created.

Indeed as descendants of both Adam and the Children of Abraham all Jews, Christians, and Muslims had much more in common than most of the instigators and soldiers were willing to admit. Even amidst the violence and turbulence of the Crusades, some remarkable examples of toleration and mutual edification have come down to us through the centuries. Some medieval Jewish, Muslim, and Christian thinkers asked a timeless theological question: What did God intend by the multiplicity of faiths?

On a different note, I have never forgotten the descriptions of the Crusades in my old high school and undergraduate world history textbooks as having "beneficial effects" because "Europe was exposed to the scientific advancements of the Arabs" which stimulated the economy and a revival of learning. However, the historical realities and unfortunate legacies of the various conflicts, known as the Crusades, are not as simple as the sentiments expressed by providential slogans about the Will of God, nor as such outdated educational materials would have us believe.

The truth is that on the receiving end of these chivalric campaigns, thousands of non-combatants died, towns were burned and communities shattered forever. Long before the Crusades, the Arabs and the kingdoms of the Latin West had economic and cultural ties that helped decrease the isolation and impoverishment known to Western Europeans as the "Dark Ages." The impact of the Crusades upon the development of medieval Europe and the legacy of these military expeditions for the future of Arab and Islamic civilization is one of the most misunderstood and neglected aspects of today's public and theological discourse.

What Were the Crusades?

Medievalists are divided as to what the defining periods and characteristics of the Crusades really were. Some regard the Crusades to the Holy Land, which lasted from 1095 to 1291 as the classic definition and example of this conflict. Another faction has argued that "crusading" was an integral part of European history from the 700's through the 1600's and was motivated much more by cultural assumptions about territorial, political, economic, and military issues than by mere stereotypes about religious wars or by theological differences between Muslims and Christians.

Even in the case of the Albigensian Crusade, conducted by Christians against the Cathar heretics of Languedoc over a thirty-five year span and culminating in the infamous massacre at Montsegur on March 16, 1244, we find protracted disputes over economic, political, and

territorial issues motivating leaders and participants on each side. This was a fight for control of southern France, in which both the Papacy and northern French nobility seemed as intent on centralizing power as on rooting out heresy.

Thus, the medieval idea of "crusade" was not just aimed at Arabs or Muslims in the Holy Land but extended to heretics and pagans, renegade nobles and kings, and enemies of the Pope across Europe.[i] In contrast, with the much more well-known Crusades to the Holy Land, which spanned only two centuries, Spain and Portugal waged a lengthy "Reconquest" for the future of Christendom, a cosmic battle that lasted from the Moorish invasion of Iberia in 711 to the fall of the Caliphate of Granada in 1492.

From these varied perspectives, the following article offers an overview of the Crusades to the Holy Land followed by a summary and analysis of the largely forgotten yet still smoldering historical legacy of the Spanish Reconquest. The need for a lasting peace with justice amidst the current global crisis necessitates that we revisit the lessons of the Crusades and the medieval legacy of religious toleration among Abraham's Children.

The Crusades to the Holy Land

The term "crusade" derives from the red crosses which crusader knights and soldiers inscribed on their white tunics. To Arab and Muslim chroniclers, the Crusades were known as "the Cross Wars" (*al-hurub al-salibiyya*). Cultural ignorance was rampant on both sides as the Europeans referred to all Arabs and Muslims as "Saracens" while most Arab chroniclers misrepresented the invaders as "Franks," after the Germanic tribe that settled the region of France. Considering how much of the Hebrew tradition and of Jesus' life is contained in the Qur'an, ignorance of each other's religious beliefs appears far deeper on the part of the European and Christian forces as their chroniclers often referred to mosques as "mahommedaries" and criticized Muslims for worshipping the Prophet Muhammad as a "god" while mistranslating his name with Latinized equivalents for "dog" and "devil."

In the post-9/11 era, almost all areas of medieval historical studies are booming but none more so than Crusade studies. On the surface this may seem odd to the general public but important reconsiderations of the political and theological ideas that led to the formation of European Christian ideologies of peace and holy war are being conducted.

Among these is Tomaž Mastnak's *Crusading Peace: Christendom, The Muslim World, and Western Political Order* (University of California Press, 2002), which examines the rise of the Crusading spirit in 1095 from the roots the church's attempt to curtail warfare and blood feuds among the nobility by enacting and enforcing sanctions like the Peace of God and the Truce of God. Converting and civilizing these Germanic warrior-princes became a top priority for the medieval Church. Whereas Christ and the Apostles, and the early Church Fathers up through St. Augustine had clearly favored a pacifist tradition, as a result of becoming embedded in such political and military conflicts medieval Popes and Bishops gained great authority in promoting secular law and order.

This "new order" as directed by the Church set limitations upon feudal lords with respect to whom they were allowed to attack, the times of the liturgical calendar when they were allowed to take arms against one another, and the types of property and/or possessions they were forbidden to take. Mastnak's main thesis rests on the impact this restructuring of power and prohibition of war had upon the Church's political prominence in the Latin West: "The circumscription of violence opened the way for the Church not only to assert its control over the use of arms but also to direct violent action" (10). The stage was then set for crusading against Christendom's foreign enemies.

It was on the last day of the Council of Claremont, November 27, 1095, that Pope Urban II preached the sermon that inspired the First Crusade as a sort of "armed pilgrimage" to free Jerusalem from the infidels. Four years later the expedition succeeded in establishing the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, which existed until 1291. As much as we would like to have the text of that sermon, there is no surviving copy, nor do we even possess reliable accounts of what he told his audience on that fateful day. What little we do know about Pope Urban's rhetoric of war comes from a few clergy and nobles present but who wrote their accounts many years later. Most scholars agree that he discussed the need to re-take Jerusalem from the Muslims who denied the divinity of Christ, and that he probably promised God's salvation for those who took up the sword in the service of Christ and the Church.[ii] Hence the phrases "soldiers for Christ" and "Christian soldiers" (*milites Christi*).

By the mid-1100s, the Church had established religious orders of warrior-monks like the Templar Knights and the Order of Knights Hospitallers. As Abbot Odo of Cluny wrote: "Truly, no one ought to be worried because a just man sometimes makes use of fighting, which seems incompatible with religion" (as quoted in Mastnak, 17). Terms such as "peace war" and the "holy manner of warfare" are common among the French and Latin sources of this period. From our vantage point, we must ask whether focusing such aggression against a foreign foe, who just a few years earlier had been eagerly sought after as a trading partner with rich textiles and technological ingenuity, was motivated by a desire to decrease feudal violence in Europe while focusing Europe's feudal kingdoms against the Arabs and Islam to promote deeper socio-political unity back home.

While Arab and Muslim chroniclers interpreted the Crusades as ploys for colonization, the invaders employed divide and conquer tactics among rival local factions to weaken the Arab kingdoms of the Middle East.[iii] The Second Crusade began in 1145 after King Louis VII of France and Pope Eugenius III agreed that the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem needed their help once more. This time, St. Bernard of Clairvaux preached the sermon that unleashed the campaign and promised the participants absolution for their sins and the Lord's promise of salvation for their deeds of courage and sacrifice.

In 1187, the great Muslim leader Saladin recaptured Jerusalem and Philip Augustus of France together with Richard the Lion Heart responded with the campaign known as the Third Crusade that failed to re-take the Holy City.

The Fourth Crusade is regarded as one of the great military disasters of the Middle Ages when in 1204 the crusaders attacked Constantinople instead of the Turks and seriously weakened the

Byzantine Empire. There was even an ill fated and dubious "Children's Crusade" followed by a "Shepherd's Crusade" to free the King of France who had been captured while crusading in the East.

By the time the French-Angevine King, St. Louis IX, led the Seventh and Eighth Crusades, the last remaining vestiges of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were soon to be expelled from the Middle East with the fall of Acre in 1291. Although European kings and Popes later dreamed of regaining control over Jerusalem, none were ever capable again of raising the financial and military resources to challenge the Islamic kingdoms of the Middle East. Also, feudal wars between England and France preoccupied the Latin West until the 1500's.

The Spanish Reconquest

About a month after the 9/11 attacks, al-Qaeda's leaders began making cryptic statements about medieval history that "the tragedy of al-Andalus will not be repeated in Palestine." Although President Bush later expressed regret through a spokesperson for his own description of the "war on terror" as a "crusade" to rid the world of evil, the two sets of comments seemed related to each other.

"Al-Andalus," was the Arabic term for Medieval Spain, a land where the Children of Abraham lived together in relative peace and economic cooperation for almost eight centuries of Islamic civilization on European soil.[iv] In the autumn of 2001, however, millions of otherwise well-educated men and women across the Western world had no idea what Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants were talking about. 911 days later when terrorists bombed the trains in Madrid on March 11, 2004 (aka: 3/11), a letter claiming responsibility for the murderous attacks stated, "This was part of settling old accounts with Spain, the Crusader…."

Once again, the use and abuse of historical memory in the twisted rhetoric of the attackers was lost upon many in the public because, in the numerous humanities courses and social studies textbooks included among our high school and university curricula, the Western nations have paid very little attention to the story and legacy of that Hispano-Muslim civilization of the Middle Ages.

The Spaniards never ignored this story but re-wrote the master narrative of this encounter among Abraham's Children with the aroma of an ardent nationalism and religious zeal as "*La Reconquista*," (The Reconquest) of their homeland from the invading Moors. One example of such national myths is the numerous depictions of St. Santiago Matamoros, (literally: "St. James, The Killer of Moors") on horseback slicing his way through the ranks of Arab and Muslim troops.

Despite Biblical and Quranic precepts promoting peace and dialogue, medieval civilization was a violent society in which warfare was a viable means of settling disputes and extending the range of one's political and economic influence, and in which successful campaigns of Holy War or jihad signified God's blessings upon the victors. Of such Divine favor, all of Abraham's Children who tasted victory seemed certain at one time or another.

Berber and Arab invaders from Morocco overthrew the Visigothic kingdoms of the medieval Iberian Peninsula in 711. It was an unusual invasion since due to Visigothic feudal excesses and cruelty some Spanish Christians and Jews welcomed the Islamic "invaders" as liberators preaching a message about the one, true God of Abraham along with ideas about justice and education for all. Then around 756, a surviving prince of the massacred Umayyad dynasty of Arabia, Abd al-Rahman I, crossed from North Africa into Spain and after a brief conflict declared himself Caliph (i.e. "Successor to the Prophet"). This began a "Golden Age" of Islamic civilization on European soil as the new Cordovan state fostered economic prosperity, established law and order, promoted literacy, and extended full rights of citizenship to tax-paying Christians and Jews across the Caliphate, who as the Abrahamic "People of the Book" were seen as theological kin. This was the land the Arabs called "al-Andalus."

The Spaniards and Portuguese retreated to the northernmost corners of the peninsula and from there launched the long series of intermittent "crusade" wars known as "The Reconquest." The knights, mercenaries, and crusaders who fought in this conflict were known as the "Conquistadors." It is hard to follow the ebb and flow of these conflicts spanning almost eight centuries. Suffice it to say that by the year 1000 there were clearly distinct Islamic and Christian territories across Iberia with embattled frontier regions changing hands frequently. A rich blending of Islamic, Christian, and Jewish cultural influences occurred in the art, music and poetry, architecture and literature of Medieval Spain which can still be seen and heard everywhere in Spain today.

The first turning point in The Reconquest came in 1085 when the Christian forces of King Alfonso VI of Leon-Castile retook Toledo from its Arab and Muslim rulers and hastened the demise of Cordova. A few more Muslim kingdoms and states would rise and fall in the ensuing centuries along with considerable feudal infighting among the Spanish kingdoms themselves. Then in 1212, the major turning point occurred when the Christian army of Alfonso VIII of Castile joined forces with the kingdoms of Navarre, Aragon, and Portugal and overwhelmed a sizable Muslim army at the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa. His son, Ferdinand III, then re-united Leon and Castile and by 1236 concentrated his military efforts on three of the remaining major Islamic centers of power: Cordova, Valencia, and Seville. Over the next eight years, all three cities fell to the crusading Spanish-Christian armies.

As in the Crusades to the Holy Land, divide and conquer tactics played a decisive role in weakening resistance among the Hispano-Muslim cities and kingdoms. For their loyalty and military support, Muslim emirs and commanders who fought for the Spanish kings were rewarded by being granted the right to retain and govern the southernmost Islamic region of Iberia, known as the Caliphate of Granada.

Christians, Jews, and Muslims living in those times prayed that the violent and turbulent Reconquest of Iberia had reached its conclusion. But it was not long before the House of Aragon superseded the supremacy of the other Spanish kingdoms by embarking on a very aggressive expansionist agenda, both at home and abroad. This revived "The Reconquest" as a struggle for national unity as well as for the expulsion of the Jews and Muslims from European soil. In their view, Aragon was carrying out the "Will of God." In the view of some clergy, Spain was to be the agent of a great transformation across Christendom.

These ideologies of power and exclusion culminated in the unification of Spain under the banner of the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabel of Castile in 1474 and in the conquest of Granada on January 2, 1492. The conclusion of this cosmic battle the same year that Christopher Columbus sailed off into the Atlantic in the name of these same Spanish Monarchs was proof enough for Spain and her leaders that this was "God's Will" for their new nation.

Given the well-known record of Spanish imperialism and exploitation in the "New World," readers of this article should note that the "explorers" who followed Columbus to the Americas were known as "Conquistadors." One might even argue that after 1492 the idea of "Crusade" took on new meanings as a new generation of "crusaders" dreamt of conquering lands across the Atlantic filled with gold and jewels, which some of them called "the New Jerusalem" and which was populated by natives tribes that some among the crusader-colonists compared to "noble-savages" in the "Garden of Eden." Thus failure to learn the hard lessons of multiculturalism and religious diversity during eight-centuries of conflict and coexistence among Christians, Muslims, and Jews living in medieval Spain culminated in yet another unfortunate legacy of violence and conquest for the indigenous and colonial peoples of what would become Latin America.

Religious Toleration During the Crusades

While modern-day radicals and terrorists have distorted and misused the past, we who live in the present have forgotten or ignored that the history of the Crusades to the Holy Land and the Reconquest of Iberia is also a story of broken kinship and failed coexistence among the Abrahamic family. Perhaps one of the most useful lessons from the many centuries medieval Christendom invested in these various Crusades may be gleamed from the scattered insights of medieval authors who wrote about religious toleration. Here is but a small sample from body of work they left us.

The Spanish Muslim theologian, Ibn Arabi (1165-1240), whose *Meccan Revelations* is probably the world's longest religious poem, offered a paraphrase and reflection of Sura 31:27 from the Qur'an. In summary, he stated that if all of the trees on Earth were pens and the seven seas ink. And, together began writing the names by which God had been known to His children across time and place, one could not possibly exhaust the list of these Divine names. This for Ibn Arabi was proof enough of God's mandate for religious toleration among human societies. If such imagination was possible at the height of the Crusades, then what are we modern men and women capable of envisioning during the present global crisis?

A former knight turned ardent missionary, St. Francis of Assisi (1181-1226) traveled through Spain, Morocco, Palestine, and Egypt seeking Muslims for conversion. Arriving in Egypt in 1219 at the time of the Fifth Crusade during a lull in the Battle of Damietta, Francis crossed over into the Sultan of Egypt's camp with the intent of converting Malik al-Kamil and his people to the Gospel. One of the medieval chroniclers of Francis' life noted that he was appalled at the brutality and lack of discipline among the Crusader forces and believed that the Saracens would defeat them. The Sultan was impressed with Francis' piety and courage, and renunciation of worldly riches but refused to convert. Instead the two men began a series of conversations about

faith and salvation while their meeting passed into legend as a symbol of peace through a dialogue of mutual edification for both Christians and Muslims.

Around the year 1200, the German poet-knight Wolfram von Eschenbach composed an epic poem, *Parzival*, about one foolish knight's quest for a mysterious Grail-stone which he slowly learns cannot be won by the sword, nor by chivalric deeds, but only by faithful recognition that human nature is made whole in relation to God's saving grace. The saga also features the Muslim knight, Fierefiz described as the chivalric champion from the Middle East. Neither Parzival nor Fierefiz ever knew his real father but both know that their fathers were killed while crusading.

Events somehow lead the two young knights into a joust to the death on the afternoon of the evening before Pentecost. As their combat begins, Parzival's sword miraculously breaks and the two young knights discover that they are brothers born of the same father through different mothers: Parzival born of a French Christian queen and Fierefiz born of an Arab Muslim queen. The Will of God intervenes to spare each of them from the sin of killing his kinsman. Parzival then attains the Grail on Pentecost Sunday and rides to the Grail-Castle with his brother to claim their destiny. This climactic conclusion recalls all sorts of Biblical images about the Children of Abraham and reconciliation among enemies in times of war.

Conclusion

In closing, we must reiterate the question already posed above: If such imaginative constructions were possible for Muslims, Jews, and Christians at the height of the Crusades, then what possibilities for peace with justice might the imaginations of today's Christian men and women yield amidst our current global crisis?

Notes

[i] For more on this see the fine article by Norman Housley, "Crusades Against Christians: Their Origins and Early Development, c.1000-1216," (pp.69-98) in Thomas F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades: The Essential Readings.* (Blackwell, 2002).
[ii] For more on this see H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade," (p.15-29) in T. F. Madden, Ed. *The Crusades.*
[iii] For an excellent reference work on the other side's views see Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2000); I would also recommend Karen Armstrong's highly readable *Holy War: The Crusades and Their Impact on Today's World* (New York: Anchor Books, 2001).
[iv] See María Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain* (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 2002).

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

Instructions for Hauerwas article.

Go to http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm

Scroll down to index. After "A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism" insert
❖ "Christological Pacifism] [fhttp://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#hauerwas]

This will link to a new box after the Hunsinger entry, as follows:

[box]

Christological Pacifism
by Stanley Hauerwas

John Howard Yoder is the great representative of Christological pacifism. He developed his account of Christian nonviolence in his great book *The Politics of Jesus*, but his account of the distinctiveness of Christological pacifism is perhaps best found in his book *Nevertheless*. In that book he outlined over twenty types of pacifism, each of which he describes for their virtues as well as their limits.

Read more.... [http://www.mupwj.org/hauerwasr.htm]

[end box]

http://www.mupwj.org/hauerwasr.htm is the designation for Hauerwas for web page.doc, which in turn links to Hauerwas PDF.doc.

University of Evansville
Exploring Ancient World Cultures
http://eawc.evansville.edu/chronology/ispage.htm

570 CE: Early Islam - Born in Mecca, Muhammad is the founder of Islam, which has profound influence on Africa, India, western Asia and Europe. He is considered by Muslims to be God's last and greatest prophet. The Koran (Qur'an), 114 chapters of Muhammad's divinely inspired revelations, is the Islamic scripture, which resembles Judaism and Christianity -- two religions that largely influence Muhammad. These three religions are the world's only monotheistic faiths.
610 CE: Early Islam - Originally adhering to a polytheistic notion of the divine, Muhammad has a religious experience that changes not only his life, but the history of a large part of the world. He hears a divine voice, later believed to be the angel Gabriel of the Christian religion, tell him that Allah is the only god. He receives further instructions to adopt the name of "Prophet" and convert the Quaraish to accept the monotheism.
622 CE: Early Islam - The Quaraishs resist the new religion. Muhammad and his small band of followers migrate to the town of Yathrib in the north, which is open to his new faith. The Hijrah of 622, the migration, marks the beginning of the Muslim era. After making himself ruler, Muhammad changes the name of the town to Medina ("city of the Prophet"), and Medina becomes the seat of the caliphate.
630 CE: Early Islam - Muhammad and his followers overtake Mecca. With the Quaraish in submission, the Kabah, the central place of worship for Arabian tribes, becomes the main shrine of Islam.
632 CE: Early Islam - With the death of Muhammad, his father-in-law, Abu-Bakr, and Umar devise a system in which Islam can sustain religious and political stability. Accepting the name of caliph ("deputy of the Prophet"), Abu-Bakr begins a military exhibition to enforce the caliph's authority over Arabian followers of Muhammad. He thereafter moves northward overtaking Byzantine and Persian forces. Abu-Bakr dies two years following his succession of Muhammad. Umar succeeds him as the second caliph and begins a campaign against the neighboring empires.
637 CE: Early Islam - The Arabs occupy the Persian capital of Ctesiphon. By 651, the entire Persian realm is under the rule of Islam as it continues its westward expansion.
638 CE: Early Islam - The Romans are defeated at the Battle of Yarmouk and the Muslims enter Palestine. Before entering Jerusalem, Caliph Umar forms a covenant with the Jews, pledging protection of their religious freedom. The Muslims continue their conquest of Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, which is completed in 641 CE.
641 CE: Early Islam - Islam spreads into Egypt. The Catholic Archbishop invites the Muslims to help free Egypt from Roman oppressors. This exemplifies the alliances formed between Muslims, Christians and Jews due to the Muslims' establishment of religious freedom for Christians and Jews. Muslim conquest is based on liberation, rather than subjugation, of conquered peoples. Egypt, Persia and the Fertile Crescent are ruled by the four "Righteous Caliphs" until 662 CE.
644 CE: Early Islam - Umar dies and is succeeded by Caliph Uthman, a member of the Umayyad family which rejected Muhammad's prophesies. Rallies arise to establish Ali, Muhammad's cousin and son-in-law, as caliph.
654 CE: Early Islam - Islam spreads into all of North Africa.
656 CE: Early Islam - Caliph Uthman is murdered, and Ali becomes the new caliph.

661 CE: Early Islam - Not satisfied with Ali, Uthman's followers murder Ali. One of Uthman's relations takes the title of caliph, and Damascus replaces Medina for the seat of the caliphate. The Umayyad family rules Islam until 750. Ali's followers form a religious party called Shiites and insist that only descendants of Ali deserve the title of caliph or deserve any authority over Muslims. The opposing party, the Sunnites, insist on the customs of the historical evolution of the caliphate rather than a hereditary descent of spiritual authority.
662 CE: Early Islam - Egypt falls under the control of the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates until 868 CE. A year prior, the Fertile Crescent and Persia yield to the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates, whose reigns last until 1258 CE and 820 CE, respectively.
669 CE: Early Islam - The Muslim conquest reaches to Morocco in North Africa. The region is open to the rule of the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates until 800 CE.
700 CE: Early Islam - The beginning of the eighth century sees the rise of Islamic mysticism. Known as Sufism, this tradition is marked by the individual's effort to establish an intimate relationship with Allah. One of the most critical passages of the Koran for Sufis is verse 7:172 which describes the covenant between God and the individual's soul before the creation of the universe. Renunciation is more than a rejection of the material realm; its objective is a level of freedom that promotes harmony with one's physical life, resulting in mystical union.
710 CE: Early Islam - Tariq ibn Malik crosses the straight separating Africa and Europe with a group of Muslims and enters Spain. A year later, 7000 Muslim men invade Gibraltar. Almost the entire Iberian peninsula is under Islamic control by 718 CE.
711 CE: Early Islam - With the further conquest of Egypt, Spain and North Africa, Islam includes all of the Persian empire and most of the old Roman world under Islamic rule.
711 CE: Early Islam - Muslims begin the conquest of Sindh in Afghanistan. Until 962 CE, Afghanistan witnesses different regional rules, periodically controlled by the Umayyad and the Abbasid caliphates and other locally-based rulers.
717 CE: Early Islam - The Umayyads attempt to conquer the Byzantine capital and fail, resulting in the weakening of the Umayyad government.
732 CE: Early Islam - At the Battle of Poitiers, Islamic expansion is halted in France but continues into parts of Asia and Africa.
750 CE: Early Islam - The Abbasids overtake the rule of the Islamic world (except for Spain which falls under the rule of a descendant of the Umayyad family) and move the capital to Baghdad in Iraq. Their orientation resembles Persian absolutism. The *Arabian Nights*, a compilation of stories written under the reign of the Abbasids, is representative of the lifestyle and administration of this Persian influenced government. Abd al-Rahman of the Umayyad dynasty flees to Spain to escape the Abbasids and is responsible for the "Golden Caliphate" in Spain, the greatest Islamic civilization yet known.
768 CE: Early Islam - Formerly passed down as an oral record, the history of Muhammad is first recorded by the historian Ishaq ibn Yasar.
786 CE: Early Islam - Caliph Harun al-Rashid, a major figure in the *Arabian Nights*, rules until 809 CE.
789 CE: Early Islam - With the Idrisid dynasty of Morocco, which lasts until 985 CE, local rulers begin to control North Africa.
800 CE: Early Islam - North Africa falls under the rule of the Aghlabi dynasty of Tunis, which lasts until 909 CE.

819 CE: Early Islam - Persian unity begins to disintegrate with the Samanid rulers in Northern Persia, whose rule in this region lasts until 1055 CE. One year later, the Tharid dynasty begins to control Khorastan (lasting until 874 CE), and in 864 CE, the Alid dynasty begins rule over Tabaristan (lasting until 1032 CE).
827 CE: Early Islam - Aghlabi rulers of Tunis begin conquests of Sicily which last until 878 CE.
857 CE: Early Islam - Sufi Al-Muhasibi introduces the study of conscience into Sufism.
865 CE: Early Islam - Rhazes discovers the difference between measles and smallpox. He is considered the greatest physician of medieval times. Rhazes dies in 925 CE.
868 CE: Early Islam - The Sattarid dynasty, whose rule continues until 930 CE, extends control throughout most of Persia. In Egypt, the Abbasid and Umayyad caliphates are ended and rule turns to Egyptian-based control with the beginning of the Tulunid dynasty (lasting until 904 CE).
877 CE: Early Islam - Syria and different sects of Lebanon are ruled periodically by the Tulunid, the Ikhidid, the Fatimid and the Ayyubid dynasties of Egypt until 1250 CE.
879 CE: Early Islam - The Seljuk Empire unites Mesopotamia and a large portion of Persia.
900 CE: Early Islam - The Fatimids of Egypt overtake north Africa and include the territory as an extension of Egypt until 972 CE.
909 CE: Early Islam - Sicily falls under the control of the Fatimids' united rule of North Africa and Egypt until 1071 CE. From 878 until 909 CE, the rule of Sicily is uncertain.
935 CE: Early Islam - Until 969 CE, the rule of Egypt is under the Ikhidid dynasty.
945 CE: Early Islam - A Shiite band invades Baghdad, and the Abbasid Empire becomes a powerless symbol of unity and legitimate government to the Muslim community. Until the sixteenth century, rule of Islamic civilization is decentralized and different sects are ruled by different rulers.
950 CE: Early Islam - Al-Farabi, the greatest of the faylasufs (Arabic for philosopher), lives most of his life in Baghdad and teaches that the enlightened individual could perfect his life through philosophy without being corrupted by the common beliefs of the public.
962 CE: Early Islam - Afghanistan is stabilized by the rule of the Ghaznavid dynasty which lasts until 1186 CE.
972 CE: Early Islam - North Africa is under the control of the Zayri rulers in Tunis. Their control lasts until 1148 CE, much longer than the Aghlabi rulers were able to sustain control.
969 CE: Early Islam - The Fatimid dynasty assumes the title of caliphate in Egypt until 1171 CE.
997 CE: Early Islam - Mahmud, ruler of a Turkish dynasty in Gujarat, conducts seventeen raids into northwestern India before his death in 1030. He is named the "Sword of Islam."
1037 CE: Early Islam - Avicenna, a faylasufs in the east, teaches a rationalistic philosophy which borders Sufi mysticism. Also a physician, Avicenna discovers that disease can be spread through the contamination of water and that tuberculosis is contagious. Among his medical writings, the *Canon* is accepted as authoritative until the late seventeenth century.
1037 CE: Early Islam - A region of Persia, Azerbajjan, falls under the rule of the Sajid dynasty. Azerbajjan is periodically ruled by different rulers from the end of the Seljuk Empire until 1502.
1056 CE: Early Islam - The Al-Moravi rulers of Morocco begin control over North Africa (lasting until 1147 CE).

1077 CE: Early Islam - The Seljuk, a Turkish dynasty, disrupts political and social structures formed by the Abbasids. The Seljuks extend their control over most of the Arab and Persian regions.
1100 CE: Early Islam - Islamic rule is weakened due to power struggles among Islamic leaders and the Christian crusades.
1100 CE: Early Islam - Afghanistan falls under the control of Ghorid rulers until 1215 CE.
1123 CE: Early Islam - The greatest of the Islamic poets is a Persian named Umar Khayyam. His poem *The Rubaiyat* is most popular in the West due to its use by Victorian Edward Fitzgerald.
1126 CE: Early Islam - In Spain, the Aristotelian Averroes of Cordova is the last important Islamic philosopher. He supports the official faith in public and is an extreme rationalist outside of the public realm. He dies in 1198 CE.
1130 CE: Early Islam - Until 1269, the Al-Mohad dynasty rules North Africa.
1168 CE: Early Islam - The Ayyubid dynasty rules Egypt until 1250 CE.
1187 CE: Early Islam - Muslim general Salah al-Kin al-Ayyubi, in Egypt, ends the Christian crusades.
1228 CE: Early Islam - The Haisi rulers of Tunis in North Africa assume control.
1248 CE: Early Islam - Muslim control of Spain is reduced to the Kingdom of Granada, which survives for more than two centuries more.
1251 CE: Early Islam - The last of the Egyptian-based dynasties, the Mamluk dynasty takes the caliphate until 1517 when Egypt falls under the control of the Ottoman Turkish Empire.
1258 CE: Early Islam - The Abbasid period is completely ended with the destruction of Baghdad by the Mongols.
1327 CE: Early Islam - With the disintegration of the Seljuk Empire, the Arab and Persian regions are fragmented into several military kingdoms until 1500. The Ottoman Turkish Empire establishes its capital at Bursa.
1453 CE: Early Islam - The Ottomans defeat the Byzantine Empire and continue expanding into the Balkans. The Ottoman Turkish Empire moves its capital from Bursa to Istanbul (Constantinople). After 1500, the Moguls (1526-1857 CE) and the Safavids (1520-1736 CE) follow the military example set by the Ottomans and create two new empires.
1492 CE: Early Islam - Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, later benefactors of Christopher Columbus, end Muslim rule in Spain.

The Prophet Mohammed was born in the northern Arabian trading city of Mecca between 570 and 580 AD. When he was forty years old, he heard the angel Gabriel speaking to him and telling him to start a new religion: Islam. After a slow start, Mohammed made a lot of converts to his new religion, and they began attacking other Arabian tribes to convert them to Islam. After they had done that, they attacked first the Romans and then the Sassanids to convert them. By 640 (after the death of Mohammed) the Arabs controlled most of Western Asia, and soon after that, under the rule of the Umayyad caliphs, they conquered Egypt. By 711, the Umayyads controlled all of Western Asia except Turkey (which was still part of the Roman Empire), and all of the southern Mediterranean: Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and most of Spain.

After the death of Mohammed in 632 AD, the leadership of the new religion, and of the newly united Arab tribes, was taken over by Mohammed's upper-class father-in-law (through his second wife) Abu Bakr. Mohammed left no sons, and in any case there was no tradition of sons taking over in the Arab world. Abu Bakr only lived for two years after becoming Caliph, but he managed to unite the whole Arabian Peninsula under Islam.

There was a rebellion of the Arab tribes after Mohammed's death, which is called the Ridda. With their leader gone, they wanted to go back to being independent. Abu Bakr took an army and succeeded in destroying the Ridda and bringing those Arab tribes back under Islamic control.

Almost immediately after becoming the Caliph, or ruler, in 634 AD, the second Caliph Umar led Arab raids into both the Roman and the Sassanid empires. Both were surprisingly successful. Apparently both the Romans and the Sassanians were much weaker than the Arabs thought they were. Umar was assassinated in 644 AD, and succeeded by Uthman. Encouraged by these early victories, Uthman and his army organized a real campaign, and by 651 AD they took over most of Western Asia, from the Mediterranean coast to eastern Iran.
Uthman was assassinated in 656, and succeeded by Ali, who had a somewhat more radical view of the Islamic faith. Under Ali, the soldiers of the Islamic Empire fought their way through Egypt and North Africa, and although Ali was assassinated in 661, the armies continued and then crossed the Straits of Gibraltar to attack Spain in 710 AD.

Wikipedia

The spread of Islam

After Muhammad's death, Abu Bakr, his father-in-law and one of the earliest converts, assumed leadership of the Muslim community. This is still a matter of contention among Muslims; the largest sect of Islam, the Sunnis, and the various Shi'a sects, disagree radically as to the history and significance of Abu Bakr's succession to what was later called the caliphate. For further discussion, see Succession to Muhammad.
Abu Bakr spent most of his brief caliphate fighting the Ridda Wars, bringing rebellious Arabian tribes to heel. After dissaffection had been quelled, Muslim troops advanced into Syria, then a battleground between the Byzantine Empire and the Persian Sassanid empire. They won an unexpected victory against the Byzantines at the Battle of Yarmuk.

Abu Bakr's successor, Umar ibn al-Khattab, expanded the Islamic empire even further, conquering most of what is now known as the Middle East, Egypt, northern Africa, and the Persian plateau.

Nonviolence and Peace Traditions in Early and Eastern Christianity
By Fr. John McGuckin

Fr. John McGuckin is professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary and professor of Byzantine History at Columbia University, both in New York City. His essay is due to appear in 2005 as a chapter in The Church's Witness to Peace, edited by Fr. K Kyriakose[1]. The text is placed here by permission of the author. Footnotes are indicated by brackets.

Ideals of Peace in a Violent World.

Christianity has had a very checkered history in terms of its peace tradition. It is often to images of Inquisition and Crusade that the popular imagination turns when considering the darker side of the church's imposition of control over the personal and political worlds it has inhabited over long centuries. The figure of a pacific Jesus (the poet of the lilies of the fields, and the advocator of peaceful resistance to evil, who so inspired Tolstoy and Gandhi among others) is often contrasted with a church of more brutish disciples who, when occasion presented itself, turned willingly, and quickly enough, to tactics of oppression and coercion, policies which they themselves had lamented, as being against both divine and natural justice, when applied to them in the earlier centuries of the Roman persecutions.

The common version among Church Historians of this generic tale of a progressive sinking into the "brutal ways of the world," also points to regular cycles of renewal and repentance, when Christians are said to reappropriate the "real" meaning of their past, and renounce violent resistance in the cause of a "truly Christian" non-resistance. This, of course, is usually a matter of occasional academic protest from the sidelines, or the wisdom of the aftermath, since in times of war the ranks of those who rush to defend the Christian defensibility of hostilities are rarely short of representatives, it would seem.

The key academic studies of the Early Church's peace tradition, for example, had to wait until the 20th century. They appeared in two clusters, both of them the immediate aftermath of the great conflicts of 1914-18, and 1939-45, followed by a longer "tail" which was overshadowed by the Cold War's generic fears of nuclear holocaust, and which produced a more thorough-going tenor of the "suspicion of war" in academic circles. Both the main-clusters of post-war re-assessments of Christian peace tradition in antiquity, witnessed a conflicted product in the tone of the literature. All lamented the fact and experience of war, from a Christian perspective, but some justified the concept of limited war engagement (usually Catholic scholars defending the then dominant Augustine-Aquinas theory of the Just War) while others were evidently more pacifist in tone (generally Protestant scholars calling for a "reform" of defective medievalist views). The more recent work, inspired by the public sight of several disastrously "failed" military interventions (such as Vietnam and Afghanistan) and the horrific record of genocidally-tinged conflict at the end of the 20th century (one of the bloodiest and nastiest on human record, though we still like to regard the ancients as less civilized than ourselves) have, again understandably, caused the Christian witness on war and violence to come under renewed scrutiny. Today the literature on war in early Christian tradition is extensive [2], and a synopsis of the primary sources has recently been collated in a useful ready-reference volume, with a good contextualizing discussion .[3]

While the common image of a militaristic Church is still, perhaps, prevalent in popular estimation, there are nevertheless, a multitude of pacific figures who feature in the Church's exemplary stories of the lives of the saints.

One such hagiography was the narrative on Abba Moses the Ethiopian in the Tales of the Desert Fathers who, when warned in advance of the impending attack of marauding Blemmyes tribesmen in 5th century Lower Egypt, refused to leave his cell, and (though famed as a strong man of previously violent temper) stayed quietly in prayer waiting for the fatal assault of the invading brigands. This story of his election of pacific martyrdom was celebrated as most unusual; a heroic and highly individualist spiritual act of a master (and thus not normative). All the other monks of Scete in his time were either slaughtered because they were surprised, or else had much earlier fled before the face of the storm of invasion.

In terms of pacific saints, the Russian church celebrates the 11th century princes Boris and Gleb, the sons of Vladimir, the first Christian ruler of ancient Rus (Kiev) who, in order to avoid a civil war on the death of their father (when the third son, Svyatopolk, took up arms to assert his right to monarchical supremacy), are said to have adopted the role of "Passion-Bearers." Refusing to bear arms for their own defense, and desiring to avoid bloodshed among their people, they followed the example of their new Lord, who suffered his own unjust Passion. The image and category of "passion-bearing martyr" is one that is dear to, almost distinctive of, the Russian church, so troubled has its history been.

Nevertheless, even this celebrated example contrasts, in many respects, with the witness of other Russian saint-heroes, such as the great warrior prince Alexander Nevsky and contrasts with the witness of many other ancient churches too (such as the Byzantine, Romanian, Serbian, Nubian, or Ethiopian) who had an equally fraught pilgrimage through history, but who proudly elevated and honored the icons and examples of warrior-saints who resisted the onslaught militarily, and died in the process.

In the Romanian Church one of the great heroic founders was the warrior prince Petru Rares who slaughtered the invading Turkish armies under the guidance of his spiritual father and confessor Saint Daniel the Hesychast. The saint commanded the prince to erect monasteries on the site of the great battles, to ensure mourning and prayer for the lost souls whose blood had been shed. This was an act that was seen as a necessary expiation of Petru's "equally necessary" violence. Both he and his spiritual mentor were heavily burdened by their perceived duty of defending the borders of Christendom. To this day Romania's most ancient and beautiful churches stand as mute witnesses to a bloody history where Islam and Christianity's tectonic plates collided (as often they did in the history of the Christian East). The national perception in Romania of prince Vlad Dracul (the western bogeyman of Dracula) is diametrically opposed to the common perception of more or less everyone outside. Within the country Vlad himself is regarded as a national hero and a great Christian warrior who assumed the duty of defending the Faith against the military attempts of Islam forcibly to convert Europe.

Similarly, almost all the saints of Ethiopia are either monastic recluses or warriors. The saints of the (now lost) Church of Nubia [4] were also predominantly warriors. Likewise, the frescoes of

saints on the walls of the ancient Stavronikita monastery on Mount Athos, on the Halkidiki peninsula, demonstrate serried ranks of martyr protectors dressed in full Roman battle gear, in attendance on the Christ in Majesty [5]. The monks were not particularly warlike themselves, but knew at first hand the terrors of living in the pirate-infested Mediterranean. Like the Nubians, a life entirely and permanently surrounded by hostile foes, gave the Athonite monks a very practical attitude to violence, pacific resistance, and the need for defense in varieties of forms. The western church too has its share of noble saint-warriors. In medieval English literature the warrior saint was a highly romantic figure [6]. We can also think of the famed Crusading juggernaut Louis the Pious. These, however, are noticeably not, any longer, "popular saints" (as their counterparts remain in Eastern Christianity) though this may be laid to the door of a generic loss of interest in hagiography and the cultus of the saints in contemporary Western Christianity, as much to a sense of embarrassment that the ranks of saints included so many generals of armies.

Along with its warriors, the Western Church often appealed, for an example of pacific lifestyle, to the Christ-like image of Francis of Assisi, in preference perhaps to the more robust figure of Dominic and his inquisitional Order of Preachers, although one ought not to forget that the Franciscan order itself had from its early origins a foundational charge to evangelize Muslims in the Middle and Near East; its own form of potential "Inquisition" that never had the opportunity to flourish because of Ottoman power, but which was often felt as real enough and resented greatly by the Eastern rite Christians of those places.

This macro-picture of Church History as a sclerotic decline, where simple origins are progressively corrupted into oppressive structures as the church seizes an ever-larger foothold on the face of the earth, is so familiar, almost cliched, that it hardly needs further amplification. It is perfectly exemplified in the general presumption that the Christian movement before the age of the Emperor Constantine the Great (4th century) was mainly pacific in philosophy, but afterwards began theologically to justify the use of coercive force, and so began the long slide into all manner of corruption of power, and abandonment of the primitive spirit of the gentle Jesus [7].

The theory is problematized to some degree by the issue of "conflicted contextualization" for the notable resistance of the earliest Christian movement (2nd through to early 4th centuries) to military service: whether this was predominantly pacifist in temperament; or was related to the military requirements to worship the pagan pantheon of gods; or was simply an aspect of the fear of an oppressed and persecuted group in the face of the state's arm of power. In early canon law the military profession had the same status as a harlot when it came to the seeking of baptism: before admission to the church was countenanced an alternative career had to be sought. After the Pax Constantina, that prohibition was relaxed as even the Christian emperors expected their fellow-Christians to take up their station in the army. Recent historical study has progressively argued that the advancement of Christians to political and military power should not be seen as a surprisingly miraculous event (as the legend of Constantine would have it be), but the result of more than a century of prior political and military infiltration of the higher offices of state by Christians bearing arms. The earliest materials (martyrial stories of how the

poor resisted the Roman imperium) tend to come from the account of the churches of the local victims [8].
The full story (why, for example, Diocletian targeted Christians within his own court and army to initiate the Great persecution of the early 4th century) [9] is less to the front: but clearly the great revolution of the 4th century which saw an internationally ascendant Church, was not simply an altruistic "gift" of power to a pacific Christian movement, but more in the terms of an acknowledgment by Constantine that his own path to monarchy lay with the powerful international lobby of Christians. The question as to "who patronized who": Constantine the Church, or the Church Constantine, remains one that is surely more evenly balanced than is commonly thought. The military and political involvement of Christians, therefore, (as distinct from the "Church" shall we say) is something that is not so simply "switched" at the 4th century watershed of Constantine's "conversion."

Nevertheless, the story that from primitive and "pure" beginnings the Christian movement degenerated into a more warlike compromise with state power, is a good story precisely because it is so cartoon-like in its crudity. It ought not to be forgotten, however, that it "is" a story, not a simple record of uncontested facts. It is a story, moreover, that took its origin as part of a whole dossier of similar stories meant to describe the movement of Christianity through history in terms of early promise, followed by rapid failure, succeeded by the age of reform and repristination of the primitive righteousness.

In short, the common view of Christianity's peace tradition, as sketched out above, is clearly a product of Late-Medieval Reformation apologetics. That so much of this early-modern propaganda has survived to form a substrate of presupposition in post-modern thought about Christian history is a testimony to the power of the apologetic stories themselves, and (doubtless) to the widespread distrust of the motives of the late medieval church authorities in western Europe at the time of the Reformation.

The common view about Christianity's peace tradition, however, is so hopelessly rooted in western, apologetic, and "retrospectivist" presuppositions (a thorough-going Protestant revision of the Catholic tradition on the morality of war and violence that had preceded it) that it is high time the issue should be considered afresh.

The common histories of Christianity, even to this day, seem to pretend that its eastern forms (the Syrians, Byzantines, Armenians, Copts, Nubians, Indians, Ethiopians, or Cappadocians) never existed, or at least were never important enough to merit mention; or that western Europe is a normal and normative vantage point for considering the story. But this narrow perspective skews the evidence at the outset.

Accordingly, the figures of Augustine of Hippo (the towering 5th century African theologian) and Thomas Aquinas (the greatest of the Latin medieval scholastic theologians) loom very large in the normative western-form of the telling of the tale. Both theologians were highly agentive in developing the western Church's theory and principles of a "Just War."

In the perspectives of the eastern Christian tradition, not only do these two monumental figures not feature but, needless to say, neither does their theory on the moral consideration of war and violence which has so dominated the western imagination. Eastern Christianity simply does not approach the issue from the perspective of "Just War," and endorses no formal doctrine advocating the possibility of a "Just War."

Its approach is ambivalent, more complex and nuanced. For that reason it has been largely overlooked in the annals of the history of Christianity, or even dismissed as self-contradictory. It is not self-contradictory, of course, having been proven by experience through centuries of political suffering and oppression. If it knows anything, the Eastern church knows how to endure, and hardly needs lessons on such a theme; but it is certainly not a linear theory of war and violence that it holds (as if war and violence could be imagined as susceptible of rational solution and packaging). Its presuppositions grow from a different soil than do modern and post-modern notions of political and moral principles.

Christianity was, and remains at heart, an apocalyptic religion, and it is no accident that its numerous biblical references to war and violent destruction are generally apocalyptic ciphers, symbols that stand for something else, references to the "Eschaton" (the image of how the world will be rolled up and assessed once universal justice is imposed by God on his recalcitrant and rebellious creation). Biblical descriptions of violence and war, in most of Christianity"s classical exposition of its biblical heritage, rather than being straightforward depictions of the life and values of "This-World-Order" are thus eschatological allegories. To confound the two orders [10] (taking war images of the apocalyptic dimension) for instances of how the world (here) ought to be managed [11] is a gross distortion of the ancient literature. This has become increasingly a problem since the medieval period when allegorist readings of scripture have been progressively substituted (especially in Protestantism) for wholesale historicist and literalist readings of the ancient texts. [12].

This is not to say that eastern Christianity itself has not been guilty of its own mis-readings of evidences, in various times of its history, or that it has no blood on its hands, for that would be to deny the brutal facts of a Church that has progressively been driven westwards, despite its own will, by a series of military disasters, for the last thousand years. But, Christian reflection in the eastern Church has, I would suggest, been more careful than the West, to remind itself of the apocalyptic and mysterious nature of the Church's place within history and on the world-stage, and has stubbornly clung to a less congratulatory theory of the morality of War (despite its advocacy of "Christian imperium"), because it sensed that such a view was more in tune with the principles of the Gospels. What follows in this paper is largely a consideration of that peace tradition in the perspective of the eastern provinces of Christianity, the "patristic" foundation that went on to provide the underpinning of Byzantine canon law, and (after the fall of Byzantium), the system of law that still operates throughout the churches of the East.

In the decades following the First World War, Adolf Von Harnack was one of the first among modern patristic theologians to assemble a whole dossier of materials on the subject of the Church's early traditions on war and violence. [13]. In his macro-thesis he favored the theory of the "fall from grace," and argued that the Church progressively relaxed its earliest blanket

hostility to bloodshed and the military profession in general. The relaxation of anti-war discipline, he saw as part and parcel of a wider "corruption" of early Christian ideals by "Hellenism."

And yet, no Eastern Christian attitudes to war, either before or after the Pax Constantina, have ever borne much relation to classic Hellenistic and Roman war theory [14], being constantly informed and conditioned by biblical paradigms (reined in by Jesus' strictures on the futility of violence) rather than by Hellenistic Kingship theory or tribal theories of national pride.
In the second part to his study (subtitled "The Christian Religion and the Military Profession"), Harnack went further to discuss the wide extent of biblical images of war and vengeance in the Christian foundational documents, suggesting that the imagery of "spiritual warfare" however removed it might be from the "real world" when it was originally coined, must take some responsibility for advocating the sanctification of war theories within the church in later ages [15].

For Harnack, and many others following in his wake, Constantine was the villain of the piece, and not less so his apologist the Christian bishop Eusebius of Caesarea. The latter finds no problem at all in comparing the deaths of the wicked as recounted in Old Testament narratives of holy war, with Constantine's conquest and execution of his enemies in the Civil War of the early 4th century [16]. For Eusebius, writing in 336, the cessation of the war in 324 was a fulfilment of the Psalmic and Isaian prophecies of a golden age of peace [17].

Eusebius' fulsome rhetoric has had a great deal of weight placed upon it by those who favor the "theory of fall," even though on any sober consideration, to extrapolate a court-theologian such as Eusebius into a marker of general opinion in the Church of the early 4th century should have been more universally acknowledged to be a serious mistake. Eusebius' more sober thoughts on the expansion of the Church (as exemplified by Constantine's victory over persecuting emperors, and his clear favoritism for the Christians) was really an intellectual heritage from that great theological teacher whose disciple he prided himself on being — Origen of Alexandria.
It was certainly Origen who had put into his mind the juxtaposition of the ideas of the Pax Romana being the providentially favorable environment for the rapid internationalization of the Gospel. Origen himself, however, was pacifist in his attitudes to war and world powers, and was sternly against the notion of the Church advocating its transmission and spread by force of arms [18]. In his wider exegesis Eusebius shows himself consistently to be a follower of his teacher's lead and the Old Testament paradigms of the "downfall of the wicked" are what are generally at play in both Origen and Eusebius when they highlight biblical examples of vindication, or military collapse.

Several scholars misinterpret Eusebius radically, therefore, when they read his laudation of Constantine as some kind of proleptic justification of the Church as an asserter of rightful violence. His Panegyric on Constantine should not be given such theoretical weight, just as a collection of wedding congratulatory speeches today would hardly be perused for a cutting edge analysis of the times. In applying biblical tropes and looking for fulfillments, Eusebius (certainly in the wider panoply if all his work is taken together not simply his court laudations) is looking to the past, not to the future; and is intent only on celebrating what for most in his generation

must have truly seemed miraculous — that their oppressors had fallen, and that they themselves were now free from the fear of torture and death.

Origen and Eusebius may have set a tone of later interpretation that could readily grow into a vision of the Church as the inheritor of the biblical promises about the Davidic kingdom (that the boundaries of Byzantine Christian power were concomitant with the Kingdom of God on earth, and thus that all those who lay outside those boundaries were the enemies of God), but there were still innumerable dissidents even in the long-lasting Byzantine Christian politeia (especially the monks) who consistently refused to relax the apocalyptic dimension of their theology, and who resisted the notion that the Church and the Byzantine borders were one and the same thing [19].

The Canonical Epistles of Basil of Caesarea.

Basil of Caesarea was a younger contemporary of Eusebius, and in the following generation of the Church of the late 4th century, he emerged as one of the leading theorists of the Christian movement. His letters and instructions on the ascetic life, and his "Canons" [20] (ethical judgements as from a ruling bishop to his flock) on morality and practical issues became highly influential in the wider church because of his role as one of the major monastic theorists of Early Christianity. His canonical epistles were transmitted wherever monasticism went: and in the Eastern Church of antiquity (because monasticism was the substructure of the spread of the Christian movement), that more or less meant his canonical views became the standard paradigm of Eastern Christianity's theoretical approach to the morality of war and violence, even though the writings were local [21] and occasional in origin. Basil's 92 Canonical Epistles were adapted by various Ecumenical Councils of the Church that followed his time. His writing is appealed to in Canon 1 of the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), in Canon 1 of the 7th Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787), and is literally cited in Canon 2 of the 6th Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (681) which paraphrases much else from his canonical epistles. By such affirmations eventually the entire corpus of the Basilian Epistles entered the Pandects of Canon Law of the Byzantine Eastern Church, and they remain authoritative to this day.

Basil has several things to say about violence and war in his diocese. It was a border territory of the empire, and his administration had known several incursions by "barbarian" forces. Canon 13 of the 92 considers war:
"Our fathers did not consider killings committed in the course of wars to be classifiable as murders at all, on the score, it seems to me, of allowing a pardon to men fighting in defense of sobriety and piety. Perhaps, though, it might be advisable to refuse them communion for three years, on the ground that their hands are not clean." [22]

The balance and sense of discretion is remarkable in this little comment, one that bears much weight in terms of Eastern Orthodox understandings of the morality of war. The "fathers" in question refers to Athanasius of Alexandria, the great Nicene Orthodox authority of the 4th century church. Athanasius' defense of the Nicene creed, and the divine status of Christ, had won him immense prestige by the end of the 4th century, and as his works were being collated and disseminated (in his own lifetime his reputation had been highly conflicted, his person exiled

numerous times, and his writings proscribed by imperial censors), Basil seems to wish to add a cautionary note: that not everything a "father" has to say is equally momentous, or universally authoritative. In his Letter to Amun Athanasius had apparently come out quite straightforwardly about the legitimacy of killing in time of war, saying:

"Although one is not supposed to kill, the killing of the enemy in time of war is both a lawful and praiseworthy thing. This is why we consider individuals who have distinguished themselves in war as being worthy of great honors, and indeed public monuments are set up to celebrate their achievements. It is evident, therefore, that at one particular time, and under one set of circumstances, an act is not permissible, but when time and circumstances are right, it is both allowed and condoned." [23]

This saying was being circulated, and given authority as a "patristic witness" simply because it had come from Athanasius. In fact the original letter had nothing whatsoever to do with war. The very example of the "war-hero" is a sardonic reference ad hominem since the letter was addressed to an aged leader of the Egyptian monks who described themselves as Asketes, that is those who labored and "fought" for the virtuous life. The military image is entirely incidental, and Athanasius in context merely uses it to illustrate his chief point in the letter — which is to discuss the query Amun had sent on to him as Archbishop: "did nocturnal emissions count as sins for desert celibates ?" Athanasius replies to the effect that with human sexuality, as with all sorts of other things, the context of the activity determines what is moral, not some absolute standard which is superimposed on moral discussion from the outset. Many ancients, Christian and pagan, regarded sexual activity as inherently defiling and here Athanasius decidedly takes leave of them. His argument, therefore, is falsely attributed when (as is often the case) read out of context as an apparent justification of killing in time of war. He is not actually condoning the practice at all, merely using the rhetorical example of current opinion to show Amun that contextual variability is very important in making moral judgements.

In his turn Basil, wishes to make it abundantly clear for his Christian audience that such a reading, if applied to the Church's tradition on war, is simplistic, and that is it is just plain wrong-headedness to conclude that the issue ceases to be problematic if one is able to dig up a justificatory "proof text" from scripture or patristic tradition (as some seem to have been doing with these words of Athanasius). And so, Basil sets out a nuanced corrective exegesis of what the Church's canon law should really be in terms of fighting in time of hostilities. One of the ways he does this is to attribute this aphorism of Athanasius to indeterminate "fathers," who can then be legitimately corrected by taking a stricter view than they appeared to allow. He also carefully sets his own context: what he speaks about is the canonical regulation of war in which a Christian can engage and be "amerced" [24]; all other armed conflicts are implicitly excluded as not being appropriate to Christian morality). Basil's text on war needs, therefore, to be understood in terms of an "economic" reflection on the ancient canons that forbade the shedding of blood in blanket terms. This tension between the ideal standard (no bloodshed) and the complexities of the context in which a local church finds itself thrown in times of conflict and war, is witnessed in several other ancient laws, such as Canon 14 of Hippolytus (also from the 4th century) [25]. The reasons Basil gives for suggesting that killing in time of hostilities could be distinguished from voluntary murder pure and simple (for which the canonical penalty was a

lifelong ban from admission to the churches and from the sacraments) is set out as the "defense of sobriety and piety." This is code language for the defense of Christian borders from the ravages of pagan marauders. The difficulty Basil had to deal with was not war on the large-scale, but local tribal insurgents who were mounting attacks on Roman border towns, with extensive rapinage. In such circumstances Basil has little patience for those who do not feel they can fight because of religious scruples. His sentiment is more that a passive non-involvement betrays the Christian family (especially its weaker members who can not defend themselves but need others to help them) to the ravages of men without heart or conscience to restrain them. The implication of his argument, then, is that the provocation to fighting, that Christians ought at some stage to accept (to defend the honor and safety of the weak), will be inherently a limited and adequate response, mainly because the honor and tradition of the Christian faith (piety and sobriety) in the hearts and minds of the warriors, will restrict the bloodshed to a necessary minimum. His "economic" solution nevertheless makes it abundantly clear that the absolute standard of

Christian morality turns away from war as an unmitigated evil. This is why we can note that the primary reason Basil gives that previous "fathers" had distinguished killing in time of war, from the case of simple murder, was "on the score of allowing a pardon." There was no distinction made here in terms of the qualitative horror of the deed itself, rather in terms of the way in which the deed could be "cleansed" by the Church's system of penance.

Is it logical to expect a Christian of his diocese to engage in the defense of the homeland, while simultaneously penalizing him if he spills blood in the process ? Well, one needs to contextualize the debarment from the sacrament in the generic 4th century practice of the reception of the Eucharist, which did not expect regular communication to begin with (ritual preparation was extensive and involved fasting and almsgiving and prayer), and where a sizeable majority of adult Christians in a given church would not have yet been initiated by means of baptism, and were thus not bound to keep all the canons of the Church. By his regulation and by the ritual exclusion of the illumined warrior from the sacrament (the returning "victor" presumably would have received many other public honors and the gratitude of the local folk) Basil is making sure at least one public sign is given to the entire community that the Gospel standard has no place for war, violence and organized death. He is trying to sustain an eschatological balance: that war is not part of the Kingdom of God (signified in the Eucharistic ritual as arriving in the present) but is part of the bloody and greed-driven reality of world affairs which is the "Kingdom-Not-Arrived." By moving in and out of Eucharistic reception Basil's faithful Christian (returning from his duty with blood on his hands) is now in the modality of expressing his dedication to the values of peace and innocence, by means of the lamentation and repentance for life that has been taken, albeit the blood of the violent. Basil's arrangement that the returning noble warrior' should stand in the Church (not in the narthex where the other public sinners were allocated spaces) but refrain from communion, makes the statement that a truly honorable termination of war, for a Christian, has to be an honorable repentance.

Several commentators (not least many of the later western Church fathers) have regarded this as "fudge," but it seems to me to express, in a finely tuned "economic" way, the tension in the basic Christian message that there is an unresolvable shortfall between the ideal and the real in an apocalyptically charged religion. What this Basilian canon does most effectively is to set a "No

Entry" sign to any potential theory of Just War within Christian theology [26], and should set up a decided refusal of post-war church-sponsored self-congratulations for victory [27]. All violence, local, individual, or nationally-sanctioned is here stated to be an expression of hubris that is inconsistent with the values of the Kingdom of God, and while in many circumstances that violence may be "necessary" or "unavoidable" (Basil states the only legitimate reasons as the defense of the weak and innocent) it is never "justifiable." Even for the best motives in the world, the shedding of blood remains a defilement, such that the true Christian, afterwards, would wish to undergo the kathartic experience of temporary return to the lifestyle of penance, that is "be penitent." Basil's restriction of the time of penance to three years (seemingly harsh to us moderns) was actually a commonly recognized sign of merciful leniency in the ancient rule book of the early Church [28].

Concluding Reflections

We might today regard such early attempts by Christians as quaintly naive. They are wired through the early penitential system, clearly, and have a fundamental "economic" character about them. By Economy the early church meant the art of doing what was possible when a higher ideal standard was not sustained. In the case of war Basil and the canonical tradition are tacitly saying that when the Kingdom ideals of peace and reconciliation collapse, especially in times of war when decisive and unusual action is required, and the ideals of reconciliation and forgiveness fall into chaos in the very heart of the Church itself [29], as members go off to fight, then the ideal must be reasserted as soon as possible — with limitations to the hostilities a primary concern, and a profound desire to mark the occasion retrospectively with a public "cleansing." While the honor of the combatants is celebrated by Basil (even demanded as an act of protection for the weak), one essential aspect of that honor is also listed as being the public acceptance of the status of penitent shedder of blood. The clergy (as with other economic concessions of morality operative in the church's canons) are the only ones not allowed benefit of necessity. In no case is violent action permitted to one who stands at the altar of God. Even if a cleric spills blood accidentally (such as in an involuntary manslaughter) such a person would be deposed from active presbyteral office. The sight of "warrior- bishops" in full military regalia, passing through the streets of Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade, left its mark on contemporary Greek sources as one of the greatest "shocks" to the system, and one of the incidentals that were taken by the Greeks as proof positive that Latin Christianity in the 13th century had a serious illness at its center.

More than naive, perhaps, might we regard such a morality of war as seriously "under-developed"? Can such an important issue really be dealt with by so few canons of the ancient eastern church, and even then, by regulations that are so evidently local and occasional in character ? Well, the charges of inconsistency (praising a noble warrior then subjecting him to penance) and muddle-headedness, were raised in early times, especially by Latin theologians who wanted to press the envelope and arrive at a more coherent and all-embracing theory of war: one that balanced the apparent biblical justifications of hostility on the part of the chosen people, with the need to limit the obvious blood-lust of our species. The Latin theory of Just War was one result. Considered primarily (as it was meant to be) as a theory of the limitation of hostilities in the ancient context (hand to hand fighting of massed armies whose very size limited the time

of possible engagement to a matter of months at most), it too was an “economic” theory that had much merit. It’s usefulness became moot in the medieval period when armament manufacture took ancient warfare into a new age, and it has become utterly useless in the modern age of mechanized warfare, where it could not stop the fatal transition (on which modernized mechanical warfare depends — both that sponsored by states, and that sponsored by smaller groups which we call “terrorism”) to the centrally important role of the murder of non-combatants. Be that as it may, it is not the purpose of the present essay to offer a sustained critique on Just War theory — merely to raise up a mainline Christian tradition of the ancient East which has never believed in Just War — and to offer instead of an elegant theory, a poor threadbare suggestion of old saints: that War is never justified or justifiable, but is de facto a sign and witness of evil and sin.

When it falls across the threshold of the Church in an unavoidable way, it sometimes becomes our duty (so the old canons say) to take up arms; though when that is the case is to be determined in trepidation by the elect who understand the value of peace and reconciliation, not in self-glorifying battle cries from the voices of the bloodthirsty and foolish. But in no case is the shedding of blood, even against a manifestly wicked foe, ever a “Just Violence.” The eastern canons, for all their tentativeness, retain that primitive force of Christian experience on that front. It may be the “Violence of the Just” but in that case the hostility will necessarily be ended with the minimal expenditure of force, and be marked in retrospect by the last act of the “violent Just” which will be repentance that finally resolves the untenable paradox. Ambivalent and “occasional” such a theory of War might be: but if it had been followed with fidelity the Church’s hands might have been cleaner than they have been across many centuries; and it might yet do a service on the wider front in helping Western Christianity to dismantle its own “economic” structures of war theory which are so patently in need of radical re-thinking. Perhaps the place to begin, as is usually the case, is here and now: with “Christian America” at the dawn of a new millennium, in which we seem to have learned nothing at all from generations of bitter experience of hostility: except the hubris that international conflicts can be undertaken “safely” now that other super-powers are currently out of commission. Such is the wisdom of the most powerful nation on earth, currently in an illegal state of war [30] which it wishes to disguise even from itself, even as the American military deaths this month exceeded 1000, with a pervasive silence all that it has to offer in relation to all figures of the deaths of those who were not American troops. Such is the wisdom under a leadership that is itself apparently eager to line up for a “righteous struggle” with the “forces of evil,” which so many others in the world outside, have seen as more in the line of a determined dominance of Islamic sensibilities by Super-Power secularism of the crassest order. In such a strange new millennium, perhaps the wisdom of the need to be tentative, finds a new power and authority.

---

1 In: KK Kuriakose (ed). Non-Violence: Concepts and Practices Across Religions and Cultures. NY. 2005.
2 The chief sources in English are: RH Bainton. Christian Attitudes to War and Peace. A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation. Nashville. 1960; CJ Cadoux. The Early Christian Attitude to War. Oxford. 1919 (repr. NY. 1982); A von Harnack. Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries. (tr. DM Gracie. Philadelphia. 1980: original German edn. 1905; HA Deane. The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine. New

York. 1963 (chs.5-6); J. Helgeland. Christians and Military Service: AD 173-337. PhD Diss. University of Chicago. 1973. (summarized in Idem. "Christians and the Roman Army. AD. 173-337." Church History. 43. June 1974. 149-161; JM Hornus. It is Not Lawful for me to Fight: Early Christian Attitudes to War, Violence and the State . (trs. A Kreider & O Coburn). Scottsdale, Pa. 1980; HT McElwain. Augustine's Doctrine of War in Relation to Earlier Ecclesiastical Writers. Rome. 1972; TS Miller & J Nesbitt (eds). Peace and War in Byzantium. Essays in Honor of GT Dennis. CUA Press. Washington. 1995; EA Ryan. "The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Christians." Theological Studies. 13. 1952. 1-32; WR. Stevenson. Christian Love and Just War: Moral Paradox and Political Life in St. Augustine and his Modern Interpreters. Macon. Ga. 1987.
3 LJ Swift. The Early Fathers on War and Military Service. (Message of the Fathers of the Church. Vol. 19). 1983. Wilmington. De.
4 Byzantine in foundation and structure, until its annihilation in the late 15th century.
5 See: M Chatzidakis. The Cretan Painter Theophanes: The Wall-Paintings of the Holy Monastery of Stavronikita. Thessaloniki. (published on Mount Athos). 1986.
6 Cf. JE Damon. Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors: Warfare and Sanctity in the Literature of Early England. (Ashgate press). Aldershot. 2003.
7 Helgeland (1973. p. 17.) illustrates how both Harnack and Cadoux's works progress from this shared presupposition despite their different perspectives on the issue of pacifism as a general Christian ideal. (Cadoux regarded Harnack as having soft-pedalled the Church's early peace witness).
8 The early martyrial acts are charged with the dramatic characterization of the martyr as the apocalyptic witness, and the condemning magistrate as eschatological servant of the Beast. The narratives often deliberately follow the literary paradigm of the Passion Story of the Gospels. The Martyrdom of Polycarp is one such example.
9 Or how it might well be the case that Christian soldiers had already taken the imperial throne by force of arms in the mid 3rd century (in the case of Philip the Arab).
10 What the ancient sources described as the "Two Ages" (This Age of turmoil that stands within the historical record and permits brutal oppression as the ultimate symbol of "the Beast," that is evil personified, and the Other Age, which is the Transcendent "Kingdom of God" when peace will be established by the definitive ending of violent powers hostile to the good., and the comforting of the poor.
11 It is a major category mistake, therefore, for fundamentalist Christians to apply apocalyptically matrixed scriptural references to "war in the heavens spilling out on earth," as authoritative "justifications" from the Bible for Christians to engage in violent conflict for political ends. The essence of biblical, apocalyptic, doctrine is that the Two Ages must never be conflated or confused. The "Next Age" cannot be ushered in by political victories gained in "This Age." By this means Christianity, in its foundational vision, undercut the principles that continue to inspire Judaism and Islam with their (essentially) non-apocalyptic understandings of the spreading of the Kingdom of God on Earth in recognizable borders, and militarily if necessary.
12 As if, for example, the biblical narratives of the Pentateuch where God commands Moses and Joshua to slaughter the Canaanite inhabitants in the process of seizing the "Promised Land" were to be read literalistically — as both vindicating war for "righteous reasons," and validating the forced appropriation of territories after conflict. Protestant fundamentalism would, of course,

read the texts with that political slant (symbolically going further to adapt the text to justify Christianity's use of violence in a just cause); whereas the ancient Church consistently reads the narrative as allegorically symbolic of the perennial quest to overcome evil tendencies by virtuous action. The Canaanites assume the symbolic status of personal vice, the Israelite armies, the status of the ethical struggle. While this allegorical symbolism still depends in large degree on a symbolic reading of violent images, it successfully defuses a wholesale biblical "sanction" for violence and war.
13 A. Harnack. Militia Christi. The Christian Religion and The Military in the First Three Centuries (Tr. D. McI. Gracie). Philadelphia. 1981.
14 Though Ambrose and Augustine take much of their views on the subject from Cicero.
15 He probably underestimated the extent to which the early Church was propelled, not by subservience to emperors, but more by the way in which the war theology of ancient Israel was passed on as an authoritative paradigm, simply by the force of ingesting so much of the Old Testament narratives in the structure of its prayers, liturgies, and doctrines. It is, nonetheless, worthy of note that formally, from early times, the war passages of the Old Testament were consistently preached as allegorical symbols of the battle to establish peaceful virtues in human hearts (not the advocating of conquest of specific territories). Harnack himself admitted (when considering the example of the Salvation Army, that this aspect of this thesis could limp badly.
16 Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History. 9.9. 5-8; Life of Constantine. 1.39.
17 Is.2.4; Ps.72.7-8.
18 See N McLynn. "Roman Empire," pp. 185-187 in: J.A. McGuckin (ed). The Westminster Handbook to Origen of Alexandria. Louisville. Ky. 2004.
19 For a further elaboration of the argument see: J.A.McGuckin. The Legacy of the Thirteenth Apostle: Origins of the East- Christian Conceptions of Church-State Relation. St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly. 47. Nos. 3-4. 2003. 251-288.
20 The "Canonical Epistles of St. Basil," otherwise known as the "92 canons." They can be found in English translation in: The Pedalion or Rudder of the Orthodox Catholic Church: The Compilation of the Holy Canons by Saints Nicodemus and Agapius. Tr. D Cummings. (Orthodox Christian Educational Society). Chicago. 1957 (repr. NY. 1983). pp. 772-864.
21 Basil was the Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, now a city (Kaisariye) of Eastern Turkey.
22 Basil. Ep. 188. 13; Pedalion. p. 801.
23 Athanasius Epistle 48. To Amun. full text in A Robertson (tr). St. Athanasius Select Works and Letters. Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Church. Vol. 4. (1891). repr. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. 1980. pp. 556-557.
24 That is find canonical forgiveness for the act of shedding blood: which is canonically prohibited. The background context of the canons which forbid the shedding of blood are important to Basil's thought, and are presumed throughout. He takes it for granted that clergy are absolutely forbidden to shed blood: and even if they do so accidentally, will be prohibited from celebrating the Eucharistic mysteries afterwards. In this case, just as with the church's canonical rules relating to the prohibition of second marriages, what began as a general rule, was relaxed in its application to wider society, although the clergy were required to sustain the original strict interpretation (see Apostolical Canons 66. Pedalion. pp. 113-116.) Today in Orthodoxy, marriage is described as a one-time occurrence: but if the marriage is broken a second (and even third) marriage can be contracted "as an economy" to human conditions and relational failures. The clergy, however, are not allowed to contract second marriages (even if the first wife has died).

The economy is not permitted to them. Clergy in the Eastern tradition are still canonically forbidden from engaging in any violence, beyond the minimum necessary to defend their life (Apostolic Canon 66.)though they are censured if they do not vigorously defend a third party being attacked in their presence. For both things (use of excessive violence in self-defence, and refusal to use violence in defense of another, they are given the penalty of deposition from orders).
25 "A Christian should not volunteer to become a soldier, unless he is compelled to do this by someone in authority. He can have a sword, but he should not be commanded to shed blood. If it can be shown that he has shed blood he should stay away from the mysteries (sacraments) at least until he has been purified through tears and lamentation." Canons of Hippolytus 14.74. Text in Swift (1983) p. 93. See also Apostolic Tradition 16.
26 As developed especially (out of Cicero) by Ambrose of Milan On Duties. 1. 176; and Augustine (Epistle 183.15; Against Faustus 22. 69-76; and see Swift:1983. pp. 110-149). But Ambrose (ibid. 1. 35.175) specifically commands his priests to have no involvement (inciting or approving) whatsoever in the practice of War or judicial punishments: "Interest in matters of war," he says, "seems to me to be alien to our role as priests."
27 Many churches have uneasily juggled this responsibility in times past. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher famously denounced the Archbishop of Canterbury's post-Falklands-war service in 80's London (St. Paul's cathedral), as " far too wet," while other critics in the country were hard on him for not stating at the outset that the Falklands invasion did not fulfill the requirements of a "Just War" in terms of classical western theory, and so should have been more severely denounced by the Church.
28 Ordinary murder was given a 20 year debarment from the church's sacraments as well as all accruing civic penalties. Basil's Canon 56. Pedalion. p. 827; manslaughter received a ten year debarment. Basil's Canon 57. Pedalion. p. 828.
29 Note that they are not querying the collapse of peace ideals outside the church as they regard the spread of hubris and violence on the earth as a clear mark of all those dark forces hostile to the heavenly Kingdom. The advocacy of war that is not a direct response to a clear and present threat of aggression is thus permanently ruled out of the court of morality in this system.
30 The conflict in Iraq, an invasion not given sanction of international law through the medium United Nations, but initiated to overthrow the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein on the pretext that he was manufacturing weapons of mass destruction.

Fr. John McGuckin
Union Theological Seminary
3041 Broadway
Knox Hall #6W
New York, NY 10027

Feminism and the Challenges of War

by Beverly E. Mitchell
Wesley Theological Seminary

[box]
VIEW OR PRINT PDF
THIS SECTION

A number of women have written recent articles on feminism and war in light of the war in Iraq. Their range of views suggests that there is no definitive feminist view of war. Like the general population, there are feminists who oppose war under any and all circumstances, feminists who hate war but recognize that there may be instances in which war might be necessary, and women who recognize war as a regrettable occurrence, but lack confidence in the success of other options.

Despite the absence of a definitive feminist position, there are several recurring themes in the discussion of the problem of war in the context of Christian feminism that are worth our consideration as debate continues over the war in Iraq. These themes are:

(1) the supposed connection between feminism and peace;
(2) the impact of war on women;
(3) theological groundings for peace; and
(4) the relevance of just war theory.

Feminism and Peace

One recurring theme in Christian feminist discussions of war is the longstanding link between feminism and peace. This historical link was strengthened in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as many women's rights organizations incorporated world peace as part of their agenda in the fight against patriarchy and other social ills.[1] Although it was believed that men could be converted to the virtues of peace and love, women's groups upheld the cultural identification of these virtues with women's as mothers and natural nurturers.

With the new feminist movements of the late 1960s, this cultural link has been challenged; however, vestiges of this notion persist in our time. Included among the problems associated with this perceived connection, which contemporary feminists rightly challenge, are an implied biological determinism that fails to do justice to the complexity of woman *and* men as human beings and the hindrance such determinism does in eradicating patriarchal-inspired obstacles to the full participation of women in peacemaking and peace-building activities.[2]

As we move the conversation forward, it seems more fruitful to frame analyses of the problems of war and the hindrances to peace around the ways in which both women and men can and do contribute to the phenomenon of war and the struggle for peace, rather than emphasizing real and/or imagined differences between men and women that obfuscate instead of illumine the shared responsibility of both sexes in what transpires in the global community.

The Impact of War on Women

A second recurring theme in feminist discussions of war is the impact of war on women in particular. Because the traditional understanding of war as a prerogative and domain of men, the adverse impact of war on women has not received the kind of attention it deserves. Scholars are now seeking to rectify this omission by calling to our attention the various ways in which women play a role and are adversely affected by war and its aftermath.[3]

The range of difficulties that women experience in time of war include, but are not limited to: the loss of protection in the absence of a central state or other authoritative structure that is responsible for the security of its citizenry; increased medical and social responsibility as more attention is given to militarization than on health care, infrastructure, etc.; wartime prostitution, which can be a very lucrative business; and increased sexualized violence as women (and children) are targeted in conflict situations.[4]

Moreover, feminist groups, such as the National Women's Studies Association, have found a connection between individual acts of violence directed against women and violence that women experience as the result of war.[5] This perceived connection challenges advocates and activists to explore the implications that lie therein. The results of such exploration so far clearly suggest that the differences of the adverse impact of war in relation to gender underscores the importance of ensuring that women have a role in the formulation of policies that impact war and peace-making.

Theological Groundings for Peace

Another recurring theme is the notion of theological groundings for peace and opposition to war.[6] One theological foundation for peacemaking, which many Christian feminists affirm, is the basic biblical conception that God freely initiates a covenant relationship with humanity that reflects the steadfast love of God for human beings. On the basis of the love God has for us, we are fundamentally in kinship with each other. As such, as we recognize the irrevocable interconnectedness that binds us to one another, we find a moral imperative to support corporate activities that foster that connectedness and a corollary imperative to oppose activities that negate that connectedness.

Another theological foundation for peacemaking lies in the doctrine of creation, whereby, the whole world is God's creation and the world is our home. We are commanded to be good stewards of that creation.

Our covenant relationship with God and the doctrine of creation are but two theological entry points that stand in judgment against the harsh realities of war. Identification of the theological groundings for peace and opposition to war serve as guideposts to inform individual Christians and churches as men and women seek to exercise their civic duty responsibly in light of their faith commitments.

Feminism and just war theory

A third theme in the discussion of feminism and war has been the doctrine of just war. Historically, the "just war" tradition has set forth conditions that should be met before Christians could, in good faith, approve of or participate in war. Seven criteria have been identified which must be met in order to justify war:[7] 1) the cause must be just; 2) the war must be undertaken by a legitimate authority; 3) war must be a last resort, undertaken only after all other reasonable measures short of war are inadequate; 4) the expectation that the predictable consequences of war must be better than the consequences of not going to war; 5) there must be a reasonable expectation of victory; 6) the actual conduct of war must be maintained in "right intention;" and 7) there can be no directly intended injury to non-combatants.

At best, conventional war has occurred in situations where the standards posed by just war doctrine have not been met. At worst, in light of the threat of thermonuclear war presented in the 20th century, there is the likelihood that no nation with nuclear capability could ever meet the exacting test of just war doctrine. A policy of mutual deterrence has helped to diffuse some of the tension surrounding the possibility of nuclear war in the recent past, but the ever possible threat of nuclear war or the calamity of other weapons of mass destruction highlight the precarious security that the just war doctrine holds in modern times. Some feminists now speak of this doctrine as an "outmoded ethical approach [that] leaves too many bodies and souls in its wake."[8]

The changing landscape of global combat demands a reassessment of the validity of the ethical approach of just war theory in our time. However, as feminists and other peace activists work hard to push for an alternative to war, we must never forget the reality that the human condition is such that there may be times when violence, as a last resort, may be the only way to avoid greater violence to others in the long run because some are non-responsive to non-violent means of ending a conflict.

If just war theory has outlived its usefulness, then other responsible ethical approaches should be substituted. These other approaches must reflect awareness of the complexity of the international arena (and human nature, for that matter) and they need to eschew the positing of an easy dichotomy between "war" and "peace."

Concreteness and Collaboration

As helpful as analysis is, the discussion of the problems of war must be taken beyond theoretical considerations. In the end, the issue is not about opposing war in the abstract, but hating war in all its ugly concreteness. The immorality of war, complicated these days by the specter of terrorism, lies in the blood, in the body parts; in the destruction of buildings and the waste of land. The need for peace lies in the cries of the bereaved and disconsolate; in the sight of children with guns and the elderly, infirm, and very young who fill mass graves. The need for wisdom is felt as those who appreciate the meaning of peace take stock of the diversion of resources from programs that sustain and support

life to a militarism that leads to death. The call for peace is contemplated by those who are mindful of the fact that too many are being scarred by the chronic anxiety that accompanies life under a constant state of siege in many parts of our world.

War in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st centuries has been marked by increasingly more brutal forms of dehumanization, including mass rape, starvation as a weapon of war, genocide by machete, and widespread torture. In the end, militarism works toward our collective insecurity, not our security. Moreover, the cost of militarism globally, that extends beyond actual seasons of combat, is one of the great tragedies of our time that should distress feminists and others alike. Women and men who know the complexities of war grapple with the realization that the policy of militarism does not break the vicious cycle of violence. Because of this realization, the imperative for us to work harder for peacemaking and peace-building is more pressing in these troubling times.

The road to peace demands bold initiatives and new strategies that recognize our interdependence and *common* security issues.[9] This recognition of interdependence and common security must inform feminist discussions of the problem of war. Genuine dialogue and collaborative efforts between women and men should be the focus as we wrestle with the challenges of global interaction in the 21st century.

Those of us who rightly clamor for peace must engage earnestly in pressing for concrete, effective strategies to meet the special challenges that terrorism, genocide, "ethnic cleansing," and tyrannical rule present in the global arena. This more concerted engagement may well be the most pressing issue in future discussions of war in the context of Christian feminism.

Notes

[1] See Rosemary Radford Ruether, "Feminism and Peace," *The Christian Century*, vol. 100, no. 25, 771-776, August 31- September 7, 1983.

[2] See Lynne Roper, "Feminism is NOT Pacifism: A Personal View of the Politics of War, *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 149-151, 2002.

[3] Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, The Roads Traversed, The Challenges Ahead," in *The International Feminist Journal of Politics*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2-25, 2001.

[4] Ibid, 4-5.

[5] Colette Morrow, "Feminists Protest War with Iraq," in *The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, 99-100, Summer 2003. See also Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, 5.

[6] Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, *Christians and War in the 21st Century: A Theological Analysis*, (Washington, DC, 2002).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Mary E. Hunt, "Speaking Out, War: A Feminist Religious View," in *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, vol. 18, no. 1, 52, Spring 2002.

[9] White, C. Dale, *Making a Just Peace, Human Rights & Domination Systems*. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 75.

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

[end box]

Feminism and the Challenges of War

A number of women have written recent articles on feminism and war in light of the war in Iraq. Their range of views suggests that there is no definitive feminist view of war. Like the general population, there are feminists who oppose war under any and all circumstances, feminists who hate war but recognize that there may be instances in which war might be necessary, and women who recognize war as a regrettable occurrence, but lack confidence in the success of other options. Despite the absence of a definitive feminist position, there are several recurring themes in the discussion of the problem of war in the context of Christian feminism that are worth our consideration as debate continues over the war in Iraq. These themes are: 1) the supposed connection between feminism and peace; 2) the impact of war on women; 3) theological groundings for peace; and 4) the relevance of just war theory.

Feminism and peace

One recurring theme in Christian feminist discussions of war is the longstanding link between feminism and peace. This historical link was strengthened in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as many women's rights organizations incorporated world peace as part of their agenda in the fight against patriarchy and other social ills.[1] Although it was believed that men could be converted to the virtues of peace and love, women's groups upheld the cultural identification of these virtues with women's as mothers and natural nurturers. With the new feminist movements of the late 1960s, this cultural link has been challenged; however, vestiges of this notion persist in our time. Included among the problems associated with this perceived connection, which contemporary

feminists rightly challenge, are an implied biological determinism that fails to do justice to the complexity of woman *and* men as human beings and the hindrance such determinism does in eradicating patriarchal-inspired obstacles to the full participation of women in peacemaking and peace-building activities.[2] As we move the conversation forward, it seems more fruitful to frame analyses of the problems of war and the hindrances to peace around the ways in which both women and men can and do contribute to the phenomenon of war and the struggle for peace, rather than emphasizing real and/or imagined differences between men and women that obfuscate instead of illumine the shared responsibility of both sexes in what transpires in the global community.

The impact of war on women

A second recurring theme in feminist discussions of war is the impact of war on women in particular. Because the traditional understanding of war as a prerogative and domain of men, the adverse impact of war on women has not received the kind of attention it deserves. Scholars are now seeking to rectify this omission by calling to our attention the various ways in which women play a role and are adversely affected by war and its aftermath.[3] The range of difficulties that women experience in time of war include, but are not limited to: the loss of protection in the absence of a central state or other authoritative structure that is responsible for the security of its citizenry; increased medical and social responsibility as more attention is given to militarization than on health care, infrastructure, etc.; wartime prostitution, which can be a very lucrative business; and increased sexualized violence as women (and children) are targeted in conflict situations.[4] Moreover, feminist groups, such as the National Women's Studies

Association, have found a connection between individual acts of violence directed against women and violence that women experience as the result of war.[5] This perceived connection challenges advocates and activists to explore the implications that lie therein. The results of such exploration so far clearly suggest that the differences of the adverse impact of war in relation to gender underscores the importance of ensuring that women have a role in the formulation of policies that impact war and peace-making.

Theological groundings for peace

Another recurring theme is the notion of theological groundings for peace and opposition to war.[6] One theological foundation for peace-making, which many Christian feminists affirm, is the basic biblical conception that God freely initiates a covenant relationship with humanity that reflects the steadfast love of God for human beings. On the basis of the love God has for us, we are fundamentally in kinship with each other. As such, as we recognize the irrevocable interconnectedness that binds us to one another, we find a moral imperative to support corporate activities that foster that connectedness and a corollary imperative to oppose activities that negate that connectedness. Another theological foundation for peace-making lies in the doctrine of creation, whereby, the whole world is God's creation and the world is our home. We are commanded to be good stewards of that creation. Our covenant relationship with God and the doctrine of creation are but two theological entry points that stand in judgment against the harsh realities of war. Identification of the theological groundings for peace and opposition to war serve as guideposts to inform individual Christians and churches as men and women seek to exercise their civic duty responsibly in light of their faith commitments.

Feminism and just war theory

A third theme in the discussion of feminism and war has been the doctrine of just war. Historically, the "just war" tradition has set forth conditions that should be met before Christians could, in good faith, approve of or participate in war. Seven criteria have been identified which must be met in order to justify war:[7] 1) the cause must be just; 2) the war must be undertaken by a legitimate authority; 3) war must be a last resort, undertaken only after all other reasonable measures short of war are inadequate; 4) the expectation that the predictable consequences of war must be better than the consequences of not going to war; 5) there must be a reasonable expectation of victory; 6) the actual conduct of war must be maintained in "right intention;" and 7) there can be no directly intended injury to non-combatants. At best, conventional war has occurred in situations where the standards posed by just war doctrine have not been met. At worst, in light of the threat of thermonuclear war presented in the 20th century, there is the likelihood that no nation with nuclear capability could ever meet the exacting test of just war doctrine. A policy of mutual deterrence has helped to diffuse some of the tension surrounding the possibility of nuclear war in the recent past, but the ever possible threat of nuclear war or the calamity of other weapons of mass destruction highlight the precarious security that the just war doctrine holds in modern times. Some feminists now speak of this doctrine as an "outmoded ethical approach [that] leaves too many bodies and souls in its wake."[8]

The changing landscape of global combat demands a reassessment of the validity of the ethical approach of just war theory in our time. However, as feminists and other peace activists work hard to push for an alternative to war, we must never forget the

reality that the human condition is such that there may be times when violence, as a last resort, may be the only way to avoid greater violence to others in the long run because some are non-responsive to non-violent means of ending a conflict. If just war theory has outlived its usefulness, then other responsible ethical approaches should be substituted. These other approaches must reflect awareness of the complexity of the international arena (and human nature, for that matter) and they need to eschew the positing of an easy dichotomy between "war" and "peace."

Concreteness and collaboration

As helpful as analysis is, the discussion of the problems of war must be taken beyond theoretical considerations. In the end, the issue is not about opposing war in the abstract, but hating war in all its ugly concreteness. The immorality of war, complicated these days by the specter of terrorism, lies in the blood, in the body parts; in the destruction of buildings and the waste of land. The need for peace lies in the cries of the bereaved and disconsolate; in the sight of children with guns and the elderly, infirm, and very young who fill mass graves. The need for wisdom is felt as those who appreciate the meaning of peace take stock of the diversion of resources from programs that sustain and support life to a militarism that leads to death. The call for peace is contemplated by those who are mindful of the fact that too many are being scarred by the chronic anxiety that accompanies life under a constant state of siege in many parts of our world.

War in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st centuries has been marked by increasingly more brutal forms of dehumanization, including mass rape, starvation as a weapon of war, genocide by machete, and widespread torture. In the end, militarism works toward our collective insecurity, not our security. Moreover, the cost of militarism

globally, that extends beyond actual seasons of combat, is one of the great tragedies of our time that should distress feminists and others alike. Women and men who know the complexities of war grapple with the realization that the policy of militarism does not break the vicious cycle of violence. Because of this realization, the imperative for us to work harder for peace-making and peace-building is more pressing in these troubling times.

The road to peace demands bold initiatives and new strategies that recognize our interdependence and *common* security issues.[9] This recognition of interdependence and common security must inform feminist discussions of the problem of war. Genuine dialogue and collaborative efforts between women and men should be the focus as we wrestle with the challenges of global interaction in the 21st century. Those of us who rightly clamor for peace must engage earnestly in pressing for concrete, effective strategies to meet the special challenges that terrorism, genocide, "ethnic cleansing," and tyrannical rule present in the global arena. This more concerted engagement may well be the most pressing issue in future discussions of war in the context of Christian feminism.

Dr. Beverly E. Mitchell
Wesley Theological Seminary
Washington, DC

Notes

[1] See Rosemary Radford Ruether, "Feminism and Peace," *The Christian Century*, vol. 100, no. 25, 771-776, August 31- September 7, 1983.

[2] See Lynne Roper, "Feminism is NOT Pacifism: A Personal View of the Politics of War, *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 149-151, 2002.

[3] Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, The Roads Traversed, The Challenges Ahead," in *The International Feminist Journal of Politics*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2-25, 2001.

[4] Ibid, 4-5.

[5] Colette Morrow, "Feminists Protest War with Iraq," in *The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, 99-100, Summer 2003. See also Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, 5.

[6] Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, *Christians and War in the 21st Century: A Theological Analysis*, (Washington, DC, 2002).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Mary E. Hunt, "Speaking Out, War: A Feminist Religious View," in *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, vol. 18, no. 1, 52, Spring 2002.

[9] White, C. Dale, *Making a Just Peace, Human Rights & Domination Systems*. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 75.

Feminism and the Challenges of War

by Beverly E. Mitchell
Wesley Theological Seminary

A number of women have written recent articles on feminism and war in light of the war in Iraq. Their range of views suggests that there is no definitive feminist view of war. Like the general population, there are feminists who oppose war under any and all circumstances, feminists who hate war but recognize that there may be instances in which war might be necessary, and women who recognize war as a regrettable occurrence, but lack confidence in the success of other options.

Despite the absence of a definitive feminist position, there are several recurring themes in the discussion of the problem of war in the context of Christian feminism that are worth our consideration as debate continues over the war in Iraq. These themes are:

(1) the supposed connection between feminism and peace;
(2) the impact of war on women;
(3) theological groundings for peace; and
(4) the relevance of just war theory.

Feminism and Peace

One recurring theme in Christian feminist discussions of war is the longstanding link between feminism and peace. This historical link was strengthened in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as many women's rights organizations incorporated world peace as part of their agenda in the fight against patriarchy and other social ills.[1] Although it was believed that men could be converted to the virtues of peace and love, women's groups upheld the cultural identification of these virtues with women's as mothers and natural nurturers.

With the new feminist movements of the late 1960s, this cultural link has been challenged; however, vestiges of this notion persist in our time. Included among the problems associated with this perceived connection, which contemporary feminists rightly challenge, are an implied biological determinism that fails to do justice to the complexity of woman *and* men as human beings and the hindrance such determinism does in eradicating patriarchal-inspired obstacles to the full participation of women in peacemaking and peace-building activities.[2]

As we move the conversation forward, it seems more fruitful to frame analyses of the problems of war and the hindrances to peace around the ways in which both women and men can and do contribute to the phenomenon of war and the struggle for peace, rather than emphasizing real and/or imagined differences between men and women that obfuscate instead of illumine the shared responsibility of both sexes in what transpires in the global community.

The Impact of War on Women

A second recurring theme in feminist discussions of war is the impact of war on women in particular. Because the traditional understanding of war as a prerogative and domain of men, the adverse impact of war on women has not received the kind of attention it deserves. Scholars are

now seeking to rectify this omission by calling to our attention the various ways in which women play a role and are adversely affected by war and its aftermath.[3]

The range of difficulties that women experience in time of war include, but are not limited to: the loss of protection in the absence of a central state or other authoritative structure that is responsible for the security of its citizenry; increased medical and social responsibility as more attention is given to militarization than on health care, infrastructure, etc.; wartime prostitution, which can be a very lucrative business; and increased sexualized violence as women (and children) are targeted in conflict situations.[4]

Moreover, feminist groups, such as the National Women's Studies Association, have found a connection between individual acts of violence directed against women and violence that women experience as the result of war.[5] This perceived connection challenges advocates and activists to explore the implications that lie therein. The results of such exploration so far clearly suggest that the differences of the adverse impact of war in relation to gender underscores the importance of ensuring that women have a role in the formulation of policies that impact war and peace-making.

Theological Groundings for Peace

Another recurring theme is the notion of theological groundings for peace and opposition to war.[6] One theological foundation for peacemaking, which many Christian feminists affirm, is the basic biblical conception that God freely initiates a covenant relationship with humanity that reflects the steadfast love of God for human beings. On the basis of the love God has for us, we are fundamentally in kinship with each other. As such, as we recognize the irrevocable interconnectedness that binds us to one another, we find a moral imperative to support corporate activities that foster that connectedness and a corollary imperative to oppose activities that negate that connectedness.

Another theological foundation for peacemaking lies in the doctrine of creation, whereby, the whole world is God's creation and the world is our home. We are commanded to be good stewards of that creation.

Our covenant relationship with God and the doctrine of creation are but two theological entry points that stand in judgment against the harsh realities of war. Identification of the theological groundings for peace and opposition to war serve as guideposts to inform individual Christians and churches as men and women seek to exercise their civic duty responsibly in light of their faith commitments.

Feminism and just war theory

A third theme in the discussion of feminism and war has been the doctrine of just war. Historically, the "just war" tradition has set forth conditions that should be met before Christians could, in good faith, approve of or participate in war. Seven criteria have been identified which must be met in order to justify war:[7] 1) the cause must be just; 2) the war must be undertaken by

a legitimate authority; 3) war must be a last resort, undertaken only after all other reasonable measures short of war are inadequate; 4) the expectation that the predictable consequences of war must be better than the consequences of not going to war; 5) there must be a reasonable expectation of victory; 6) the actual conduct of war must be maintained in "right intention;" and 7) there can be no directly intended injury to non-combatants.

At best, conventional war has occurred in situations where the standards posed by just war doctrine have not been met. At worst, in light of the threat of thermonuclear war presented in the 20th century, there is the likelihood that no nation with nuclear capability could ever meet the exacting test of just war doctrine. A policy of mutual deterrence has helped to diffuse some of the tension surrounding the possibility of nuclear war in the recent past, but the ever possible threat of nuclear war or the calamity of other weapons of mass destruction highlight the precarious security that the just war doctrine holds in modern times. Some feminists now speak of this doctrine as an "outmoded ethical approach [that] leaves too many bodies and souls in its wake."[8]

The changing landscape of global combat demands a reassessment of the validity of the ethical approach of just war theory in our time. However, as feminists and other peace activists work hard to push for an alternative to war, we must never forget the reality that the human condition is such that there may be times when violence, as a last resort, may be the only way to avoid greater violence to others in the long run because some are non-responsive to non-violent means of ending a conflict.

If just war theory has outlived its usefulness, then other responsible ethical approaches should be substituted. These other approaches must reflect awareness of the complexity of the international arena (and human nature, for that matter) and they need to eschew the positing of an easy dichotomy between "war" and "peace."

Concreteness and Collaboration

As helpful as analysis is, the discussion of the problems of war must be taken beyond theoretical considerations. In the end, the issue is not about opposing war in the abstract, but hating war in all its ugly concreteness. The immorality of war, complicated these days by the specter of terrorism, lies in the blood, in the body parts; in the destruction of buildings and the waste of land. The need for peace lies in the cries of the bereaved and disconsolate; in the sight of children with guns and the elderly, infirm, and very young who fill mass graves. The need for wisdom is felt as those who appreciate the meaning of peace take stock of the diversion of resources from programs that sustain and support life to a militarism that leads to death. The call for peace is contemplated by those who are mindful of the fact that too many are being scarred by the chronic anxiety that accompanies life under a constant state of siege in many parts of our world.

War in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st centuries has been marked by increasingly more brutal forms of dehumanization, including mass rape, starvation as a weapon of war, genocide by machete, and widespread torture. In the end, militarism works toward our collective insecurity, not our security. Moreover, the cost of militarism globally, that extends beyond actual seasons

of combat, is one of the great tragedies of our time that should distress feminists and others alike. Women and men who know the complexities of war grapple with the realization that the policy of militarism does not break the vicious cycle of violence. Because of this realization, the imperative for us to work harder for peacemaking and peace-building is more pressing in these troubling times.

The road to peace demands bold initiatives and new strategies that recognize our interdependence and *common* security issues.[9] This recognition of interdependence and common security must inform feminist discussions of the problem of war. Genuine dialogue and collaborative efforts between women and men should be the focus as we wrestle with the challenges of global interaction in the 21st century.

Those of us who rightly clamor for peace must engage earnestly in pressing for concrete, effective strategies to meet the special challenges that terrorism, genocide, "ethnic cleansing," and tyrannical rule present in the global arena. This more concerted engagement may well be the most pressing issue in future discussions of war in the context of Christian feminism.

Notes

[1] See Rosemary Radford Ruether, "Feminism and Peace," *The Christian Century*, vol. 100, no. 25, 771-776, August 31- September 7, 1983.

[2] See Lynne Roper, "Feminism is NOT Pacifism: A Personal View of the Politics of War, *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 149-151, 2002.

[3] Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, The Roads Traversed, The Challenges Ahead," in *The International Feminist Journal of Politics*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2-25, 2001.

[4] Ibid, 4-5.

[5] Colette Morrow, "Feminists Protest War with Iraq," in *The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, 99-100, Summer 2003. See also Azza Karam, "Women in War and Peace-building, 5.

[6] Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, *Christians and War in the 21st Century: A Theological Analysis*, (Washington, DC, 2002).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Mary E. Hunt, "Speaking Out, War: A Feminist Religious View," in *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, vol. 18, no. 1, 52, Spring 2002.

[9] White, C. Dale, *Making a Just Peace, Human Rights & Domination Systems*. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 75.

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

The Just War Theory

by Brother John Raymond

Excerpt

Origin of the "Just War"

Most authors agree that "St. Augustine was the originator of the Just War Theory."(2) When it came to individual self-defense, St. Augustine contended that one's own life or property was never a justification for killing one's neighbor. Christian charity was the motivating force behind this statement. But when one speaks of rulers of nations they have the obligation to maintain peace. This obligation gives them the right to wage war. He says, "'The natural order conducive to peace among mortals demands that the power to declare and counsel war should be in the hands of those who hold the supreme authority.'"(3) Those subject to the rulers must obey unless they command something against a Divine Law. For St. Augustine the only reason for waging a war would be to defend the nation's peace against serious injury. He says, "'A just war is wont to be described as one that avenges wrongs, when a nation or state has to be punished, for refusing to make amends for the wrongs inflicted by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized unjustly.'"(4) The intention of the war is very important for St. Augustine. He says, "'The passion for inflicting harm, the cruel thirst for vengeance, an unpacific and relentless spirit, the fever of revolt, the lust of power, and such things, all these are rightly condemned in war.'"(5) St. Augustine emphasizes the idea of restoration of peace as the main motive of war. He says, "'We do not seek peace in order to be at war, but we go to war that we may have peace. Be peaceful, therefore, in warring, so that you may vanquish those whom you war against, and bring them to the prosperity of peace.'"(6) So in St. Augustine's thinking a war "was limited by its purpose, its authority and its conduct."(7)

Further Developments - St. Thomas Aquinas and the Middle Ages

A great impetus to the Just War Theory was St. Thomas Aquinas. He emphasized St. Augustine's statements about war and added a little to them. He followed a similar reasoning breaking up his argument into three necessary conditions for a just war: authorized authority, just cause and rightful intention. In speaking about who authorizes war St. Thomas emphasizes that the sovereign has the responsibility for the common good of those committed to his care. Only he can declare war. Moreover the sovereign has the lawful right of recourse to "the sword" to defend his people against internal strife by punishing those who do evil, justified by St. Paul in verse 4 of chapter 13 in the letter to the Romans. Therefore it is his duty to defend the common good against external enemies by having recourse to arms. A just cause is required to wage war. St. Thomas considers such a cause to

be "that those who are attacked, should be attacked because they deserve it on account of some fault."(8) Finally St. Thomas discusses the right intention for waging war. Only two possibilities are presented: either the furthering of some good or an avoidance of some evil. The underpinnings of his arguments and most important contribution to St. Augustine's theory "would appear to consist in his stress on the natural law."(9)

The Middle Ages were occupied mostly with the right to wage war and restoring peace through mercy and justice. After St. Thomas other authors on a just war such as St. Ramon of Penafort just elaborated on his position. They mainly concentrated on specifying the proper authority, just causes and intentions of St. Thomas.

Non Violence and Peace Traditions in Early & Eastern Christianity.[1]

J.A. McGuckin

Ideals of Peace in a Violent World.

Christianity has had a very chequered history in terms of its peace tradition. It is often to images of Inquisition and Crusade that the popular imagination turns when considering the darker side of the church's imposition of control over the personal and political worlds it has inhabited over long centuries. The figure of a pacific Jesus (the poet of the lilies of the fields, and the advocator of peaceful resistance to evil, who so inspired Tolstoy and Gandhi among others) is often contrasted with a church of more brutish disciples who, when occasion presented itself, turned willingly, and quickly enough, to tactics of oppression and coercion, policies which they themselves had lamented, as being against both divine and natural justice, when applied to them in the earlier centuries of the Roman persecutions. The common version among Church Historians of this generic tale of a progressive sinking into the 'brutal ways of the world', also points to regular cycles of renewal and repentance, when Christians are said to reappropriate the 'real' meaning of their past, and renounce violent resistance in the cause of a 'truly Christian' non resistance. This, of course, is usually a matter of occasional academic protest from the sidelines, or the wisdom of the aftermath, since in times of war the ranks of those who rush to defend the Christian defensibility of hostilities are rarely short of representatives, it would seem. The key academic studies of the Early Church's peace tradition, for example, had to wait until the 20th century. They appeared in two clusters, both of them the immediate aftermath of the great conflicts of 1914-18, and 1939-45, followed by a longer 'tail' which was overshadowed by the Cold War's generic fears of nuclear holocaust, and which produced a more thorough-going tenor of the 'suspicion of war' in academic circles. Both the main-clusters of post-war re-assessments of Christian peace tradition in antiquity, witnessed a conflicted product in the tone of the literature. All lamented the fact and experience of war, from a Christian perspective, but some justified the concept of limited war engagement (usually Catholic scholars defending the then dominant Augustine-Aquinas theory of the Just War) while others were evidently more pacifist in tone (generally Protestant scholars calling for a 'reform' of defective medievalist views). The more recent work, inspired by the public sight of several disastrously 'failed' military interventions (such as Vietnam, and Afghanistan) and the horrific record of genocidally-tinged conflict at the end of the 20th century (one of the bloodiest and nastiest on human record, though we still like to regard the ancients as less civilised than us) have, again understandably, caused the Christian witness on war and violence to come under renewed scrutiny. Today the literature on war in early Christian tradition is extensive [2], and a synopsis of the primary sources has recently been collated in a useful ready-reference volume, with a good contextualising discussion.[3]

---

1 Taken from: KK Kuriakose (ed). *Non Violence: Concepts and Practices Across Religions and Cultures.* NY. 2005.

2 The chief sources in English are: RH Bainton. *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace. A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation.* Nashville. 1960; CJ Cadoux. *The Early Christian*

While the common image of a militaristic Church is still, perhaps, prevalent in popular estimation, there are nevertheless, a multitude of pacific figures who feature in the Church's exemplary stories of the lives of the saints. One such hagiography was the narrative on Abba Moses the Ethiopian in the *Tales of the Desert Fathers* who, when warned in advance of the impending attack of marauding Blemmyes tribesmen in 5th century Lower Egypt, refused to leave his cell, and (though famed as a strong man of previously violent temper) stayed quietly in prayer waiting for the fatal assault of the invading brigands. This story of his election of pacific martyrdom was celebrated as most unusual; a heroic and highly individualist spiritual act of a master (and thus not normative). All the other monks of Scete in his time were either slaughtered because they were surprised, or else had much earlier fled before the face of the storm of invasion.

In terms of pacific saints, the Russian church celebrates the 11th century princes Boris and Gleb, the sons of Vladimir, the first Christian ruler of ancient Rus (Kiev) who, in order to avoid a civil war on the death of their father (when the third son, Svyatopolk, took up arms to assert his right to monarchical supremacy), are said to have adopted the role of 'Passion-Bearers'. Refusing to bear arms for their own defence, and desiring to avoid bloodshed among their people, they followed the example of their new Lord, who suffered his own unjust Passion. The image and category of 'passion-bearing martyr' is one that is dear to, almost distinctive of, the Russian church, so troubled has its history been. Nevertheless, even this celebrated example contrasts, in many respects, with the witness of other Russian saint-heroes, such as the great warrior prince Alexander Nevsky and contrasts with the witness of many other ancient churches too (such as the Byzantine, Romanian, Serbian, Nubian, or Ethiopian) who had an equally fraught pilgrimage through history, but who proudly elevated and honoured the icons and examples of warrior-saints who resisted the onslaught militarily, and died in the process. In the Romanian Church one of the great heroic founders was the warrior prince Petru Rares who slaughtered the invading Turkish armies under the guidance of his spiritual father and confessor Saint Daniel the Hesychast. The saint commanded the prince to erect monasteries on the site of the great battles, to ensure mourning and prayer for the lost souls whose blood had been shed. This was an act that was seen

---

Attitude to War. Oxford. 1919 (repr. NY. 1982); A von Harnack. *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries.* (tr. DM Gracie. Philadelphia. 1980: original German edn. 1905; HA Deane. *The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine.* New York. 1963 (chs.5-6); J. Helgeland. *Christians and Military Service: AD 173-337.* PhD Diss. University of Chicago. 1973. (summarized in Idem. 'Christians and the Roman Army. AD. 173-337.' *Church History*. 43. June 1974. 149-161; JM Hornus. *It is Not Lawful for me to Fight: Early Christian Attitudes to War, Violence and the State* . (trs. A Kreider & O Coburn). Scottsdale, Pa. 1980; HT McElwain. *Augustine's Doctrine of War in Relation to Earlier Ecclesiastical Writers.* Rome. 1972; TS Miller & J Nesbitt (eds). *Peace and War in Byzantium. Essays in Honor of GT Dennis.* CUA Press. Washington. 1995; EA Ryan. 'The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Christians.' *Theological Studies.* 13. 1952. 1-32; WR. Stevenson. *Christian Love and Just War : Moral Paradox and Political Life in St. Augustine and his Modern Interpreters. Macon.* Ga. 1987.

[3] LJ Swift. *The Early Fathers on War and Military Service*. (Message of the Fathers of the Church. Vol. 19). 1983. Wilmington. De.

as a necessary expiation of Petru's 'equally necessary' violence. Both he and his spiritual mentor were heavily burdened by their perceived duty of defending the borders of Christendom. To this day Romania's most ancient and beautiful churches stand as mute witnesses to a bloody history where Islam and Christianity's tectonic plates collided (as often they did in the history of the Christian East). The national perception in Romania of prince Vlad Dracul (the western bogeyman of Dracula) is diametrically opposed to the common perception of more or less everyone outside. Within the country Vlad himself is regarded as a national hero and a great Christian warrior who assumed the duty of defending the Faith against the military attempts of Islam forcibly to convert Europe. Similarly, almost all the saints of Ethiopia are either monastic recluses or warriors. The saints of the (now lost) Church of Nubia [4] were also predominantly warriors. Likewise, the frescoes of saints on the walls of the ancient Stavronikita monastery on Mount Athos, on the Halkidiki peninsula, demonstrate serried ranks of martyr protectors dressed in full Roman battle gear, in attendance on the Christ in Majesty [5]. The monks were not particularly warlike themselves, but knew at first hand the terrors of living in the pirate-infested Mediterranean. Like the Nubians, a life entirely and permanently surrounded by hostile foes, gave the Athonite monks a very practical attitude to violence, pacific resistance, and the need for defence in varieties of forms.

The western church too has its share of noble saint-warriors. In medieval English literature the warrior saint was a highly romantic figure [6]. We can also think of the famed Crusading juggernaut Louis the Pious. These, however, are noticeably not, any longer, 'popular saints' (as their counterparts remain in Eastern Christianity) though this may be laid to the door of a generic loss of interest in hagiography and the cultus of the saints in contemporary Western Christianity, as much to a sense of embarrassment that the ranks of saints included so many generals of armies. Along with its warriors, the Western Church often appealed, for an example of pacific lifestyle, to the Christ-like image of Francis of Assisi, in preference perhaps to the more robust figure of Dominic and his inquisitional Order of Preachers, although one ought not to forget that the Franciscan order itself had from its early origins a foundational charge to evangelize Muslims in the Middle and Near East; its own form of potential 'Inquisition' that never had the opportunity to flourish because of Ottoman power, but which was often felt as real enough and resented greatly by the Eastern rite Christians of those places.

This macro- picture of Church History as a sclerotic decline (where simple origins are progressively corrupted into oppressive structures as the church seizes an ever-larger foothold on the face of the earth) is so familiar, almost clichéd, that it hardly needs further amplification. It is perfectly exemplified in the general presumption that the Christian movement before the age of the Emperor Constantine the Great (4th century) was mainly pacific in philosophy, but afterwards began theologically to justify the use of coercive force, and so began the long slide into all

---

4 Byzantine in foundation and structure, until its annihilation in the late 15th century.

5 See: M Chatzidakis. *The Cretan Painter Theophanes: The Wall-Paintings of the Holy Monastery of Stavronikita.* Thessaloniki. (published on Mount Athos). 1986.

6 Cf. JE Damon. *Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors : Warfare and Sanctity in the Literature of Early England.* (Ashgate press). Aldershot. 2003.

manner of corruption of power, and abandonment of the primitive spirit of the gentle Jesus [7]. The theory is problematized to some degree by the issue of 'conflicted contextualization' for the notable resistance of the earliest Christian movement (2nd through to early 4th centuries) to military service: whether this was predominantly pacifist in temperament; or was related to the military requirements to worship the pagan pantheon of gods; or was simply an aspect of the fear of an oppressed and persecuted group in the face of the state's arm of power. In early canon law the military profession had the same status as a harlot when it came to the seeking of baptism: before admission to the church was countenanced an alternative career had to be sought. After the Pax Constantina, that prohibition was relaxed as even the Christian emperors expected their fellow-Christians to take up their station in the army. Recent historical study has progressively argued that the advancement of Christians to political and military power should not be seen as a surprisingly miraculous event (as the legend of Constantine would have it be), but the result of more than a century of prior political and military infiltration of the higher offices of state by Christians bearing arms. The earliest materials (martyrial stories of how the poor resisted the Roman imperium) tend to come from the account of the churches of the local victims [8]. The full story (why, for example, Diocletian targeted Christians within his own court and army to initiate the Great persecution of the early 4th century [9]) is less to the front : but clearly the great revolution of the 4th century which saw an internationally ascendant Church, was not simply an altruistic 'gift' of power to a pacific Christian movement, but more in the terms of an acknowledgement by Constantine that his own path to monarchy lay with the powerful international lobby of Christians. The question as to 'who patronised who': Constantine the Church, or the Church Constantine, remains one that is surely more evenly balanced than is commonly thought. The military and political involvement of Christians, therefore, (as distinct from the 'Church' shall we say) is something that is not so simply 'switched' at the 4th century watershed of Constantine's 'conversion'.

Nevertheless, the story that from primitive and 'pure' beginnings the Christian movement degenerated into a more warlike compromise with state power, is a good story precisely because it is so cartoon-like in its crudity. It ought not to be forgotten, however, that it '***is***' a story, not a simple record of uncontested facts. It is a story, moreover, that took its origin as part of a whole dossier of similar stories meant to describe the movement of Christianity through history in terms of early promise, followed by rapid failure, succeeded by the age of reform and repristination of the primitive righteousness. In short, the common view of Christianity's peace tradition, as sketched out above, is clearly a product of Late-Medieval Reformation apologetics. That so much of this early-modern propaganda has survived to form a substrate of presupposition in post-

---

7 Helgeland (1973. p. 17.) illustrates how both Harnack and Cadoux's works progress from this shared presupposition despite their different perspectives on the issue of pacifism as a general Christian ideal. (Cadoux regarded Harnack as having soft-pedalled the Church's early peace witness).

8 The early martyrial acts are charged with the dramatic characterisation of the martyr as the apocalyptic witness, and the condemning magistrate as eschatological servant of the Beast. The narratives often deliberately follow the literary paradigm of the Passion Story of the Gospels. The *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is one such example.

9 Or how it might well be the case that Christian soldiers had already taken the imperial throne by force of arms in the mid 3rd century (in the case of Philip the Arab).

modern thought about Christian history is a testimony to the power of the apologetic stories themselves, and (doubtless) to the widespread distrust of the motives of the late medieval church authorities in western Europe at the time of the Reformation. The common view about Christianity's peace tradition, however, is so hopelessly rooted in western, apologetic, and 'retrospectivist' presuppositions (a thorough-going Protestant revision of the Catholic tradition on the morality of war and violence that had preceded it) that it is high time the issue should be considered afresh. The common histories of Christianity, even to this day, seem to pretend that its eastern forms (the Syrians, Byzantines, Armenians, Copts, Nubians, Indians, Ethiopians, or Cappadocians) never existed, or at least were never important enough to merit mention; or that western Europe is a normal and normative vantage point for considering the story. But this narrow perspective skews the evidence at the outset. Accordingly, the figures of Augustine of Hippo (the towering 5th century African theologian) and Thomas Aquinas (the greatest of the Latin medieval scholastic theologians) loom very large in the normative western-form of the telling of the tale. Both theologians were highly agentive in developing the western Church's theory and principles of a 'Just War'. In the perspectives of the eastern Christian tradition, not only do these two monumental figures not feature but, needless to say, neither does their theory on the moral consideration of war and violence which has so dominated the western imagination. Eastern Christianity simply does not approach the issue from the perspective of 'Just War', and endorses no formal doctrine advocating the possibility of a 'Just War'.

Its approach is ambivalent, more complex and nuanced. For that reason it has been largely overlooked in the annals of the history of Christianity, or even dismissed as self-contradictory. It is not self-contradictory, of course, having been proven by experience through centuries of political suffering and oppression. If it knows anything, the Eastern church knows how to endure, and hardly needs lessons on such a theme; but it is certainly not a linear theory of war and violence that it holds (as if war and violence ***could be*** imagined as susceptible of rational solution and packaging). Its presuppositions grow from a different soil than do modern and post-modern notions of political and moral principles. Christianity was, and remains at heart, an apocalyptic religion, and it is no accident that its numerous biblical references to war and violent destruction are generally apocalyptic ciphers, symbols that stand for something else, references to the 'Eschaton' (the image of how the world will be rolled up and assessed once universal justice is imposed by God on his recalcitrant and rebellious creation). Biblical descriptions of violence and war, in most of Christianity's classical exposition of its biblical heritage, rather than being straightforward depictions of the life and values of 'This-World-Order' are thus eschatological allegories. To confound the two orders [10] (taking war images of the apocalyptic dimension) for instances of how the world (here) ought to be managed [11] is a gross distortion of the ancient

---

[10] What the ancient sources described as the 'Two Ages' (This Age of turmoil that stands within the historical record and permits brutal oppression as the ultimate symbol of 'the Beast', that is evil personified, and the Other Age, which is the Transcendent 'Kingdom of God' when peace will be established by the definitive ending of violent powers hostile to the good., and the comforting of the poor.

[11] It is a major category mistake, therefore, for fundamentalist Christians to apply apocalyptically matrixed scriptural references to 'war in the heavens spilling out on earth', as authoritative 'justifications' from the Bible for Christians to engage in violent conflict for political ends. The essence of biblical, apocalyptic, doctrine is that the Two Ages must never be conflated or

literature. This has become increasingly a problem since the medieval period when allegorist readings of scripture have been progressively substituted (especially in Protestantism) for wholesale historicist and literalist readings of the ancient texts [12]. This is not to say that eastern Christianity itself has not been guilty of its own mis-readings of evidences, in various times of its history, or that it has no blood on its hands, for that would be to deny the brutal facts of a Church that has progressively been driven westwards, despite its own will, by a series of military disasters, for the last thousand years. But, Christian reflection in the eastern Church has, I would suggest, been more careful than the West, to remind itself of the apocalyptic and mysterious nature of the Church's place within history and on the world-stage, and has stubbornly clung to a less congratulatory theory of the morality of War (despite its advocacy of 'Christian imperium'), because it sensed that such a view was more in tune with the principles of the Gospels. What follows in this paper is largely a consideration of that peace tradition in the perspective of the eastern provinces of Christianity, the 'patristic' foundation that went on to provide the underpinning of Byzantine canon law, and (after the fall of Byzantium), the system of law that still operates throughout the churches of the East.

In the decades following the First World War, Adolf Von Harnack was one of the first among modern patristic theologians to assemble a whole dossier of materials on the subject of the Church's early traditions on war and violence [13]. In his macro-thesis he favoured the theory of the 'fall from grace', and argued that the Church progressively relaxed its earliest blanket hostility to bloodshed and the military profession in general. The relaxation of anti-war discipline, he saw as part and parcel of a wider 'corruption' of early Christian ideals by 'Hellenism'. And yet, no Eastern Christian attitudes to war, either before or after the Pax Constantina, have ever borne much relation to classic Hellenistic and Roman war theory [14], being constantly informed and conditioned by biblical paradigms (reined in by Jesus' strictures on the futility of violence) rather than by Hellenistic Kingship theory or tribal theories of national pride. In the second part to his study (subtitled 'The Christian Religion and the Military Profession') Harnack went further to

---

confused. The 'Next Age' cannot be ushered in by political victories gained in 'This Age'. By this means Christianity, in its foundational vision, undercut the principles that continue to inspire Judaism and Islam with their (essentially) non-apocalyptic understandings of the spreading of the Kingdom of God on Earth in recognisable borders, and militarily if necessary.

[12] As if, for example, the biblical narratives of the Pentateuch where God commands Moses and Joshua to slaughter the Canaanite inhabitants in the process of seizing the 'Promised Land' were to be read literalistically – as both vindicating war for 'righteous reasons', and validating the forced appropriation of territories after conflict. Protestant fundamentalism would, of course, read the texts with that political slant (symbolically going further to adapt the text to justify Christianity's use of violence in a just cause); whereas the ancient Church consistently reads the narrative as allegorically symbolic of the perennial quest to overcome evil tendencies by virtuous action. The Canaanites assume the symbolic status of personal vice, the Israelite armies, the status of the ethical struggle. While this allegorical symbolism still depends in large degree on a symbolic reading of violent images, it successfully defuses a wholesale biblical 'sanction for violence and war.

[13] A. Harnack. *Militia Christi. The Christian Religion and The Military in the First Three Centuries* (Tr. D. McI. Gracie). Philadelphia. 1981.

[14] Though Ambrose and Augustine take much of their views on the subject from Cicero.

discuss the wide extent of biblical images of war and vengeance in the Christian foundational documents, suggesting that the imagery of 'spiritual warfare' however removed it might be from the 'real world' when it was originally coined, must take some responsibility for advocating the sanctification of war theories within the church in later ages [15]. For Harnack, and many others following in his wake, Constantine was the villain of the piece, and not less so his apologist the Christian bishop Eusebius of Caesarea. The latter finds no problem at all in comparing the deaths of the wicked as recounted in Old Testament narratives of holy war, with Constantine's conquest and execution of his enemies in the Civil War of the early 4th century.[16] For Eusebius, writing in 336, the cessation of the war in 324 was a fulfilment of the Psalmic and Isaian prophecies of a golden age of peace [17]. Eusebius' fulsome rhetoric has had a great deal of weight placed upon it by those who favour the 'theory of fall', even though on any sober consideration, to extrapolate a court-theologian such as Eusebius into a marker of general opinion in the Church of the early 4th century should have been more universally acknowledged to be a serious mistake. Eusebius' more sober thoughts on the expansion of the Church (as exemplified by Constantine's victory over persecuting emperors, and his clear favouritism for the Christians) was really an intellectual heritage from that great theological teacher whose disciple he prided himself on being – Origen of Alexandria. It was certainly Origen who had put into his mind the juxtaposition of the ideas of the Pax Romana being the providentially favourable environment for the rapid internationalisation of the Gospel. Origen himself, however, was pacifist in his attitudes to war and world powers, and was sternly against the notion of the Church advocating its transmission and spread by force of arms [18]. In his wider exegesis Eusebius shows himself consistently to be a follower of his teacher's lead and the Old Testament paradigms of the 'downfall of the wicked' are what are generally at play in both Origen and Eusebius when they highlight biblical examples of vindication, or military collapse. Several scholars misinterpret Eusebius radically, therefore, when they read his laudation of Constantine as some kind of proleptic justification of the Church as an asserter of rightful violence. His *Panegyric on Constantine* should not be given such theoretical weight, just as a collection of wedding congratulatory speeches today would hardly be perused for a cutting edge analysis of the times. In applying biblical tropes and looking for fulfilments, Eusebius (certainly in the wider panoply if all his work is taken together not simply his court laudations) is looking to the past, not to the future; and is intent only on celebrating what for most in his generation must have truly seemed miraculous – that their oppressors had fallen, and that they themselves were now free from the fear of torture and death. Origen and Eusebius may have set a tone of later interpretation that could readily grow into a vision of the Church as

---

[15] He probably underestimated the extent to which the early Church was propelled, not by subservience to emperors, but more by the way in which the war theology of ancient Israel was passed on as an authoritative paradigm, simply by the force of ingesting so much of the Old Testament narratives in the structure of its prayers, liturgies, and doctrines. It is, nonetheless, worthy of note that formally, from early times, the war passages of the Old Testament were consistently preached as allegorical symbols of the battle to establish peaceful virtues in human hearts (not the advocating of conquest of specific territories). Harnack himself admitted (when considering the example of the Salvation Army, that this aspect of this thesis could limp badly.

[16] *Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History. 9.9. 5-8; Life of Constantine.* 1.39.

[17] Is.2.4; Ps.72.7-8.

[18] See N McLynn. 'Roman Empire', pp. 185-187 in: J.A. McGuckin (ed). The Westminster Handbook to Origen of Alexandria. Louisville. Ky. 2004.

the inheritor of the biblical promises about the Davidic kingdom (that the boundaries of Byzantine Christian power were concomitant with the Kingdom of God on earth, and thus that all those who lay outside those boundaries were the enemies of God), but there were still innumerable dissidents even in the long-lasting Byzantine Christian *politeia* (especially the monks) who consistently refused to relax the apocalyptic dimension of their theology, and who resisted the notion that the Church and the Byzantine borders were one and the same thing.[19]

The Canonical Epistles of Basil of Caesarea.

Basil of Caesarea was a younger contemporary of Eusebius, and in the following generation of the Church of the late 4th century, he emerged as one of the leading theorists of the Christian movement. His letters and instructions on the ascetic life, and his 'Canons' [20] (ethical judgements as from a ruling bishop to his flock) on morality and practical issues became highly influential in the wider church because of his role as one of the major monastic theorists of Early Christianity. His canonical epistles were transmitted wherever monasticism went: and in the Eastern Church of antiquity (because monasticism was the substructure of the spread of the Christian movement), that more or less meant his canonical views became the standard paradigm of Eastern Christianity's theoretical approach to the morality of war and violence, even though the writings were local [21] and occasional in origin. Basil's 92 *Canonical Epistles* were adapted by various Ecumenical Councils of the Church that followed his time. His writing is appealed to in Canon 1 of the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), in Canon 1 of the 7th Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787), and is literally cited in Canon 2 of the 6th Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (681) which paraphrases much else from his canonical epistles. By such affirmations eventually the entire corpus of the Basilian *Epistles* entered the Pandects of Canon Law of the Byzantine Eastern Church, and they remain authoritative to this day.

Basil has several things to say about violence and war in his diocese. It was a border territory of the empire, and his administration had known several incursions by 'barbarian' forces. Canon 13 of the 92 considers war:

> 'Our fathers did not consider killings committed in the course of wars to be classifiable as murders at all, on the score, it seems to me, of allowing a pardon to men fighting in defence of sobriety and piety. Perhaps, though, it might be advisable to refuse them communion for three years, on the ground that their hands are not clean.' [22]

---

[19] For a further elaboration of the argument see: J.A.McGuckin. *The Legacy of the Thirteenth Apostle : Origins of the East- Christian Conceptions of Church-State Relation.* St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly. 47. Nos. 3-4. 2003. 251-288.

[20] The 'Canonical Epistles of St. Basil', otherwise known as the '92 canons.' They can be found in English translation in : *The Pedalion or Rudder of the Orthodox Catholic Church : The Compilation of the Holy Canons by Saints Nicodemus and Agapius.* Tr. D Cummings. (Orthodox Christian Educational Society). Chicago. 1957 (repr. NY. 1983). pp. 772-864.

[21] Basil was the Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, now a city (Kaisariye) of Eastern Turkey.

[22] Basil. Ep. 188. 13; Pedalion. p. 801.

The balance and sense of discretion is remarkable in this little comment, one that bears much weight in terms of Eastern Orthodox understandings of the morality of war. The 'fathers' in question refers to Athanasius of Alexandria, the great Nicene Orthodox authority of the 4th century church. Athanasius' defence of the Nicene creed, and the divine status of Christ, had won him immense prestige by the end of the 4th century, and as his works were being collated and disseminated (in his own lifetime his reputation had been highly conflicted, his person exiled numerous times, and his writings proscribed by imperial censors), Basil seems to wish to add a cautionary note: that not everything a 'father' has to say is equally momentous, or universally authoritative. In his *Letter to Amun* Athanasius had apparently come out quite straightforwardly about the legitimacy of killing in time of war, saying:

> 'Although one is not supposed to kill, the killing of the enemy in time of war is both a lawful and praiseworthy thing. This is why we consider individuals who have distinguished themselves in war as being worthy of great honours, and indeed public monuments are set up to celebrate their achievements. It is evident, therefore, that at one particular time, and under one set of circumstances, an act is not permissible, but when time and circumstances are right, it is both allowed and condoned.' [23]

This saying was being circulated, and given authority as a 'patristic witness' simply because it had come from Athanasius. In fact the original letter had nothing whatsoever to do with war. The very example of the 'war-hero' is a sardonic reference *ad hominem* since the letter was addressed to an aged leader of the Egyptian monks who described themselves as *Asketes*, that is those who laboured and 'fought' for the virtuous life. The military image is entirely incidental, and Athanasius in context merely uses it to illustrate his chief point in the letter – which is to discuss the query Amun had sent on to him as Archbishop: 'did nocturnal emissions count as sins for desert celibates ?' Athanasius replies to the effect that with human sexuality, as with all sorts of other things, the context of the activity determines what is moral, not some absolute standard which is superimposed on moral discussion from the outset. Many ancients, Christian and pagan, regarded sexual activity as inherently defiling and here Athanasius decidedly takes leave of them. His argument, therefore, is falsely attributed when (as is often the case) read out of context as an apparent justification of killing in time of war. He is not actually condoning the practice at all, merely using the rhetorical example of current opinion to show Amun that contextual variability is very important in making moral judgements.

In his turn Basil, wishes to make it abundantly clear for his Christian audience that such a reading, if applied to the Church's tradition on war, is simplistic, and that is it is just plain wrong-headedness to conclude that the issue ceases to be problematic if one is able to dig up a justificatory 'proof text' from scripture or patristic tradition (as some seem to have been doing with these words of Athanasius). And so, Basil sets out a nuanced corrective exegesis of what the Church's canon law *should really be* in terms of fighting in time of hostilities. One of the ways he

---

[23] Athanasius Epistle 48. *To Amun.* full text in A Robertson (tr). *St. Athanasius Select Works and Letters.* Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Church. Vol. 4. (1891). repr. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. 1980. pp. 556-557.

does this is to attribute this aphorism of Athanasius to indeterminate 'fathers', who can then be legitimately corrected by taking a stricter view than they appeared to allow. He also carefully sets his own context: what he speaks about is the canonical regulation of war in which a Christian can engage and be 'amerced' [24]; all other armed conflicts are implicitly excluded as not being appropriate to Christian morality). Basil's text on war needs, therefore, to be understood in terms of an 'economic' reflection on the ancient canons that forbade the shedding of blood in blanket terms. This tension between the ideal standard (no bloodshed) and the complexities of the context in which a local church finds itself thrown in times of conflict and war, is witnessed in several other ancient laws, such as Canon 14 of Hippolytus (also from the 4th century) [25]. The reasons Basil gives for suggesting that killing in time of hostilities could be distinguished from voluntary murder pure and simple (for which the canonical penalty was a lifelong ban from admission to the churches and from the sacraments) is set out as the 'defence of sobriety and piety.' This is code language for the defence of Christian borders from the ravages of pagan marauders. The difficulty Basil had to deal with was not war on the large-scale, but local tribal insurgents who were mounting attacks on Roman border towns, with extensive rapinage. In such circumstances Basil has little patience for those who do not feel they can fight because of religious scruples. His sentiment is more that a passive non-involvement betrays the Christian family (especially its weaker members who can not defend themselves but need others to help them) to the ravages of men without heart or conscience to restrain them. The implication of his argument, then, is that the provocation to fighting, that Christians ought at some stage to accept (to defend the honour and safety of the weak), will be inherently a limited and adequate response, mainly because the honour and tradition of the Christian faith (piety and sobriety) in the hearts and minds of the warriors, will restrict the bloodshed to a necessary minimum. His 'economic' solution nevertheless makes it abundantly clear that the absolute standard of Christian morality turns away from war as an unmitigated evil. This is why we can note that the primary reason

[24] That is find canonical forgiveness for the act of shedding blood: which is canonically prohibited. The background context of the canons which forbid the shedding of blood are important to Basil's thought, and are presumed throughout. He takes it for granted that clergy are absolutely forbidden to shed blood: and even if they do so accidentally, will be prohibited from celebrating the Eucharistic mysteries afterwards. In this case, just as with the church's canonical rules relating to the prohibition of second marriages, what began as a general rule, was relaxed in its application to wider society, although the clergy were required to sustain the original strict interpretation (see *Apostolical Canons* 66. *Pedalion.* pp. 113-116.) Today in Orthodoxy, marriage is described as a one-time occurrence: but if the marriage is broken a second (and even third) marriage can be contracted 'as an economy' to human conditions and relational failures. The clergy, however, are not allowed to contract second marriages (even if the first wife has died). The economy is not permitted to them. Clergy in the Eastern tradition are still canonically forbidden from engaging in any violence, beyond the minimum necessary to defend their life (*Apostolic Canon* 66.)though they are censured if they do not vigorously defend a third party being attacked in their presence. For both things (use of excessive violence in self-defence, and refusal to use violence in defence of another, they are given the penalty of deposition from orders).

[25] 'A Christian should not volunteer to become a soldier, unless he is compelled to do this by someone in authority. He can have a sword, but he should not be commanded to shed blood. If it can be shown that he has shed blood he should stay away from the mysteries (sacraments) at least until he has been purified through tears and lamentation.' *Canons of Hippolytus* 14.74. Text in Swift (1983) p. 93. See also *Apostolic Tradition* 16.

Basil gives that previous 'fathers' had distinguished killing in time of war, from the case of simple murder, was 'on the score of allowing a pardon'. There was no distinction made here in terms of the qualitative horror of the deed itself, rather in terms of the way in which the deed could be 'cleansed' by the Church's system of penance.

Is it logical to expect a Christian of his diocese to engage in the defence of the homeland, while simultaneously penalising him if he spills blood in the process ? Well, one needs to contextualize the debarment from the sacrament in the generic 4th century practice of the reception of the Eucharist, which did not expect regular communication to begin with (ritual preparation was extensive and involved fasting and almsgiving and prayer), and where a sizeable majority of adult Christians in a given church would not have yet been initiated by means of baptism, and were thus not bound to keep all the canons of the Church. By his regulation and by the ritual exclusion of the illumined warrior from the sacrament (the returning 'victor' presumably would have received many other public honours and the gratitude of the local folk) Basil is making sure at least one public sign is given to the entire community that the Gospel standard has no place for war, violence and organised death. He is trying to sustain an eschatological balance: that war is not part of the Kingdom of God (signified in the Eucharistic ritual as arriving in the present) but is part of the bloody and greed-driven reality of world affairs which is the 'Kingdom-Not-Arrived'. By moving in and out of Eucharistic reception Basil's faithful Christian (returning from his duty with blood on his hands) is now in the modality of expressing his dedication to the values of peace and innocence, by means of the lamentation and repentance for life that has been taken, albeit the blood of the violent. Basil's arrangement that the returning noble warrior' should stand in the Church (not in the narthex where the other public sinners were allocated spaces) but refrain from communion, makes the statement that a truly honourable termination of war, for a Christian, has to be an honourable repentance.

Several commentators (not least many of the later western Church fathers) have regarded this as 'fudge', but it seems to me to express, in a finely tuned 'economic' way, the tension in the basic Christian message that there is an unresolvable shortfall between the ideal and the real in an apocalyptically charged religion. What this Basilian canon does most effectively is to set a 'No Entry' sign to any potential theory of Just War within Christian theology[26], and should set up a decided refusal of post-war church-sponsored self-congratulations for victory [27]. All violence, local, individual, or nationally-sanctioned is here stated to be an expression of *hubris* that is inconsistent with the values of the Kingdom of God, and while in many circumstances that

---

[26] As developed especially (out of Cicero) by Ambrose of Milan *On Duties.* 1. 176; and Augustine (*Epistle* 183.15; *Against Faustus* 22. 69-76; and see Swift :1983.
pp. 110-149). But Ambrose (ibid. 1. 35.175) specifically commands his priests to have no involvement (inciting or approving) whatsoever in the practice of War or judicial punishments: 'Interest in matters of war,' he says, 'seems to me to be alien to our role as priests.'

[27] Many churches have uneasily juggled this responsibility in times past. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher famously denounced the Archbishop of Canterbury's post-Falklands-war service in 80's London (St. Paul's cathedral), as ' far too wet', while other critics in the country were hard on him for not stating at the outset that the Falklands invasion did not fulfill the requirements of a 'Just War' in terms of classical western theory, and so should have been more severely denounced by the Church.

violence may be 'necessary' or 'unavoidable' (Basil states the only legitimate reasons as the defence of the weak and innocent) it is never 'justifiable.' Even for the best motives in the world, the shedding of blood remains a defilement, such that the true Christian, afterwards, would wish to undergo the kathartic experience of temporary return to the lifestyle of penance, that is 'be penitent'. Basil's restriction of the time of penance to three years (seemingly harsh to us moderns) was actually a commonly recognised sign of merciful leniency in the ancient rule book of the early Church [28].

Concluding Reflections.

We might today regard such early attempts by Christians as quaintly naïve. They are wired through the early penitential system, clearly, and have a fundamental 'economic' character about them. By Economy the early church meant the art of doing what was possible when a higher ideal standard was not sustained. In the case of war Basil and the canonical tradition are tacitly saying that when the Kingdom ideals of peace and reconciliation collapse, especially in times of war when decisive and unusual action is required, and the ideals of reconciliation and forgiveness fall into chaos in the very heart of the Church itself [29], as members go off to fight, then the ideal must be reasserted as soon as possible – with limitations to the hostilities a primary concern, and a profound desire to mark the occasion retrospectively with a public 'cleansing'. While the honour of the combatants is celebrated by Basil (even demanded as an act of protection for the weak), one essential aspect of that honour is also listed as being the public acceptance of the status of penitent shedder of blood. The clergy (as with other economic concessions of morality operative in the church's canons) are the only ones not allowed benefit of necessity. In no case is violent action permitted to one who stands at the altar of God. Even if a cleric spills blood accidentally (such as in an involuntary manslaughter) such a person would be deposed from active presbyteral office. The sight of 'warrior- bishops' in full military regalia, passing through the streets of Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade, left its mark on contemporary Greek sources as one of the greatest 'shocks' to the system, and one of the incidentals that were taken by the Greeks as proof positive that Latin Christianity in the 13th century had a serious illness at its centre.

More than naïve, perhaps, might we regard such a morality of war as seriously 'under-developed'? Can such an important issue really be dealt with by so few canons of the ancient eastern church, and even then, by regulations that are so evidently local and occasional in character ? Well, the charges of inconsistency (praising a noble warrior then subjecting him to penance) and muddle-headedness, were raised in early times, especially by Latin theologians who wanted to press the envelope and arrive at a more coherent and all-embracing theory of war: one that balanced the apparent biblical justifications of hostility on the part of the chosen people, with

---

28 Ordinary murder was given a 20 year debarment from the church's sacraments as well as all accruing civic penalties. Basil's Canon 56. *Pedalion*. p. 827; manslaughter received a ten year debarment. Basil's Canon 57. *Pedalion.* p. 828.

29 Note that they are not querying the collapse of peace ideals outside the church as they regard the spread of hubris and violence on the earth as a clear mark of all those dark forces hostile to the heavenly Kingdom. The advocacy of war that is not a direct response to a clear and present threat of aggression is thus permanently ruled out of the court of morality in this system.

the need to limit the obvious blood-lust of our species. The Latin theory of Just War was one result. Considered primarily (as it was meant to be) as a theory of the limitation of hostilities in the ancient context (hand to hand fighting of massed armies whose very size limited the time of possible engagement to a matter of months at most), it too was an 'economic' theory that had much merit. It's usefulness became moot in the medieval period when armament manufacture took ancient warfare into a new age, and it has become utterly useless in the modern age of mechanized warfare, where it could not stop the fatal transition (on which modernized mechanical warfare depends – both that sponsored by states, and that sponsored by smaller groups which we call 'terrorism') to the centrally important role of the murder of non-combatants. Be that as it may, it is not the purpose of the present essay to offer a sustained critique on Just War theory – merely to raise up a mainline Christian tradition of the ancient East which has never believed in Just War – and to offer instead of an elegant theory, a poor threadbare suggestion of old saints: that War is never justified or justifiable, but is *de facto* a sign and witness of evil and sin.

When it falls across the threshold of the Church in an unavoidable way, it sometimes becomes our duty (so the old canons say) to take up arms; though when that is the case is to be determined in trepidation by the elect who understand the value of peace and reconciliation, not in self-glorifying battle cries from the voices of the bloodthirsty and foolish. But in no case is the shedding of blood, even against a manifestly wicked foe, ever a 'Just Violence'. The eastern canons, for all their tentativeness, retain that primitive force of Christian experience on that front. It may be the 'Violence of the Just' but in that case the hostility will necessarily be ended with the minimal expenditure of force, and be marked in retrospect by the last act of the 'violent Just' which will be repentance that finally resolves the untenable paradox. Ambivalent and 'occasional' such a theory of War might be: but if it had been followed with fidelity the Church's hands might have been cleaner than they have been across many centuries; and it might yet do a service on the wider front in helping Western Christianity to dismantle its own 'economic' structures of war theory which are so patently in need of radical re-thinking. Perhaps the place to begin, as is usually the case, is here and now: with 'Christian America' at the dawn of a new millennium, in which we seem to have learned nothing at all from generations of bitter experience of hostility: except the *hubris* that international conflicts can be undertaken 'safely' now that other super-powers are currently out of commission. Such is the wisdom of the most powerful nation on earth, currently in an illegal state of war [30] which it wishes to disguise even from itself, even as the American military deaths this month exceeded 1000, with a pervasive silence all that it has to offer in relation to all figures of the deaths of those who were ***not*** American troops. Such is the wisdom under a leadership that is itself apparently eager to line up for a 'righteous struggle' with the 'forces of evil', which so many others in the world outside, have seen as more in the line of a determined dominance of Islamic sensibilities by Super-Power secularism of the crassest order. In such a strange new millennium, perhaps the wisdom of the need to be tentative, finds a new power and authority.

---

[30] The conflict in Iraq, an invasion not given sanction of international law through the medium United Nations, but initiated to overthrow the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein on the pretext that he was manufacturing weapons of mass destruction.

Theology of War and Peace

Resources for Study Groups
from
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Wesleyan Quadrilateral

Scripture: Biblical Perspective http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm

Old Testament http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#oldtestament

"War and Peace in the Old Testament" by Harold Washington
Available from MUPWJ

"Old Testament Foundations for Peacemaking in the Nuclear Era" by Bruce C. Birch (1985)
http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1909

New Testament http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#newtestament

"Dealing with Adversaries: New Testament Teachings by Word and Deed"
by Howard W. Hallman http://www.mupwj.org/DealiingwithAdversaries.pdf

"U.S. Catholic and United Methodist Bishops Analyze the New Testament"
http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#bishopsAnalyzeNT

Tradition: Christian History http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm

"Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace" by D. Stephen Long
http://www.mupwj.org/Christian%20history%20-%20Long%20(2).pdf

"The Crusades & Religious Toleration in Medieval Christianity" by Albert Hernández
Available from MUPWJ

"Orthodox Tradition"
Available from MUPWJ

"War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition" by J. Steven O'Malley
http://www.mupwj.org/O%27Malley.pdf

Forthcoming:
"Reformation and Peace Churches"
"Methodism"

Reason: Theological Perspectives http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm

Christian Pacifism http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm

"A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism" by George Hunsinger
http://www.mupwj.org/Hunsinger-Christian.pdf

"Christological Pacifism" by Stanley Hauerwas
Available from MUPWJ

Other articles on the web
http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#articlesontheweb

Just War http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm

"The Just War Tradition and Christian Discipleship" by Daniel M. Bell, Jr.
http://www.mupwj.org/danielbell.pdf

"Contemporary Application of Just War Theory"
http://www.mupwj.org/application.htm
Other articles on the web
http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#articlesontheweb
Liberation Theology
"Feminism and the Challenges of War" by Beverly E. Mitchell
Available from MUPWJ
Forthcoming:
"Liberation Theology in Latin America"
"Black Theology"
Armageddon
Forthcoming
Just Peacemaking http://www.mupwj.org/justpeacemaking.htm

Experience: Alternatives to War http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm

Nonviolent Action http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm
"A Century of Experience"
http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#acenturyofexperience
"Principles and Techniques"
http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#principlesandtechniques
"Resources"
http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#resources
20th Century Prophets and Theologians
Forthcoming
Diplomacy and International Law
Forthcoming

Some articles have been written but not yet posted on the website. They are available upon request from Methodists United for Peace with Justice at mupwj@mupwj.org or at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

September 30, 2005

So What About War in the Old Testament?
A Mennonite Perspective

A challenge for pacifist Christians is understanding God's role in Old Testament warfare. How does this fit with Jesus' teachings and example?

"Holy Wars" are found in the Old Testament. Perhaps the most important is the Exodus, as described in the book of Exodus. In this instance the Hebrew slaves escaped Egypt not by their own efforts but by the efforts of God. Note the victory song in Exodus 15 that celebrates God's actions, not those of a human hero. The people don't need weapons, because it is God who fights for them. This is in sharp contrast to the societies around them who wanted the most advanced weapons, and who celebrated their military heroes.

Israel at this time did not have a king, modern weapons, or a professional army, and didn't rely on large numbers of fighters to win. Initially the people of Israel said no to a society of kings, rich and poor classes, and uneven land distribution.

But all of that changed as time went on and the people of Israel wanted to be like other nations. The people of Israel couldn't get used to the idea of God protecting them. It was hard to do things in a manner that was so different from the societies around them, so they asked for a king. In 1 Samuel 8:10-22, God tells what a king will do to them. A king will form a standing army and draft their children into it. He will collect taxes and make the people his slaves.

Another troubling aspect of war in the Old Testament is the way the nation was called to mop up when a battle was over. In Joshua 6:15-21 , we see Israel called to kill all of the people, and destroy all of the spoils. Some of the reasons given for this are:

- If the victory is God's, the people shouldn't benefit. Victorious armies normally collected slaves, animals and other booty.
- If the defeated enemy is allowed to live, their pagan religions might influence the Israelites.
- The defeated army deserves to die because they are fighting God and God's people.

War in the Old Testament is plan B, not the first choice of God. Having a king other than God was not the first choice either. One of the reasons why King David in the Old Testament could not build the temple was that he had killed too many people or "shed too much blood." So his son Solomon, described as "a man of peace," would do the building instead (1 Chronicles 22).

Throughout the prophets' writings we see a call to live in a peaceable kingdom, one known for justice and mercy.

Later, when the Israelites themselves were carried into captivity, God sent visions of the restoration of God's kingdom. Though captives, some still remembered God and did not give in to the culture around them. In the Old Testament book of Daniel, Daniel and his friends are examples. This vision of restoration was really a vision of all the nations coming to God and living in peace there (Hosea 2:15-23; Isaiah 2:1-5, 25:6-9, 56:1-8).

In the book of Jonah, we see Jonah sent to one of the neighboring nations, not to conquer but to call for change, for repentance. The purpose was not to gain power over Nineveh, but to offer its people forgiveness and the chance to change. God's purpose was not to use Israel to annihilate the other nations but to make Israel a beacon of light, offering God's mercy.

In 2 Kings 6, Elisha calls on God to bring blindness on the army that has come to capture him. He then leads them away, removes their blindness, gives them a feast, and sends them back home. Earlier Elisha offered healing to Naaman, a commander in the enemies' army, and refused to accept any reward for doing this. Naaman would not have sought Elisha's help if it had not been for the captured Israelite girl who suggested this solution.

Throughout the prophets' writings we see a call to live in a peaceable kingdom, one known for justice and mercy. This is God's intent for nations, an intention God again demonstrated with the coming of Jesus.

Some concluding hypotheses:

- The people of God are called to trust God. To trust one's nation or its military strength is a form of idolatry.
- We can trust in the nonviolent power of God instead of the violence of humans. We are called to practice justice, peace, and mercy in the same way God does.
- War should not benefit the victor in any economic way.
- Judgment or vengeance should rest with God, not with human organizations or institutions.
- We are assured that some day God will bring a final victory over all evil. We are called to be faithful until that time. (See the Old Testament book of Habakkuk.)
- The image as warrior is only one of many images we find in the Bible. God is also merciful, lover, shepherd, forgiver, mother, light, and rock, just to name a few. God has a global vision of all peoples coming to worship and becoming part of the kingdom of God. Israel's special mission couldn't be accomplished by killing people, but by serving as a light drawing all nations to walk in God's ways.

———

From *Third Way Cafe* http://www.thirdway.com/peace/?S=3&P_ID=5

Study Group Contacts

Lonnie Hoogeboom <lonnie@appelarchitects.com>, Jane McFarland <janemc@austin.rr.com>,
Lisa Marchal <lmarchal@fumccolumbus.org>, William Finnin <wfinnin@mail.smu.edu>,
Kathy Campbell-Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>, Stuart Shaw <stubonshaw@comcast.net>,
ruthwalton@earthlink.net <ruthwalton@earthlink.net>,

The Teachings on Peace in the Fathers

By Fr. Stanley S. Harakas

The following essay will appear as chapter 6 of Fr. Stanley Harakas' forthcoming book, Wholeness of Faith and Life: Orthodox Christian Ethics, in Part One, "Patristic Ethics." The publisher is Holy Cross Orthodox Press. Originally published in "Un Regard Orthodoxe sur la Paix", Chambésy, Geneva: Editions du Centre Orthodoxe du Patriarcat Oecuménique, 1986.

Introduction

It has been customary when approaching the social teachings of the Fathers of the Church, to speak of the patristic teaching on the topic of war rather than to speak of the Church Father's teaching on peace. Nevertheless, it is certainly more within the spirit of the tenth topic of the forthcoming Great and Holy Council, as presently formulated, to speak of peace, rather than war, even though the two topics are far from being unrelated.

In 1978, I published a small, popular study on the topics of the forthcoming Great and Holy Council to which I would like to refer briefly in these introductory remarks1.This study referred to an agenda item on the list of topics for the forthcoming pan-Orthodox Council: item ten was "the contribution of the local Orthodox Churches to the adoption of the Christian ideals of peace, freedom, brotherhood and love among the peoples of the world and the elimination of racial prejudice."

The inclusion of this topic in the list of agenda topics was heartening to me because it reflected a need of the Orthodox Church to address the problems of our age from the perspective of the Orthodox Christian truth, a truth which is not merely a sectarian affirmation, but which the Church teaches is, in fact, the actual description of the human condition and the response of God to it.

Until now, it has been a bit disheartening, however, to note that only two of the Orthodox Churches, Greece and Czechoslovakia, offered to address the topic. To my knowledge only Czechoslovakia's Orthodox Church has responded to it with a significant and substantial document. In a sense, this is quite sorrowful, for the potential of an Orthodox contribution is significant in this area. Nevertheless, individual studies have been made and conferences have been organised over the past few years on some of these topics, notably on the topic of "Peace," with the Orthodox Churches in socialist countries taking the lead on this topic.

In some of my comments on the tenth topic after the publication of my little work on the forthcoming Great and Holy Council, I have tried to show the wisdom and balance with which it was formulated, especially as it appealed to the social concern interests shown by the First, Second and Third Worlds. Though all nations in the world have a vested interest in the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of the nuclear holocaust, it is in large part resolvable only by the major First World powers. Anyone who has travelled knows that the Peace topic has

become a favourite popular cause in the socialist nations, who accuse the Western democracies of promoting war, a charge denied and reciprocated by the West.

The favourite popular cause in the capitalist countries, in contrast, is the issue of personal freedom. The West charges the Eastern bloc nations with a suppression of freedom, a charge vehemently denied by the socialist nations. Second and Third World nations find themselves particularly resonant with the issues raised in the tenth topic of the forthcoming Great and Holy Council under the rubrics of brotherhood and the struggle against racism, charging both of the blocs with insensitivity to the need for a more corporate world concern for the requirements of the less powerful nations and peoples of the world, and with intemperate and degrading racism. The topic, therefore, in my judgement is well formulated, and it is particularly welcome at this time that the Patriarchal Centre at Chambésy should choose to focus on one of its chief elements, "Peace." The topic calls for the "adoption of the Christian ideal of peace…." And so it is appropriate to concern ourselves with its clarification and study.

In my brief discussion of the topic of "peace" in the above mentioned book, I wrote the following words of caution:
There are very few Orthodox writers and thinkers who have dealt deeply and thoughtfully with these issues. Still fewer, if any, have provided the theoretical underpinnings for a consistent and authentic Orthodox Christian Social Ethic. Because of this there is the danger that our social concern will become subject to mere sloganeering and, worse yet, become the tool of alien forces. For example, Peace as an ideal for the Christian Church is almost self-evident. Yet there is no such thing as a coherent body of Orthodox peace studies. Few, if any, Orthodox theologians have concerned themselves with the problems of pacifism, disarmament, nuclear war, just war theory, peace movements, etc. There is a danger on this issue that we will allow ourselves simply to be used as a propaganda outlet2.

It is for this reason that the sustained study of the topic of peace in this seminar is most welcome, and I am sure will supply the Orthodox world with some worthwhile resources for the development of the tenth topic of the forthcoming Great and Holy Council. Without question a development of an uniquely Orthodox Christian approach to the issue of peace in our day cannot take place without some study of the Patristic teachings on peace, and the related issue of the Christian approach to war. In this paper, unfortunately, only the surface can be dealt with; neither can this presentation be one of the "in depth studies" which I called for in the quotation above, because of the breadth of the topic. We are, however, fortunately assisted in our work by a number of new writings on the topic3.

In this paper, I propose to survey the subject by treating the topic in three parts. In the first, I will survey and illustrate the stance of the Fathers of the Church on the ideal of peace, as a normative and determinative patristic stance. Part two will seek to apply the peace bias of the Fathers to its military dimensions. In the third part, the paper will delineate Eastern and Western Church approaches to the peace ideal in the post-Constantinian period. I would remind you that the treatments of these topics cannot be exhaustive, and can only, at this stage, be suggestive and illustrative.

The Pro-peace Patristic Stance

The Background

The concern for peace as a desired spiritual, moral, social and political good did not begin with the New Testament and the Fathers of the Church. Both the cultural environment of the Roman Empire and its Greek philosophical tradition, on the one hand, and the Old Testament and Jewish roots of the Christian tradition, on the other, provided significant antecedents for the Fathers of the Church regarding their views on peace4.

Among the ancient Greeks, the fundamental characteristic of the use of the term eirene was to denote the state or condition of non-war, the interlude, so to speak, between stages of almost continuous war. The Romans provided, with their term "Pax", an instrumental connotation to the same goal with its understanding as "a reciprocal legal relationship between two parties", thus used in phrases such as a "treaty of peace", "the conclusion of peace," and the "conditions of peace5." As "absence of war," peace took on metaphorical meanings as applied to the individual, essentially signifying the absence of hostile feelings, a sort of Stoic Aataraxia."
The Old Testament term "Shalom" is an extremely rich and variegated word, fertile with multiple levels of meaning. It certainly connotes more than "peace."

At its root, "Shalom" means "well-being", with a heavy emphasis on the material side of life. As such, it often refers to bodily health, or to the nation enjoying prosperity. Numerous Old Testament passages use the term — by extension — to indicate a relationship between political entities, as well as among persons, rather than just as a state of being. It follows that the word "Shalom" found occasional use to connote the practice of making covenants. By extension, thus, it referred to the inner dispositions of those involved in them. For example in Isaiah 54:10 we read: "My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed".

A few other things need to be noted about "shalom". It was always seen as a gift of Yahweh, and as such connected with the saving and redeeming work of God. Often genuine prophets would condemn false prophets who were inspired by self-interest and not God, as proclaiming "peace, peace, when there was no peace", in truth (Jeremiah 6:14). The term, however, also carries with it, in the Old Testament, elements of eschatological anticipation. It expresses an expectation of a final condition of unending peace, both on earth and in heaven. And significantly, the Messianic King in Proto-Isaiah carries as one of his titles, the appellation "Prince of Peace", but all of the titles can be subsumed or closely related to the broad term "Shalom" (Isaiah 9:6). What is notably missing, however, in the Old Testament, is a specifically spiritual connotation to the word, the inner disposition of the soul as spiritual. In fact, "Shalom" in the Old Testament is an almost exclusive public and social term.

Regarding the Septuagint let it suffice to say that the Hebrew word was translated in most cases as eirene and that the Septuagint served admirably to convey to the Greco-Roman world the senses of well-being and of salvation characteristic of the Hebrew understanding of the term. The social dimension is strong, as well, however, as the absence of war. The Septuagint conveys as well the source of peace as being God.

“Shalom”, widely used in rabbinical literature as a frequent greeting, connotes “well-being.” Seen as a gift of God, it is a summary word for the blessings of the messianic period, with almost exclusive limitation to concord within Israel. What is new, however, in the rabbinical literature is that peace is also strongly applied to individual relations, and not just as among nations. Thus, the Rabbis frequently refer to the making of peace among men. It is the judgement of some scholars that “peacemaking” in the sense of eliminating strife among persons in Judaism takes on the same significance which the love commandment has for the New Testament and subsequent Christianity. Strife and enmity among people is contrary to God’s will. The rabbinical literature also focuses strife and peace on the relationship of humanity with God. Sin creates strife and the proper relationship of God and man restores peace between them.

In the Apocryphal writings, eirene, of course, is used with variety. Of interest is that in some writings, such as the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs and the Ethiopian Enoch, the opposite of peace is not “strife between God and Israel or humanity”, as is found in the rabbinical literature, but “the judgement of God”, conceived in much more personal terms. Peace is the absence of the judgement of God upon the righteous. Philo, strongly within the Greek philosophical tradition, sees peace as the political state of the absence of war and the inner rest which is the absence of desire, with the inner conflict deemed worse, even, than the outer lack of peace.

In the New Testament, there is a continuation of the rabbinical tradition in terms of greetings. Also, eirene as salvation, as peace with God, and as concord among people, are prominent in the New Testament. Further, the New Testament presents peace as the appropriate and fitting normal state of things under God. The opposite of disorder is peace, for, as in I Corinthians, 14:33, “God is not a God of confusion but of peace”. Eirene is also a catchword for “the eschatological salvation of the whole man”6. Thus the angelic announcement of “peace on earth” is incarnational and salvific peace, neither limited nor primarily focusing on social or political peace. Thus Jesus Christ gathers together for the New Testament the major senses of peace. He is “the King of Peace” (Hebrews 7:2).

In the framework of salvation, sanctification and peace are closely aligned and we are instructed to seek them. “Strive for peace with all men, and for the holiness without which no one will see the Lord” (Eirenen diokete meta panton, kai ton aghiasmon, ou choris, oudeis opsetai ton Kyrion) (Hebrews 12:14). Further, the New Testament closely associates the term eirene with the powerful salvific term zo, life, which serves almost as a summary term for the whole consequence of Christ’s saving work, the very opposite of thanatos, death. Its positive, personal, social, holistic and eschatological dimensions are expressed powerfully in 1 Thessalonians 5:23 “May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”. Rarely, the New Testament understands eirene as “peace with God”, mostly in the sense of salvation and the result of reconciliation, katalage between sinful humanity and God. Not absent, as well, from the New Testament is the sense in which eirene is concord, harmony and order among human beings, for the Kingdom is “righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit” (Romans 14:17). But there is also the sense of “eirene” as inner peace, much richer than the Greek and Stoic sense of the absence of disturbance, ataraxia. Peter speaks of the “inner person of the heart with the

imperishable jewel of a gentle and quiet spirit" (I Peter 3:4). The wisdom which comes from above is "peaceable," according to James 3:17.

By its association with joy, hara (Romans 15:13) and in the context of the salvation meaning of peace, as the normative human condition, peace of soul points to the content of the spiritual and moral life, and its reflection in our relations with others. Thus in I Timothy the Christian's goal is to "lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectful in every way (2:2). Thus the disciples are instructed "to keep the peace" (eireneuete) among themselves (Mark 9:50), and with all people (Romans 12:18, 2 Corinthians 13:11). Hebrews teaches that the heavenly Father's and the earthly parent's discipline yield "the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it" (Hebrews 12:11). Most significantly, Jesus' Beatitudes call blessed those who are peacemakers, as establishing peace and harmony among people, in imitation, in the likeness of, and parallel to Christ's work of salvation and reconciliation, according to which He makes "peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:19). Thus the making of peace between God and humanity and among human beings becomes a function of the loving and salvific work of God for us, but also a reflection of the will of God for the relations of human beings among each other. On this basis, the Fathers of the Church build their teachings on peace.

The Patristic Teaching on Peace

The Christian emphasis on love, brotherhood, reconciliation, and peace rooted itself in the moral standards of the Christ-like and Christ-ordered life in the early Church. The Evangelical Ethic7 picks up many of these themes in the focus on peace in the patristic corpus. It must, however, be seen as providing the background for the patristic desire for peace, and also for the sense of its harmony with the spiritual and moral character of Kingdom living. The Sermon on the Mount commandments of non-resistance to evil, the return of good for evil, the spirit of reconciliation and brotherhood underpin for the Fathers the reference to, and the understanding of, peace. In the synoptic account which I am going to present now, I will not focus on the issue of peace as contrasted to war, but on the broader based conceptions as delineated in the background material which we have just surveyed. I will follow this with a more careful attention to the issue of peace and war.

For the Fathers of the Church the source of peace, and its fundamental meaning, come from God as a gift to humanity. Clement of Rome's 1st Epistle serves as a patristic example:
…let us run on to the goal of peace, which was handed down to us from the beginning. Let us fix our eyes on the Father and Creator of the universe and cling to his magnificent and excellent gifts of peace and kindness to us… Let us consider how free he is from anger toward his whole creation8.

In the same vein, Chrysostom teaches that "the true peace is from God".9 Clement of Rome also attributes the source of peace to Christ and associates it with the Holy Spirit. He says: "Content with Christ's rations… you were all granted a profound and rich peace and an insatiable longing to do good, while the Holy Spirit was poured out upon you all10."

St. Basil says in his Homily on the Psalms “he who seeks peace, seeks Christ, for he is the peace…” When commenting on the Lord’s farewell gift of peace to His disciples, he adds “I cannot persuade myself that without love to others, and without, as far as rests with me, peaceableness towards all, I can be called a worthy servant of Jesus Christ12.” In the Divine Names of Dionysios the “reopagite several paragraphs are committed to the discussion of the name of peace as attributed to God and its embodiment in the person and work of Jesus Christ. There, he writes:

Now, the first thing to say is this: that God is the Fount of True Peace and of all Peace, both in general and in particular, and that He joins all things together in an unity without confusion… There is no need to tell how the loving-kindness of Christ comes bathed in Peace, wherefrom we must learn to cease from strife, whether against ourselves or against one another, or against the angels, and instead to labour together even with the angels for the accomplishment of God’s Will, in accordance with the Providential Purpose of Jesus Who works all things in all and makes Peace, unutterable and foreordained from Eternity, and reconciles us to Himself, and, in Himself, to the Father13.

As such, since God is the source of all good, peace is taught by Gregory of Nyssa to be an essential good, a necessary concomitant to every other good in which the faithful participate14. Thus the Letter of Barnabas calls the Christians “children of love and peace15,” and Chrysostom says that the peace from God is the Christian’s “nurse and mother”, arising from spiritual harmony in the Christian from the “peace which is in accordance with God16 .”

One of the major emphases in the patristic corpus which does not appear strongly in the earlier traditions described above is the patristic emphasis upon peace as a personal spiritual phenomenon. Seen from the perspective of the inner spiritual life, with some clear philosophical overtones, is Origen’s expectation that the mind and reason of Christians must be formed with God’s “free co-operation … when the soul is quiet and in the enjoyment of that peace which passes all understanding, and when she is turned away from all disturbance and not buffeted by any billows17.” Similarly referring to the “peace which passes all understanding,” St. Basil holds that if such a peace “guards our hearts, we will he able to avoid the turbulence… of the passions18.” Thus, for Basil, spiritual peace is “the most perfect of blessings,” which he defines as a “kind of stability of the rational ability19.” The ascetic side of Basil is highlighted, nevertheless, when he emphasises the view that “true inner peace comes from above… and that one should “seek peace, which is the separation from the turbulences of this world… so as to obtain the peace of God20.”

That this inner peace should express itself in outward behaviour and external relationships, as a function of the proper relationship with God, and the control of the passions, as well as love and forgiveness, is the next emphasis of the patristic tradition on peace. Thus the following progression in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on Romans serves to illustrate the point: “peace is release from invisible enemies, from whom Christ frees us, and for the body not to rebel against the thoughts of the soul’s dispositions, and the pious harmony with others21.” Thus the patristic understanding of eirene has a decided social and moral application as well. Clement of Alexandria identifies eirene and dikaiosyne in the Stromateis 22. He denotes the Christians as the “peaceable generation”, (eirenikon genos 23) and identifies the moral role of

the believer in establishing peace: “man is a pacific instrument … the one instrument of peace, the Word alone by which we honour God is what we employ24.” Therefore, for Clement, Christ uses the Christians as his soldiers of peace:

This is the proclamation of righteousness: to those that obey, glad tidings; to those that disobey, judgement. The loud trumpet, when sounded, collects the soldiers, and proclaims war. And shall not Christ, breathing a strain of peace to the ends of the earth, gather together His own soldiers, the soldiers of peace? Well, by His blood and by the word, He has gathered the bloodless host of peace, and assigned to them the kingdom of heaven25.

As His soldiers, the Christians fight evil for the sake of bringing about a moral and spiritual peace. Thus, writing in his 114th letter, To Cyriacus, at Tarsus, enjoining steps for the reunion of divided Christians, St. Basil opines that “nothing is so characteristically Christian as being a peacemaker, and for this reason our Lord has promised us peacemakers a very high reward”. And before him, the Didache admonished, “You must not start a schism, but reconcile those at strife (eireneueseis de machomenous)26.

The striving for peace among men, of course, is not unconnected with the other virtues, such as justice and righteousness, but in particular, as we have noted above, it is intimately related with the chief of the Christian virtues, love. Chrysostom thus teaches, “if there be peace, there will also be love; if love, there will be peace, also” in his Homilies on Ephesians (24, v.23).
When this range of patristic thought is coupled with the teachings of the Gospels on non-retribution, the avoidance of violence, the returning of good for evil, it forms a holistic view which sees peace, peacemaking, and the harmony of peoples among themselves as a normative good which Christians must seek to realise with God’s help. This is the background for seeking to understand the patristic stance toward civil peace, and peace among nations.

Peace and War in the Early Church

The teaching of the Fathers of the pre- and post-Constantinian Church on War in general, on Christian participation in the military, and on whether the early Church was pacifist or not, has a huge bibliography. Important studies have exhaustively grappled with these issues. Certainly we cannot, nor is there need to reproduce here, what has been fully and adequately described in great detail elsewhere27.

The Pacifist Strand

Let it suffice to briefly document what we can properly call a pro-peace stance of the Fathers of the Church. A few examples are all that is needed for this purpose. Around the end of the first century, in the 1st letter of Clement, there are petitions to God for the civil rulers of the Roman Empire. We read: “It is you, Heavenly Master, Ruler of the Ages, who give to the sons of men glory, honour and power over earthly things. Guide their decisions yourself, O Lord, according to what is good and acceptable in your eyes, so that by dutifully wielding in peace and gentleness the authority you gave them, they may gain your favour28.” Obviously based on the New

Testament injunctions regarding the Christian attitude toward the civil rulers in Romans and the pastoral epistles, such prayers focusing on the role of civil rulers in the maintenance of peace are fairly common in the second century. Justin Martyr perceives the messianic period prophesied by Isaiah when the peoples will beat their swords into ploughs and their spears into pruning hooks, as having arrived with the Christians, for the Christians, he says, "who formerly killed one another… refuse to make war on (their) enemies."29 In his treatise On the Crown, Tertullian makes a sustained argument against the idea of Christians serving in the military of the pagan empire. Arguing both from the idolatry connected with that service and the taking of life, he holds that "the sons of peace" cannot be soldiers: "Will a son of peace who should not even go to court take part in a battle? Will a man who does not avenge wrongs done to himself have any part in chains, prisons, tortures and punishments?" Tertullian asks rhetorically30.

In a third century document attributed to Hippolytos of Rome, there is the expectation that lower rank soldiers may not obey orders to kill anyone, and if they do, that they are to be expelled from the Church31.

In his writing To Donatus St. Cyprian of Carthage decries war:
…everywhere wars have broken out with the ghastly bloodletting of the camp. The world is drenched with mutual bloodshed. When individuals slay a man, it is a crime. When killing takes place on behalf of the state it is called a virtue. Crimes go unpunished not because the perpetrators are said to be guiltless but because their cruelty is so extensive32.
In this same spirit, Origen maintains the total impropriety of Christians going to war themselves, but he does commend the rightness of the Roman emperor in waging war "in a just cause". Nevertheless, Origen notes in his Against Celsus, that Christians do support the effort with their prayers: "We do not go out on the campaign with (the emperor) even if he insists, but we do battle on his behalf by raising a special army of piety through our petitions to God33." Elsewhere he says of the Christians, that "we no longer take up the sword against any nation, nor do we learn the art of war any more. Instead,… we have become sons of peace through Jesus our founder34."

Other pre-Constantinian writers such as Lactantius also clearly present to the reader a sense of the wrongness of war, and a bias toward peace. No less so, does this same predilection for peace and against war continue into the post-Constantinian patristic period. Eusebius of Caesarea, Constantine's staunch supporter, praises the pax Augusti that permitted the uninhibited spread of Christianity35. For Eusebius, the coming together of the Church and the Empire meant that "the whole human race was converted to peace and friendship when all men recognised each other as brothers and discovered their natural kinship," a sign for him that the Constantinian synthesis was the fulfilment of scriptural prophesies for peace on earth36. Thus, the priority of peace for the Christian conscience remained strong. No less a figure than Chrysostom embodied this patristic bias for peace in his writing and preaching. In his 14th Homily on Philippians, Chrysostom states:

God is not a God of war and fighting. Make war and fighting to cease, both that which is against Him, and that which is against thy neighbour. Be at peace with all men, consider with what character God saveth them. 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.'

Such always imitate the Son of God: do thou imitate Him too. Be at peace. The more thy brother warreth against thee, by so much the greater will be thy reward. For hear the prophet who saith, 'With the haters of peace, I was peaceful' (Psalm 120, 7, Septuagint). This is virtue, this is above understanding, this maketh us near God; nothing so much delighteth God as to remember no evil. This sets thee free from thy sins, this looseth the charges against thee: but if we are fighting and buffeting, we become far off from God: for enmities are produced by conflict, and from enmity springs remembrance of evil37.

The Endorsement of Christian Involvement in War

My purpose in bringing these few quotations is to emphasise the patristic commitment to peace. I have not entered into the debate as to whether the pre-Constantinian Church was pacifistic. I tend to agree with modern scholarship which rejects — as overly simplifying the issue — the view that the pre-Constantinian Church was fully pacifist, and that the post-Constantinian Church compromised its peace principles. Scholarship, which focuses not only on the patristic writings but also on Christian practice, such as that of Helgeland38, Daly and Burns39, Ryan40 and Swift41, seems to show that the early Church had elements in its teaching which supported a pro-peace, but not a pacifist position. Considerations founded on the stories of soldier saints and martyrs, the goodness of the state, the rightness of the exercise of the sword by the state, prayers for the state and spiritual support of military actions of defence, as well as the need for the defence of order and the protection of the innocent, lead to the view that these pre-existing factors came to the fore when the danger of pagan pollution and compromise was eliminated and the Christians and their Church assumed responsibilities of governing.

Nevertheless, my point is that in the patristic mind, the bias for peace continued. How that bias for peace was handled, however, differed in the East and in the West.

Eastern and Western Patristic Approaches to Peace and War

It is clear that the early Fathers saw war as an evil in which it was perceived that Christians should not participate. It is also clear that they recognised the important and necessary role of the state to use "military force for the protection of the temporal order as a function proper to the governance of the empire," in the words of one new study of the subject42.

Pacifistic Emphasis Retained: Liturgy and the Clergy

The exuberant enthusiasm of Eusebius of Caesaria for the new situation, as it impacted on peace and war perspectives of the newly established Church, did not find much endorsement in the rest of the patristic conscience. On the other hand, the benefits of the end of persecution, the establishment of the Church, the support for the spread of the Gospel, the eradication of heresies, and the incorporation of Christian values into the legal and social system of the Empire, seemed great enough benefits for the Church so as to outweigh some of the concerns which the earlier Church found so ready to promote in a radically different social, religious and moral climate43.

Nevertheless, in both East and West, there were efforts to preserve in the life of the Church a witness to the earlier emphasis which did not approve of military service for Christians. This is to be seen in the Church's disapproval of military service by the clergy and by the continued heavy emphasis in the liturgy of the Church on the theme of peace. In the latter case, there is an unbroken liturgical tradition based on the Old Testament, Rabbinical, New Testament tradition of the "giving of peace" in the form of blessings. For example, the blessing "May the peace of God be with you all" is to be found in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions. There is no need, I believe, to document the continued tradition of prayer on behalf of peace both within and outside the Church in the liturgies of both East and West to this day.

The continuity of the pro-peace bias of the Church can be recognised in the ready agreement of the consciousness of today's Church with the early second century sentiments of St. Ignatius. As he was being escorted by a military guard on the way to his judgement, taught, according to his Letter to the Ephesians, that "There is nothing better than peace, by which all strife in heaven and earth is done away44." Involvement in the empire's public life meant for the post-Constantinian Church an enhanced appreciation of those elements in the Christian tradition which affirmed the need for order, the punishment of evil doers, defence of the innocent and other such conditions. These new conditions also permitted and even enjoined the involvement of Christians in the military, though there were steps to preserve, in the life of the Church, the earlier pacifistic tendencies of the pre-Constantinian Church.

In addition to the liturgical emphasis on peace, this was accomplished by what I have called elsewhere the "stratification of pacifism" with the canonical requirement that at least the clergy not be involved in military service45.

In seeking to deal with these two tendencies in the revelatory teaching upon which it based its life, that is, the moral repugnance of war and all it stands for, and the need to support order and defend and protect life, one solution was to embody the peace ideal in its fullest sense in the clergy:
…the Church decided to require monks and clergy to be the pacifists in a Church which spoke for the whole of society. Thus, canon 83 of the Apostolic Canons says that a priest or bishop may not engage in military matters. Also prohibited to clergy is government service (Apostolic Canons 6 and 81, canon 3 of the 4th Ecumenical Council and canon 10 of the 7th Ecumenical Council), because one thereby compromises his priesthood. Canon 7 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council combines both injunctions: "We have decreed in that those who have once been enrolled in the Clergy or who have become Monks shall not join the army nor obtain any secular position of dignity. Let those be anathematised who dare to do this and fail to repent, so as to return to that which they had previously chosen on God's account46.

While a solution of sorts, it also reflects serious problems, not the least of which is the ecclesiological problem of the place of the laity in the Church for whom no such requirement is made, and who must meet the question of participation in war by Christians on the basis of different criteria. This stratification of the pacifistic tendencies of the early Church was common, and continues to be common to Eastern and Western Christianity, at least, to Roman Catholicism.

Variant Responses in East and West

Not shared, however, in my judgement, are the theological rationales used in the East and the West in dealing with the participation of Christian laity in the military. It is not necessary at this point to delineate the development of the "Just War" tradition in the West. I believe that it is sufficiently familiar47. St. Ambrose and St. Augustine are its clear founders. These two Western Fathers drew on the scriptural and patristic sources which in one way or another validate the participation of Christian laity in government and in military service. These two seminal writers led the Western Church, not only to an acceptance of the military role by Christians, but its enhancement into a positive virtue through the development of criteria by which a war could be distinguished from an unjust war, and be called "just."

It is my contention that the East developed a different approach to the issue. Rather than seek to morally elevate war and Christian participation in it so that it could be termed "just," the East treated it as a necessary evil. I have previously developed this idea in an evaluation of the United States Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops' recent encyclical letter on war and peace48. I present here a somewhat revised version of that argument.

Contrary to Augustine, "who called it a Manichaean heresy to assert that war is intrinsically evil and contrary to Christian charity49," the Eastern Patristic tradition rarely praised war, and to my knowledge, almost never called it "just" or a moral good. Two cases, only, are known to me where it might be implied that, in passing, wars were characterised as possibly just. These references are to be found in Origen and Eusebius. Origen, in an argument specifically rejecting Christian participation in the military service of the Empire, appears to acknowledge the possibility of just wars. He says, "Though they keep their right hands clean, the Christians fight through their prayers to God on behalf of those doing battle in a just cause and on behalf of an emperor who is ruling justly in order that all opposition and hostility toward those who are acting rightly may be eliminated50." In the same manner, in his Demonstration of the Gospel, Eusebius, while speaking of the distinction of the clergy and laity life styles in the Church, refers by way of illustration only, and in passing to "practical rules for those "serving in the army, according to justice"51.

Whatever meaning and value these passages may have, they do not seem to be in the mainstream of Eastern thinking on the matter. I believe that Louis Swift is correct in substance, but wrong in tone and implication, when he notes that "the whole problem of public and private responsibility in this area and the moral limits surrounding the ius belli and the ius in bello were never serious topics of interest in the minds of eastern writers52." The East did not seek to deal with just war themes such as the correct conditions for entering war, and the correct conduct of war on the basis of the possibility of the existence of a "just war," precisely because it did not hold to such a view of war. Its view was different from that of the West. The East's approach to war was that it was a necessary evil. The peace ideal continued to remain normative and no theoretical efforts were made to make conduct of war into a positive norm.

The locus classicus illustrating this view is the 13th canon of St. Basil from his first Canonical Letter to Amphilochius . The canon struggles to free killing during war from the ethical

judgement of being equivalent to murder, while concurrently refusing to call the act good or just. Here is the text:
"Our Fathers did not consider murders committed in the course of wars to be classifiable as murders at all, on the score, it seems to me, of allowing a pardon to men fighting in defence of sobriety and piety. Perhaps, though it might be advisable to refuse them communion for three years, on the ground that they are not clean handed53."
The major early patristic passage, which Basil may have been referring to, is found in St. Athanasius' Epistle to Amun 54. In passing, and by way of illustration, as he seeks to show that circumstances serve to modify moral judgements, St. Athanasius refers to killing in war: "…thus it is not right to commit murder, but to kill enemies in war is lawful and praiseworthy55."
His conclusion, however, does not place him so far from Basil as might first appear. "Therefore, the same thing on the one hand according to which at one time is not permitted, is on the other, at appropriate times permitted and is forgiven56."

The inclusion of "forgiveness" needs to be understood as reflective of the strong tradition in Eastern Christianity of the concept of "involuntary sin". This widely documented teaching acknowledges the lack of direct and willed responsibility for an act, while concurrently acknowledging the involvement of the moral agent in an act which in itself is not good and not in accordance with the divine will. In fact, St. Basil's 13th canon follows on a canon where this concept is discussed in the context of "involuntary murder". In the case of "involuntary murder", Basil imposes a penance of abstinence from communion for eleven years (not a small period, compared to twenty years for a voluntary murderer), because "the man who struck had no intention of killing him". Nevertheless, he adds, "we deem the assailant a murderer, to be sure, but an involuntary murderer57."

Clearly, Basil, like Athanasius, evaluates killing in war to be less of an evil than a face-to-face killing between non-military persons, albeit involuntary, since in canon 13 he provides for three years of abstinence from Communion, rather than eleven years of abstinence in the preceding canon58. Other Patristic sources for the concept of "involuntary sin" are the 5th Canon of St. Gregory of Nyssa59, and Canon 23 of Ancyra (c. 314-331)60.

This view is characteristic of Byzantine society, even the military establishment. In an anonymous manual of strategy, written in the sixth century during the reign of Emperor Justinian I, war is acknowledged to be "the greatest of evils", though often necessary.
I know well that war is a great evil, even the greatest of evils. but because enemies shed our blood in fulfilment of an incitement of law and valour, and because it is wholly necessary for each man to defend his own fatherland and his fellow countrymen with words, writings, and acts, we have decided to write about strategy, through which we shall be able not only to fight but to overcome the enemy61.

A careful study of the chapters of this work will show that most military definitions are couched in defensive language. Further, it will be seen that the majority of tactics espoused seek to embody subterfuge, cunning, deception, tricks, and hoaxes in order to avoid battle, and to cause the enemy to withdraw of his own volition. The Byzantines also preferred the payment of tribute rather than the doing of battle.

This is not the only evidence. Walter Kaegi, a historian of Byzantine military strategy, summarises a late 6th or early 7th century major Byzantine strategic treatise, known as the Strategikon of Maurice, which shows that every means possible was used to avoid open warfare62.

The author of the Strategikon advises his readers to fashion craftiness and cunning in war and to avoid open battles, that it is often preferable to strike the enemy "by means of deceptions or raids or hunger" instead of open battle.

He cautions against using open warfare. The object of warfare is the defeat and disruption, not necessarily the slaughter, of the enemy. In fact, the author of the Strategikon counsels against using the technique of encirclement because it would encourage the enemy to remain and to risk battle. He advises that it is better to allow an encircled enemy to flee to avoid forcing him to take a life-or-death stand, which would be costly in casualties to the encircling party. There is no more eloquent testimony to the desire to avoid decisive battle63.

We are not here primarily interested in Byzantine military strategy, of course. The purpose of quoting the passages above is to show that, both religiously and militarily, the East recognised the necessity for war, as well as its evil and the need and desire to mitigate its consequences. Though one might question the practical outcome of such a view, it is considered by some to have been an important contributing factor to the long life of the Byzantine Empire64. In the last analysis, it would appear that the Eastern approach served to limit and reduce war and its evil consequences, in practice, while neither making it into a good, nor following the path of pacifism.

I believe that these approaches express well the viewpoint of the Eastern Orthodox Church on war. Thus in a strict sense it cannot speak of a "good war", or even a "just war." There are, of course, problems on both sides of this issue. For example, seeing war as a necessary evil, rather than as a "just" and thus morally approved practice, raises the question of motivation for the waging of war, since calling it a necessary evil can hardly be encouraging to a strong military élan. Consequently, some might be motivated to charge the Eastern approach as guilty of contributing to the possibility of defeat and failure by fostering the begrudging taking up of arms. Nevertheless, it is perhaps because of some such considerations (with the possible exception of Heraclius' Persian campaign), that crusades were noticeably absent from Byzantine imperial military policy. All that this does, however, is to re-emphasise the great difficulties for the Church in dealing with the pro-peace bias in a world fraught with sin, evil and injustice. My point is that the East has responded to the issue in a way that is different from that of the West.

Conclusion

All the evidence, I believe, points to the realisation that the patristic sources see peace as an integral aspect of the Christian truth. For the Fathers, whether one speaks of the inner world of the soul, the intimate relationship of the soul with God, the life in the Church, the social relationships among believers, the encounter of believers with the world at large, the

enforcement of justice within societies, or the defence of nations from external threat, there is a bias for peace.

That emphasis on peace is an ongoing and permanent focus of the Christian teaching as it addresses the issues of today's nuclear-threatened world, and justifies its inclusion in the topics of the forthcoming Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church.

endnotes for this essay:

1 Stanley S. Harakas, Something is Stirring in World Orthodoxy. Minneapolis: Light & Life Publ. Co., 1978.
2 Ibid., p. 65.
3 In English, three volumes are of particular interest: Louis J. Swift, The Early Fathers on War and Military Service, Vol.19; 1983 and Peter C. Phan, Social Thought, Vol.20, 1984, in the series Message of the Fathers of the Church. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, Inc. See also the study, by John Helgeland, Robert J. Daly, and S. Patout Burns, Christians and the Military: The Early Experience. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
4 I am here closely following Gerhard von Rad and Werner Foerster, in Gerhard Kittel, ed Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol.11. Tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964, pp. 400-420.
5 Ibid., p. 401.
6 Ibid., p. 412.
7 Stanley S. Harakas, Toward Transfigured Life: The Theoria of Eastern Orthodox Ethics. Minneapolis: Light and Life Publishing Co, 1983, chapter 7.
8 19:2, 3.
9 Homily I on 1st Corinthians.
10 op. cit., 2,2.
12 Letter 203, 2.
13 II,2,4
14 On the Beatitudes, 7.
15 21, 9
16 Against the Jews, 3, 6.
17 Commentary on John, 6, 1.
18 Homily on Psalm 29.
19 Homily on Psalm 28.
20 Homily on Psalm 33.
21 1:7.
22 4, 25.
23 Instructor, 2, 2.
24 ibid., 2, 4.
25 Exhortation to the Heathens, II.
26 4, 3.
27 A few representative titles in English are: Cecil J. Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War, Oxford, 1919; _________,The Early Church and the World. A History of the Christian Attitude to Pagan Society and the State down to the Time of Constantinius, Edinburgh, 1925;

C.E. Caspary, Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords. Berkeley, 1979; H.A. Deane, The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine. New York, 1963; A. von Harnack, Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries. Philadelphia, 1980; G. Zampaglione, The Idea of Peace in Antiquity. Notre Dame, 1973.
28 28 61, 1-2.
29 First Apology, 39:3.
30 II, 1-7.
31 Apostolic Tradition, XVI.
32 6.
33 7, 73.
34 5, 33.
35 Demonstration of the Gospel, 3, 7, 140; Preparation for the Gospel 1, 4.
36 In Praise of Constantine, 2, 3.
37 On v. 8.
38 Christians and the Roman Army: A..D. 173-337, Church History, 43, 1974, pp. 149-163.
39 Christians and the Military: The Early Experience, op. cit.
40 "The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Christians", Theological Studies, 13, 1952, pp. 1-32.
41 The Early Fathers on War and Military Service, op. cit.
42 Helgeland, Daly, Burns, op. cit., p.89 of the page proofs. I am grateful to Fr. Robert Daly who made the page proofs available to me, shortly before the publication of the book.
43 8, 13, 1.
44 13, 2.
45 Stanley S. Harakas, "The Morality of War", Joseph J. Allen, ed. Orthodox Synthesis: The Unity of Theological Thought. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981, pp. 67-94.
46 Ibid, p.85. See also Swift, op. cit. pp.88,92-93.
47 See bibliographical references above.
48 National Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response. Washington, DC, 1983. The paper, under the title "The NCCB Pastoral Letter: 'The Challenge of Peace' — An Eastern Orthodox Response" was published in 1985 by the Catholic University of America Press.
49 Quoted in footnote 31, The Challenge of Peace, Sec. 82.
50 Against Celsus, 8′73
51 1,8.1 do not think that Swift's translation "practical rules for those fighting in a just war" is adequate.
52 Ibid., p.96.
53 The Rudder, Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957, p.801.
54 MPG, 26, 1169-1180.
55 Ibid., 1173B.
56 Ibid. Emphasis mine.
57 Canon 11, ibid., p.800.
58 For more on "involuntary sin", see Stanley S. Harakas, Toward Transfigured Life. op. cit., p. 84.
59 "Canonical Epistle to Letoius, Bishop of Melitine." Canon V. The Pedalion. Ibid., pp. 874-875.

60 Ibid., p. 502.
61 “Der Byzantiner Kriegswissenschaft”, 4.2 in Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller, ed. H. Koechly and W. Rustow. Leipzig, 1855, vol. 2, p. 56.
62 Das Strategikon des Maurikios, ed. George T. Dennis and German translation by E. Gamillscheg, and the Dennis English translation, published by the University of Pennsylvania Press.
63 Walter Emil Kaegi, Jr., “Some Thoughts on Byzantine Military Strategy,” Brookline, Ma.: Hellenic College Press, 1983, p. 8.65.
64 Ibid., pp.9-10.
For the Peace From Above — Table of Contents

The Orthodox Church and Peace

Some Reflections

By Olivier Clément

The spiritual and eschatological meaning that Scripture and Christ Himself give to the word "peace" characterizes the Orthodox Church as it does all Christian communities, although she is perhaps more wary than others of secularizing reinterpretations. The Biblical shalom which the Septuagint translates as eirene indicates the gift, the coming, the presence of God himself, for God is the one and only source of peace. The Messianic title 'Prince of peace' that we find in Proto-Isaiah1 applies in its fullness to Christ, the 'king of peace'.2 In the New Testament, the 'peace of Christ' is a synonym for that life stronger than death which is brought to us by the Resurrection. Peace, life and joy are thus almost synonymous. 'Peace on earth', the message of the angels, is in fact accomplished by Christ — and in Him — for He reunites God and humanity by triumphing over death and hell. He 'makes peace by the blood of his cross'.3 In rooting Himself in the Church, Body of Christ, place of an ever-continuing Pentecost, the Christian, to the extent of his ascesis, an ascesis of trust and humility, is able to experience — whatever the changes and chances of his life, despite 'wars and rumours of war'4 — that deep peace which is the foreshadowing within him of the Kingdom. 'May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly, and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ', writes St Paul to the Thessalonians.5 Similarly, Peter points to the 'gentleness' and 'peace' of the 'hidden man of the heart.'6

Nevertheless this peace is not a withdrawal into oneself. Man is called to share in the very life of the Trinity: 'That they may be one, even as we are one,'7 said Jesus to His Father whom He has made ours. Our personal peace is realized in the peace of communion. The Christian, wherever he finds himself, has to become a peacemaker of human and cosmic existence — 'Strive for peace with all men, and for the holiness without which no one will see the Lord', we are told in the Epistle to the Hebrews.8 The eucharistic community, which in the first centuries was called agape in Greek, caritas in Latin, ought to become, perhaps above all, a seed of peace in the world. The key text here is the Beatitude about the peacemakers, those who work to make peace9 — who 'shall be called sons of God', adopted in the Son, therefore literally 'deified'. Thus the disciples of Jesus are 'to be at peace with one another'10 and with all men.11

The first Christian communities are to be found in a 'universal' Empire which is a vast area of peace. They pray therefore for its preservation, while refusing to divinise the power of Rome and of the Emperor. But this refusal, which discloses the area of the free personal conscience between the Kingdom of God and that of Caesar, does not express itself through rebellion but through martyrdom, that is to say, through a non-violent stance, which has remained characteristic of the Christian East to this day.

The following text from the First Letter to Timothy12 has been almost entirely integrated into the eucharistic liturgies of St Basil and of St John Chrysostom which are still used today in the Orthodox Church: 'I exhort… that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and

peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.' The Christians of the first centuries felt very strongly, as do many Eastern Christians today, that the Church covers the world through her presence and her prayer (Paul Evdokimov goes as far as to say that 'in the mystery' it is the world which is in the Church and not the other way around); that she preserves peace, delays the Parousia in its aspect of destruction, hastens it in its aspect of transfiguration. 'What the soul is in the body, such are Christians in the world', says the second century Letter to Diognetes.13 They sustain and support the world of which they are a fundamental element of its internal cohesion, life and peace. 'I have no doubt at all that it is because of the intercession of Christians that the world continues to exist', writes Aristides in his Apologia.14 Such is the priestly role of the entire Christian people, plainly indicated by the Sermon on the Mount: 'You are the salt of the earth,'15, which refers back to Leviticus: 'With all your offerings you shall offer salt,'16 and through to Revelation and the First Letter of Peter, which applies to the members of the Church the promise once made by the mouth of Moses to the chosen people: 'You shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.'17

The Fathers of the Church, of whom, as is well known, the Orthodox are always very much aware, emphasized that peace, as the anticipation of the Kingdom, had not only a spiritual but also a dynamic and communicable character. St Clement of Rome in his Letter to the Corinthians18 insists that 'peace is the aim that has been proposed to us from the beginning.' 'A deep and joyful peace has been given to us for all men, with an insatiable longing to do good and an abundant outpouring of the Spirit.' St Basil recalls that 'Christ is our peace', and hence 'he who seeks peace seeks Christ… Without love for others, without an attitude of peace towards all men, no one can be called a true servant of Christ.'19 'The love which Christ bears for mankind spreads his peace among them,' writes St Dionysius the Areopagite.20 Barnabas describes Christians as 'children of love and of peace.'21 The saying of Christ is quoted constantly: 'Peace I leave with you; my peace I give you; not as the world gives do I give to you,'22 — that peace 'which passes all understanding'.23 The peace of Christ comes to birth in man's heart, it flows forth, becomes responsible and creative love, acquires a social dimension. Christians are the peaceable race (eirenikon genon) remarks Clement of Alexandria.24 Christ calls them to be 'soldiers of peace'.25 'Nothing is more characteristic of a Christian than to be a worker for peace,' writes Saint Basil.26 The fight for peace cannot be separated from the fight for justice. The great boldness of the Fathers in social matters is well known. For St John Chrysostom, the 'sacrament of the altar' is nothing if it does not extend itself in the 'sacrament of the poor'.
In the period before Constantine, the Church expected Christians to adopt a position that was fundamentally pacific (but not pacifist in the systematic and ideological sense that the word has taken on). In the second century, at the height of the Roman Peace an apologist like Justin could take the view that the Messianic age prophesied by Isaiah, when swords would be beaten into ploughshares, had arrived with Christianity, for Christians, he says 'refuse to make war with their enemies'.27 The army is a professional army and ecclesiastical authors, for the most part, consider that the military profession is among those that Christians should not take up. Tertullian gives two reasons for this: because the cult of Rome and of the Emperor is obligatory for legionaries and because the 'sons of peace' cannot be soldiers, 'Can a son of peace take part in a battle?'28 In the third century, when Christianity was beginning to become a widespread religion and there were Christian soldiers, the Apostolic Tradition acknowledges that they maintain order and guard the frontiers, but forbids them to kill. If they do so, they must be excluded from the

Church.29 Origen mentions that although Christians can pray for the Emperor in wartime — the situation had become dangerous for the Empire — 'they may not themselves bear arms against any nation nor learn the art of war. For the fact is that Jesus has made us sons of peace'.30 However, it should be noted that from the third century, the Church prays for the authorities engaged in defensive wars when it is a matter of preventing invasion, chaos and the shedding of innocent blood.

The psychological climate changes with the conversion of the Emperors, the end of persecution, state support for the Church (without which the Ecumenical Councils could not have taken place) and the embedding of Christian values in imperial legislation. Christians are to be found in the highest positions, and the Church is called upon to take, as it were, direct responsibility for the course of events. However, an overriding requirement for peace continued to be a vital element in the Christian conscience. 'God is not the God of war,' writes St John Chrysostom. 'To make war is to declare oneself against God as well as against one's neighbour. To be at peace with all men is what God, who saves them, requires of us. "Blessed are those who work for peace, for they shall be called the sons of God." How are we to imitate the Son of God? By seeking peace and pursuing it.'31 The pacific stance of the early Church then falls back to liturgical prayer and to the role of exemplars and intercessors allotted to monks (still laymen in the East), and to the clergy. Fr Michel Evdokimov has already very well presented the theme of peace as it appears in the Orthodox Liturgy. As for monks and clergy, not only must they refuse to serve in armies but they must also forgo the right of legitimate self-defence. The 5th canon of Gregory of Nyssa, which is still in force, states that should a priest 'fall into the defilement of murder even involuntarily (i.e. in self-defence), he will be deprived of the grace of the priesthood, which he will have profaned by this sacrilegious crime.'

The prohibition32 against clergy and monks serving in the army is paralleled by the canons forbidding them to take office in the administration or government of the State.33 These two injunctions of non-violence and of non-power are combined in the 7th canon of the Council of Chalcedon: 'Those who have entered the clergy or who have become monks must no longer serve in the army or accept civil office.' Henceforth, it is the monks who take upon themselves the universal priesthood of working for peace among mankind and the whole of creation, which formerly fell to all Christians. From the mid-fourth century, Serapion of Thmuis, the friend of St Antony, did not hesitate to apply to monks that saying of Christ: 'You are the light of the world.' 'Because of you', he comments, 'by your prayers, the universe is saved.'34

Or rather the peace-making service of the universal priesthood is ascribed both to the monks and to the Emperor. The myth of Christian Empire meant a lot to the Orthodox Church, at least until the fall of the Russian Empire in 1917. The conversion of Constantine, linked to the apparition of a 'sign in the sky', has been thought of as an inauguration of the eschaton. For Eusebius of Caesarea, the union of the Church and Empire 'converted the whole human race to peace and friendship, since from now on, men mutually recognize one another as brethren and discover their natural unity (in the sense of one human nature gathered up in Christ)'. This for Eusebius is a sign that the Scriptural prophecies have been fulfilled.35 In the Byzantine view, Christian mankind, constantly extended through missions, ought to constitute a kind of 'city' politeuma, headed by the Emperor, which he had to keep in peace. His role was to be fulfilled symbolically

and by reciprocal agreement rather than by domination. For example, the Emperor sent Clovis, the King of the Franks, consular titles, which integrated him into the politeuma without calling into question his independence. In the Middle Ages, when the Slav and Caucasian nations asserted themselves — thanks in part to evangelization from Byzantium in their own languages — the Empire organized the politeuma as a kind of Christian 'commonwealth'. It is also true, unfortunately, that the confrontation of Bulgarians and Byzantines, and later of Serbs and Byzantines, for the imperial title led to exhausting wars.

After the fall of Constantinople the Empire passed to Russia. In the nineteenth century, she made very great efforts — and often disinterested ones — for the protection and freedom of the Orthodox of the Balkans. Even so, the division of Christendom was a major obstacle to the reconstitution of a politeuma. After the defeat of Napoleon, Tsar Alexander I entered Paris and all he asked in compensation for the burning of Moscow was that the Easter Liturgy should be celebrated in the very square, now called 'La Place de la Concorde', where King Louis XVI had been guillotined. And he tried to reconstitute the politeuma by the creation of a 'Holy Alliance' (which should not be confused with the Realpolitik of Metternich's reactionary Quadruple Alliance). The idea was to bring lasting peace to Europe through an understanding — in all but words an 'ecumenical' understanding — between Orthodox Russia, Lutheran Prussia, Anglican England and Catholic Austria and France. The dream was of a Christian society of European nations capable of reconciling tradition and liberty. The rise of secular nationalism in Europe doomed the project to failure. However, it should not be forgotten that in 1901 Tsar Nicolas I proposed and obtained the creation of the International Tribunal of The Hague, to which he would have wished to give a greater capacity to act to prevent future conflicts

This whole long history, as is well known, has not gone by without wars. The Orthodox Church has become intimately linked to every people among whom she has taken root, to whom she has given a script, whose language she has blessed by using it for her Liturgy, whose culture she has safeguarded, and whose Christian ways she has upheld during periods of foreign domination (e.g. of the Ottomans in South East Europe and of the Mongols in Russia). She has thus been totally involved in movements of resistance and wars of liberation. To limit oneself to Greece (although analogous examples could be found in the history of Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria), the banner of insurrection during the terrible war of independence was raised by the Archbishop of Patras. Half the Athonites left the Holy Mountain, monks though they were, to fight the Ottomans (oppressors and, I shall return to the point, Muslims). One should not forget that under Turkish domination (the 'Turkokratia') the bishops were regarded, in the Islamic conception of the occupying power, as religious and civil leaders, without distinction, of the milet, namely of the Christian 'people'. This explains the role assumed by Archbishop Makarios as virtual 'ethnarch', i.e. 'leader of the people', during the liberation of Cyprus!

However the Orthodox Church has never elaborated a doctrine of the 'just war' as the Christian West did following St Ambrose and St Augustine. The latter, let us not forget, designated as Manichean heresy — and he was a past master in the field! — the affirmation that war is intrinsically evil and contrary to the Christian understanding of love. The Christian East, on the other hand, has always thought of war as an evil but a sometimes necessary evil for the defence of justice and freedom. The only normative ideal is that of peace, and hence the Orthodox

Church has never made rules on the subject of ius belli and of ius in bello. To kill in war is permitted by a kind of commiseration but, for the Fathers, it is still a sin which must be forgiven! In his 13th canon, St Basil notes: 'Our fathers have not, in fact, held the homicides committed in warfare to be murders, thus pardoning, it seems to me, those who have taken up the defence of justice and of religion. However, it would be good to advise them to abstain from communion for three years since their hands are not pure.' Killing in war is relevant to a significant concept of Eastern canon law, that of 'involuntary sin'.

From this point of view, the only war permitted by the Church as a lesser evil is a defensive war, or a war of liberation. Byzantine treatises on tactics and strategy begin by affirming that war is an evil. Thus, an anonymous sixth century author writes: 'I am well aware that war is a great evil, and even the greatest of evils. But because enemies shed our blood…, because everyone has to defend his homeland and his fellow citizens…, we have decided to write about strategy…'36 However, the work is concerned only with defensive strategy. It recommends ruses, manoeuvres and subterfuges to avoid battle and to lead to the enemy's withdrawal. The Strategikon of Maurice, another handbook on the art of war,37 advises against complete encirclement, which would drive a cornered enemy to fight to the end, and recommends always allowing him an outlet to take flight. For the aim is to get him to withdraw, not to slaughter him.

Byzantium, the Balkan countries, Russia at the time of the Mongols, have all been attacked by Islam, an Islam rougher, often far more opaque, than that of the Arabs. Nevertheless it would be wrong to speak of 'crusades', but rather of a difficult and painful defence of the Cross. This attitude is imprinted in the liturgical texts and they still have a strange actuality, I have been told, for Greek Cypriots. Certainly, there was a great temptation to identify the Christian people with a particular historic nation. For example, on the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, on 14 September, we sing: 'Lifted up of Thine own will upon the Cross, O Christ God, do Thou bestow Thy mercy upon the new commonwealth that bears Thy Name. Make our faithful kings glad in Thy strength, giving them victory over their enemies: may Thy Cross assist them in battle, weapon of peace and unconquerable ensign of victory'.38 In this context, where eschatology runs the risk of being borne off to the advantage of national Messianism, the ancient canon distancing the warrior from communion is quite forgotten. He who fights in defence of his land and his faith is henceforth regarded as a martyr. 'God will account our blood as that of the martyrs', said one of the 'holy Princes' of Russia, to whom it went against the grain to take up arms, and yet who fought to save their people, and sometimes accepted humiliation and death at the court of the Tatar Khan by freely offering themselves as hostages. In 1380, the Khan marched on Moscow. The Grand Prince Dimitri went to ask the advice of St Sergius of Radonezh, the restorer of the monastic life and therewith of the moral and cultural life of Russia. 'Your duty demands that you defend your people', said Sergius. 'Be ready to offer your soul and to shed your blood. But go first of all before the Khan as his vassal and try to hold him back by submitting to him in all loyalty. Holy Scripture teaches us that if our enemies require our glory, if they want our gold or silver, we can let them have it. We only give up our lives and shed our blood for the faith and in the name of Christ. Listen, Prince, let them have your glory and your wealth, and God will not let you be defeated. Seeing your humility, He will come to your aid and will abase their indomitable pride.' The Grand Prince made it clear that he had done all that he could to appease the Khan, but in vain. 'So fight then, they will perish. God will come to your

aid. May His grace be with you.' And he gave Dimitri two of his monks to fight with him. The Russian victory at Kulikovo was decisive. What we have here is neither a theology of violence nor a theology of non-violence, but the unmistakable savour of the Bible, which becomes evangelic when history becomes tragic.

The same conception of warfare is found in the strategy of Kutuzov in the face of Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812. The battle of Borodino was purely defensive. On its eve, everyone fell to their knees before a particularly venerated icon of the Virgin. Kutuzov then abandoned Moscow to the invader. And when Napoleon, overtaken by winter, withdrew, Kutuzov limited himself to harassing him, having no other aim than to drive him back to the frontier. Tolstoy, who was later to become non-violent, has described these events magnificently in War and Peace.

Since the disappearance of the last Orthodox Empire, that of Russia in 1917, and of the last Catholic Empire, that of Austria in 1918 — the latter deliberately destroyed by anticlerical France — the dream of a Christian politeuma has completely vanished. (It is true that a good number of the notions of John Paul II spring from an 'imperial' charisma, rather than from a 'pontifical' charisma, but that is another story). This has accentuated the national character of the different Orthodox Churches. During the Second World War, they were at the side of their respective peoples. The Patriarch of Serbia was behind the 1941 plot to dismiss the Regent for having granted free passage to the German armies. He was sent to a concentration camp by the Nazis. In Russia, on news of the German attack, when Stalin floundered and an attitude of wait-and-see was growing in a good many quarters, it was the head of the Russian Church, the Metropolitan, and future Patriarch, Sergius, who called for national resistance. Subscriptions from the faithful enabled the Church to offer the State an armoured column, which flew the flag of Holy Russia and bore the name of the victor of Kulikovo and friend of St Sergius, Dimitri Donskoy. During the 900-day siege of Leningrad, the Church made a decisive contribution through prayer, exhortation and social assistance. But previously, unlike, for example, the Spanish Church, the Russian Church had refused to participate in civil war. Patriarch Tikhon did not give his blessing to the White armies. He himself offered the State the wealth of the Church to combat the famine, and he simply exhorted the faithful to non-violent resistance; while Lenin, having refused his offer, ordered the confiscation even of the things needed for public worship. This was the time when Starets Alexis Metchev opposed the calls for an anti-Bolshevik crusade made by some emigre bishops, and declared that a powerful spiritual renewal was the only way in which Russia would be able to overcome anti-theism.

So, historically, the Orthodox Church has accepted warfare sorrowfully as a sometimes necessary evil, but without concealing that it is an evil which must be avoided or limited as much as possible. Her spiritual men and women have never ceased to pray for peace. St Silouan, who died in 1938 on Mount Athos, carried the whole of mankind in his prayer; and he, a Russian, interceded especially for the persecutors of his Church; persecutions, to which the response was martyrdom — of tens of millions of Martyrs, many of whom died praying for their tormentors. Today, in a context which has become global and extremely precarious, there are two signs which appear to make specific the position of the Orthodox Church: one is her stance in the war in Lebanon, and the other is the text on Peace worked on by the Third Pre-conciliar Pan-

Orthodox Conference, which met at Chambésy near Geneva from 28 October to 6 November 1998.

In Lebanon, the Orthodox community, which is one of the most significant in terms of numbers, economic importance and cultural influence, was the only one to refuse to take up arms and form a militia. The Orthodox Youth Movement of the Patriarchate of Antioch, inspired, above all, by Metropolitan George Khodr, has always put into practice the non-violence of the Gospel, going to the assistance of victims on all sides and developing a dialogue with Islam, which could be of great future importance.

The Third Pre-conciliar Conference has drawn up a long text on 'the contribution of the Orthodox Church to the achievement of peace.' This text offers a definition of peace which is that of Scripture and of the Fathers. The basis of peace can be none other than unconditional respect for the human person who, being in the image of God, is rooted beyond this world and, in Christ, becomes irreducible. At the same time, the human person is fulfilled in communion, for the Church as 'mystery' of the Risen Christ, makes the person a participant of the love of the Trinity. The Trinity would thus appear, in its radiance of unity and diversity, as the guiding image for a humanity which is unifying but does not want to become uniform. Christ's Gospel is the Gospel of peace (Eph. 6:15). Christ has become 'our peace' (Eph.2:14). The peace 'which passes all understanding' (Phil. 4:7), as Christ himself said to his Apostles at the Holy Supper — peace which is broader and more essential than the peace which the world promises. On this point, the Conference quotes the text of Clement of Alexandria on the 'peaceable race' to which we have already made reference. Peace is inseparable from justice, which is the social aspect of communion; and from freedom, where the mystery of the image of God is inscribed. The Conference therefore makes a vehement appeal on the one hand, for respect for persons and for minorities and on the other, for justice on the planetary scale.

However, it is only in the Church (and this is why the Church must be the Church) that evil, the root of all discord, can be healed radically by the Life-giving Cross, whose sanctity alone can radiate the strength to do so. Here we discover again the meaning of a peace-making priesthood of all the faithful as in the pre-Constantinian Church. The Church constitutes a force for peace quite different from that of international organizations or States. This 'force for peace' is infectious, it is 'caught' and spreads through the communion of Eucharistic communities, through prayer, service, and the active love of people who become capable, as St Paul requires, of 'making Eucharist in all things' (1 Thess. 5:8).

In this way a creative spirituality is defined which involves all Christians — people of the Resurrection — in the struggle against death as it ravages society and culture in all its dimensions. As regards war in particular, the text reads:
'Orthodoxy condemns war in general, for she regards it as a consequence of the evil and sin in the world. Out of commiseration she has allowed wars, undertaken to re-establish justice and freedom where they have been trodden underfoot.'

Today, however, the risk of the self-destruction of mankind and of the annihilation of all life on earth through a nuclear war can no longer be a matter of a lesser evil. At this point, politics

becomes ‘metapolitical’ and addresses the problem of the meaning of existence itself. The text then condemns armaments of all kinds, especially nuclear and space weapons ‘wherever they come from’. (It is not a question of unilateral disarmament as in pacifist movements).
‘The consequences of a nuclear war would be terrifying, not only because it would cause the death of an incalculable number of human beings, but because the life of those who survived would be intolerable. Incurable diseases would appear, and genetic mutations would occur with dire effects for future generations, assuming that life on earth continued. In the opinion of scientists, one result of nuclear war would be the so-called nuclear winter — climatic disturbances on our planet the end result of which would be the disappearance of all life. Consequently, nuclear war is unacceptable from all points of view, environmental and ethical. It would be a crime against humanity, a mortal sin against God, whose work would be destroyed.’
Confronted by this threat, by the no-less-suicidal progressive destruction of the environment and by famine in so many regions of the Third World, while ‘the economically developed countries live in a regime of opulence and waste, committing themselves to a sterile policy of armaments,’ only a spiritual leap can open the paths of the future. The Conference summons Christians to adopt a new lifestyle based on voluntary limitation, sharing, and sympathetic respect for Nature. The Conference text concludes:
‘Because we know the meaning of salvation, we have the duty of striving to alleviate illness, unhappiness and anxiety; because we have access to the experience of peace, we cannot remain indifferent when peace is lacking in contemporary society; because we are blessed with the justice of God, we have to strive for more complete justice in the world and for the disappearance of all oppression… Because we are nourished by the Body and Blood of the Lord in the holy Eucharist, we feel the need of sharing the gifts of God with our brethren — we understand better what hunger is and we strive for its abolition. Because we are preparing for a new earth and a new heaven where justice will reign, we struggle here and now for the vivifying and the renewal of man and of society.’

First published as “L’Altra Pace” in the volume “La Pace come metodo,” Milano 1991
For the Peace From Above — Table of Contents

UM Campus Ministers Association

William Campbell of Middle Tennessee State University and Angela Gay Kincaid of West Virginia Wesleyan College will lead the new UM Campus Ministers Association after being elected as co-chairs in late July...

With 125 persons in attendance at a July 23-27 conference near Baltimore, Md., campus ministers decided to form an official association and work toward credentialing of its members. The new UM Campus Ministers Association is expected to provide a support network and assistance in recruiting and advocating for concerns that may appear before General Conference or various general agencies, such as increasing consistency in policies and procedures for campus ministries and their boards, funding and resource support, and providing credit-bearing church and Bible-related courses to students even if the credit does not come from the degree-granting institution.

Newscope September 2, 2005

HISTORIQUE SUR LE ROLE JOUE PAR L'EGLISE METHODISTE UNIE DANS LA RECONCILIATION DE CONFLITS DANS LE DISTRICT DE KITENGE

PAR REV. MUJINGA MWAMBA KORA SURINTENDANT DE DISTRICT DE KITENGE.

I. HISTORIQUE.

Tout à commencer en 1998 à Kitenge chef lieu du district ecclésiastique de Kitenge, là où j'étais affecté comme pasteur afin de commencer la deuxième paroisse, alors qu'il y a eu plus de 20 ans ce village n'avait qu'une seule paroisse, avec mon affectation et sous l'initiative du Surintendant de District le Rév. KABONGO ILUNGA, il a été proposé que nous commençâmes la deuxième paroisse nommée « Mont Carmel ».

Un mois après mon arrivé, Kabalo tomba dans les mains de rebelles pendant la guerre d'agression « Rwanda/ RDC ». Dispersion à Kitenge, je suis resté seul. Tout le monde s'était enfui ne sachant que faire. Etant pasteur, je ne pouvais pas croiser les bras, je me suis fait Aumônier de militaires presque 16000 militaires qui étaient regroupés à Kitenge. Mon travail d'aumonerie a commencé de novembre 1998 à Janvier 1999.

En janvier la population commencait à rentrer progressivement et nous avons commencé les activités avec 30 membres.

Dans ce trois mois, j'ai eu l'ocassion de connaître la vie d'un militaire, eux aussi dans leur camp avaient besoin du secours divin et bon nombre d'entre eux se sont convertis.

Kitenge est un village d'au moins 24000 âmes, comme il y avait une surpopulation, la nourriture devenait de plus en plus rare et cher, la faim battait son plein, il ne fallait pas croiser les bras chacun se tracassait de tous coté pour trouver quoi mettre sous la dent. Moi non plus n'étais pas épargné à cette situation de misère.
Un jour je suis décidé comme tous les autres, d'aller chercher à manger à plus de 45 Kms. Arrivé à Ngende à 17 hoo', comme le malheur ne vient jamais seul, la même nuit du 22 septembre 1999, nous étions encerclé par les rebelles Congolo-rwandais, ces derniers nous ont tout pris, (argent , habits, vélos …) mais j'en suis resté la vie sauve. J'ai fait le pied dans mon chemin de retour.

Sorti de là, nous avons encore rencontré quelques difficultés nous infligées par nos frères ' SIMBA - MAY MAY'. Nous étions obligé de fuir trois fois dans trois ans, nous nous refugions contre les inciviques. L'insécurité était généralisée dans tout le district ecclésiastique de Kitenge.

Dans 9 circuits que composaient notre district, trois seulement étaient disposés à travailler, les autres non. Les églises étaient fermées car toute la population était éparpillée soit dans la forêt soit dans les villages de l'autre rive de la rivière lomami. Pour visiter ces fidèles, nous étions exposé à toput danger, nous gaspillions l'argent pour se frayer le chemin et surtout savoir négocier de tous les deux cotés (May May et Soldats gouvernementaux) Ce ministère a duré presque 3 ans au péril de notre vie mais dans tout cela la main de Dieu nous accompagnait et il n'y avait pas des incidents majeurs pour toutes les équipes qui partaient en evangélisation. Comme il y avait deuxcamps, le centre

de Kitenge était abrité par les soldats du gouvernement et tous l'intérieur étaient habité par les May-May sous la responsabilité du Général TSHINJA TSHINJA ; Dans tout ceci, la population était entre le marteau et l'enclume et l'on ne savait pas sur quel pied danser. Etre dans le camp de militaires, c'est etre enemi de May-May et etre dans le camp de May-May c'est etre enemi de militaires.

Sachant que l'Eglise est apolitique et neutre, nous ne pouvions pas croiser les bras et laisser le mal continuer. Nous étions obligés de s'y impliquer malgré le coût que nous allions payer. Nous cherchions comment rassembler les deux frères enemis pour les mettre autour d'une même table de négociation, quoique s'était difficile, auprès de Dieu, tout était possible, après deux d'attente, pour cela, Dieu avait exhaussé notre prière car ce n'était pas le seul souci des églises, cela était devenu la préoccupation de tout un chacun. Ensemble avec les autorités politico-administratives, les militaires et la Police Nationale Congolaise (PNC) , nous chercions partout nous retrouver pour discuter et chercher les voies et moyens pour mettre fin aux tracasseries policières, à des tueries et l'insécurité qui battait son plein.

L'Administrateur en la personne de Mr Pierre DAMIER NDOMBE, le Commandant Bataillon de 941° bataillon qui était à Kitenge, le Commandant de la Police Nationale Congolaise sont venus chez moi à la maison me demander si notre Eglise pouvait etre la cible de notre négociation comme c'était notre préoccupation. Nous n'avions pas hésiter à leur répondre positivement pour cette rencontre. Et j'ai était choisi comme prédicateur dans cette réunion tant longtemps attendu. Le travail était bien fait et présenté , toutes les parties se sont mises d'accord pour enterrer la chez de guerre.

Là où les politiciens échouaient, Dieu seul est prêt à donner la solution, pour vivre ces événements, voici les rapport du travail que nous avons accompli :

LUNDI 24 MARS 03

Entretien avec toutes les parties impliquées au rétablissement de la paix : Mr l'Administrateur de Territoire Assistant de Kitenge, le Commandant Battaillon de Forces Armées Congolaises à Kitenge (Cmd Bn FAC), Cmd Bn2, Cmd Bn3 et Cmd Bn5 FAC, Cmd PNC, Cmd FAP, Président CPP et son Comité, le Chef Sous Poste ANR, le Représentant du Chef de Groupement Nyembo, le Représentant de l'Eglise catholique, le Représentant de l'<Union des Enseignants de Kitenge et les sages et Conseillers de combattants Simba May-May sont venus à la rencontre organisée dans l'enceinte de la paroisse Méthodiste Unie de Kitenge. Un groupe de combattants May May est venu aussi se joindre à nous pour préparer les conditions d'acceuil de leur Général CHINJA CHINJA ; Malheureusement ce dernier n'est pas venu ce lundi ; Ce pendant nous avons remarqué que les combattants May-May étaient plus nombreux que les soldats FAC sur le lieu de réconciliation ainsi que dans la cité de Kitenge.

MARDI 25 MARS 03

Vers 7h05, Mr Jackson KABAMBA l'Administrateur ai de Kabongo est venu se joindre à la rencontre. C'est seulement vers 14h15 que le Général CHINJA CHINJA est arrivé sur le lieu de la rencontre. Trente minutes après, quelques combattants May-May

estimés à 6000 sont venus rejoindre l'équipe de réconciliation. Ceux-ci ont envailli la cour de la paroisse avec les soldats FAC. Nous étions alors tous présents pour débuter la cérémonie de réconciliation qui avait débuté à 14h15.

Mr Pierre Damien NDOMBE l'ATA de la place, a pris la parole le premier pour donner l'introduction à la rencontre.

Il a commencé par rendre gloire à Dieu pour avoir permis la tenue de réunion. Il s'est rejouit de cette rencontre entre frères. Il a ainsi demandé au Surintendant de l'Eglise Méthodiste Unie, le Rév. MUJINGA MWAMBA KORA de prier pour la circonstance et prêcher la parole de Dieu avant de commencer le dialogue.

Notre intervention était taxée sur les points suivants :

- La prière
- Le message : Luc 15 : 17 – 24 Thème « Nous étions tous perdus et nous avons besoin de la repentance »

Après mon sermon, Mr l'ATA a repris le thème de cette réunion en insistant sur le fait que nous sommes tous les perdus comme est le sujet d notre prédication. Il a procédé à la présentation des participants en commençant par le général de Brigade Chinja Chinja et sa suite, le Cmd Bn FAC et sa suite, la FAP et la PNC ainsi que les membres.

A l'intervention de l'AT : il a retracé l'historique de la guerre d'agression et la création des Forces d'Autodéfenses Populaires FAP et il est arrivé des mouvements de May-May. Il a aussi évoqué, les troubles entre FAC et May-May et la déstabilisation de villages et surtout la perte en vie humaine, le villages incendiés et le déplacement massif de la population.

Aujourd'hui nous ne voulons pas faire le tribunal dit-il pour chercher qui a raison et qui n'en a pas, non ! Mais ensemble chercons les vraies causes qui fassent chaque fois causer des troubles enfin que nous parlions et trouver de bases solides pour la survie de notre agglomération qui a tant souffert.

B. Les déclarations du général de Brigade Chinja Chinja : Moi, je suis un civil, ce qui nous est parfois choqué, c'est la tracasserie de Fac et la mauvaise compréhension de part et d'autres, les faux rapports de la population de tous les deux cotés. Aujourd'hui ce jour, c'est la première et la dernière réunion pour moi. Je ne peux plus encore combattre les Fac, car FAC est notre père qui nous chapeaute tous. Nous lui devons du respect chez-moi, il n'ya pas de tribunal, je demande à tout le monde d'aller déposer leurs problèms au tribunal sécondaire, à la PNC. Nous reconnaissons l'etat et toute sa force.

Après ce meeting, Dieu s'est vraiment manifesté, l'attitude des Simbas s'est vite chanchée. Ils se sont conformés aux paroles de leur chefs. La tracasserie était terminée. Nous attendons bientôt à avoir nîatre la paix.

Que vive l'Eglise Méthodiste Unie qui a hébergé les bélligérants et qui avait joué un rôle de catalyseur à travers son serviteur Rév. Mujinga Mwamba Kora.

Instructions for article by Harold Washington

Go to http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#oldtestament

Replace "Featured Article" with "War and Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible"
Change URL from http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#featuredarticle to
http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm#washington

In the box strike "Featured Article" and "To be written" with the following (similar type style):

War and Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible

by
Harold C. Washington

The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) makes clear that God's ultimate purpose for the world is peace and reconciliation among the nations, but it also contains troubling passages concerning warfare. How are we to understand the biblical praise of God as a mighty warrior (Exodus 15.3)? How can the biblical God of justice and mercy command wars of annihilation against Israel's enemies (e.g., 1 Samuel 15.2-3)? How can a Scripture containing such elements inspire peacemaking in the world today?

<u>Read more</u>.... [go to http://www.mupwj.org/washington.htm]

[Note: This will be the attached article, sent as Washington for web page.doc. This in turn will provide linkage to the attached Washington PDF.doc.]

War and Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible

by
Harold C. Washington
Saint Paul School of Theology

[box]
VIEW OR PRINT PDF
THIS SECTION

Introduction

The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) makes clear that God's ultimate purpose for the world is peace and reconciliation among the nations, but it also contains troubling passages concerning warfare. How are we to understand the biblical praise of God as a mighty warrior (Exodus 15.3)? How can the biblical God of justice and mercy command wars of annihilation against Israel's enemies (e.g., 1 Samuel 15.2-3)? How can a Scripture containing such elements inspire peacemaking in the world today?

To address these questions, we must recognize that the diverse writings of the Hebrew Scriptures took shape over the time span of a millennium, involving multiple authors and changing historical settings. Diverse points of view concerning war and peace inevitably found their way into these writings. The Hebrew Bible, moreover, is profoundly shaped by the ancient Near Eastern cultures from which it emerged. This is especially true regarding warfare.

The Divine Warrior and "Holy War" in Ancient Israel

In the world of the Hebrew Bible, war and religion were closely related. Ancient Near Eastern peoples such as the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians typically conceived of their high gods as divine warrior kings who accompanied their human kings in battle. Ancient Israel likewise thought of God as a divine warrior:

> Who is this King of Glory?
> The Lord, strong and mighty,
> The Lord, mighty in battle (Psalm 24.8).

Israel's divine warrior, however, first appears in the story of the Exodus, where God saves the fleeing Hebrew slaves from their Egyptian pursuers. After God's defeat of the Egyptian army, the people sing:

> The Lord is my strength and my might, and he has become my salvation.
> This is my God, and I will praise him, my father's God, and I will exalt him.
> The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name (Exodus 15.2-3).

Israel's God is revealed as a liberator, a God of compassion and justice who frees slaves and defeats the oppressor. How different this is from other ancient Near Eastern national gods. The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian divine warriors sanctioned brutal conquest and exploitation, but here Israel's God defends the vulnerable.

Israel, however, has its own conquest story in the book of Joshua, where the Israelites wage total war aiming to annihilate the Canaanite population (e.g., Joshua 6.21). The biblical text speaks of sacral "utter destruction" to describe this practice: all the spoils of war, including captured

humans and animals, are to be destroyed, rendered to God as a sacrifice (Deuteronomy 13.16). Like the divine warrior motif, this "holy war" language is common to Israel and other ancient Near Eastern nations. It is a way of asserting that wars are devoted to God and of claiming, or at least threatening, total defeat of enemies.

The continued existence of Canaanites in the biblical record, however, makes clear that Joshua's armies did not exterminate them (Judges 1.1; cf. Joshua 15.63; 16.10; 17.12-13; 19.47; Deut 20.16-18). Historically speaking, Israel did not actually wage wars of total destruction. Scholars now generally agree that Israel's occupation of the Promised Land involved not the unified invasions that the book of Joshua recounts, but chaotic internecine conflicts among various groups, all of whom would have believed that they entered battle with God on their side.

The accounts of Joshua-Judges and the Deuteronomic commands to destroy the Canaanites (Deuteronomy 7.2; 13.15; 20.16-18) were composed centuries after the times that they describe. They are written in such a way as to emphasize the threat of Canaanite customs to Israelite faithfulness: if they had totally vanquished the Canaanites, perhaps the Israelites would have remained faithful and escaped their own downfall. In the present text, however, the legal provision for war of total destruction is framed so that it pertains only to the generation of Joshua (Deuteronomy 20.15-16). From the biblical author's point of view, such warfare is a thing of the past, not to be repeated.

The martial associations embedded in the theology of the Hebrew Bible are of great antiquity. They reflect ancient Near Eastern cultural assumptions. As the biblical literature develops, they become significantly qualified or mitigated. Still, these elements of the Bible are problematic. Fortunately, the Hebrew Bible also offers a deeply sustaining vision of peace, an affirmative ground for the work of peacemaking through the centuries.

The Meaning of Biblical Shalom

The hope for peace in the Hebrew Bible is a deep longing because warfare was a constant reality in biblical antiquity. People lived in ever-present dread of being defeated by foreign enemies, their cities destroyed and population killed or enslaved—a fate that both the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel and Judah eventually met. Thus peace, Hebrew *shalom*, certainly includes the absence of warfare, but it also involves much more than that.

The basic meaning of the Hebrew term *shalom* is completeness, wholeness, or well-being in an all-inclusive sense. In peace, the necessities of life—food, shelter, health, safety—are secure for all. The prophet Micah's vision of peace foresees a time when everyone is provided for and all are free from even the threat of harm:

> They shall all sit under their own vines and under their own fig trees,
> And no one shall make them afraid;
> For the mouth of the LORD of hosts has spoken (Micah 4.4)

Peace, righteousness, and justice come together in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Isaiah 32.16-18). In the beautiful vision of the Psalmist, "righteousness and peace will kiss," they are intimately related (Ps 85.10). The Psalmist also urges, "do good; seek peace, and pursue it" (Ps 34.14).

Peace then is not simply still and quiet; it involves deep commitment to working for justice. If any members of a community are harmed, the *shalom* of the whole is broken: there is no peace.

Jeremiah, for example, denounces the Jerusalem leadership for proclaiming "Peace, peace, when there is no peace" (Jeremiah 6.14; 8.11; cf. Ezekiel 13.10, 16). He rebukes the people's false confidence: their religiosity, wealth and power will not save them. The people will live in peace only if they act justly and care for the most vulnerable: the alien, the orphan, and the widow (Jeremiah 7.1-7). If Jeremiah were present today, we can imagine him joining in with those who chant: "No justice, no peace!"

God's *shalom* finally extends beyond human society, restoring the entire world to the original harmony and wholeness that God intended for it as part of a good creation (Genesis 1). Isaiah, for example, envisions the world as a peaceable kingdom where even the violence among animals ends. Predator and prey will live together peaceably, the wolf will lie down with the lamb, and no one will hurt or destroy in God's entire realm (Isaiah 11.6-9).

Biblical peace therefore is truly universal in scope: God wills wholeness for all. In today's world still ravaged by war, we need ever more urgently to understand the biblical role of Israel as the Lord's servant who brings peace to all the nations of the earth. Christ embraced the role of God's servant Israel. Christian believers are called to do so too.

God's Ultimate Purpose: Peace and Reconciliation of the Nations

From the beginning of Israel's story in God's call to Abraham, it is clear that God's blessing of Israel is linked with the blessing of "all the families of the earth" (Genesis 12.1-3; cf. 18.18; 22.18; 28.14). Historically, Israel saw this role in a new light after the Babylonian destruction of 587 BCE, when Jerusalem was burned, the leading population exiled, and Judah as an independent nation was effectively destroyed. Some of the Judeans in Babylonian exile hoped for a restored monarchy and the chance to avenge Judah's humiliation.

In the book of Jeremiah (ch. 29), the prophet sends these exiles a word from the Lord: Do not fight, but build houses, plant gardens, have children, and finally:

> seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you,
> and pray to the Lord on its behalf,
> for in its *shalom* you will find your *shalom*" (Jeremiah 29.7).

Jeremiah tells the people to nurture life, to pray for their enemies, and work for reconciliation, even with Babylon, the deadliest foe.

The central section of the book of Isaiah (chs. 40-55), also addresses the exiles in Babylon. Here Israel, crushed and dispossessed by the nations, is reconceived as a "light to the nations" (Isaiah 42.6; 49.6; 51.4), the Lord's Servant, who for the sake of others yields even to profound suffering (52.13-53.12). The early Church, of course, recognized the figure of Christ in this depiction of the Lord's Suffering Servant. To grasp Isaiah's meaning for the original addressees in Babylonian exile only enhances our appreciation of the Christian interpretation. God's grace works reconciliation in the world. God's servant ends the cycle of violence by renouncing force, suffering for others rather than returning harm for harm, praying for enemies (Isaiah 53.12b).

Israel's role as a mediator of forgiveness to enemies and of blessing to the nations appears also in the remarkable proclamation of Isaiah 19.24-25:

> On that day Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom the Lord of hosts has blessed, saying, "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my heritage."

Here Egypt, the arch-oppressor of the Exodus, and Assyria, destroyer of the northern kingdom of Israel, are gathered with Israel as recipients of the Lord's blessing.

We could multiply examples of this theological strain in the Hebrew Bible, but perhaps the most memorable is Isaiah 4.2-4. Here Jerusalem is envisioned as a fount of salvation flowing out to all the world. The nations will stream in to receive God's instruction, and the Lord will establish peace among them:

> They shall beat their swords into plowshares,
> And their spears into pruning hooks;
> Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
> Neither shall they learn war any more (Isaiah 2.4; cf. Micah 4.4).

God's ultimate aim is manifest here. The question for people of faith is, how shall we embrace this vision and live as God's servants, sacrificing and working for reconciliation in a world broken by violence?

Postscript: The Sixth Commandment, "You shall not kill"

What is the relevance of the sixth commandment, "You shall not kill" (Exodus 20.13, Deuteronomy 5.17) for ethical reflection on war and peace? In the strictest sense, the language of the commandment refers to murder, as both the NRSV and NIV translations indicate. Killing in war and capital punishment are licit in the Hebrew Bible (Deuteronomy 20.10-18; Exodus 21.12-17; 22.18-20), and biblical Hebrew denotes them with language different from that of the sixth commandment.

Christian tradition, though, has often taken the sixth commandment more fundamentally to convey reverence for human life. Consider the following:

- In biblical perspective, all life belongs to God (Leviticus 17.11) and hence should be regarded as sacred.
- The taking of human life is especially unjustifiable, as humanity is made in the image of God (Genesis 1.27).
- Jesus' Sermon on the Mount affirms the sixth commandment and extends it beyond violence to include even the expression of anger, stressing reconciliation as the most important value (Matthew 5.21-24).

Many Christians therefore conclude, taking the sixth commandment broadly, that it obliges us to renounce all taking of human life, including in war.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Craigie, Peter C. The Problem of War in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Hanson, Paul D. "War and Peace in the Hebrew Bible." Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology Vol. 38, No. 4 (October, 1984), pp. 341-62.

Healey, Joseph P. "Peace: Old Testament," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 5, pp. 206-207.

Hiebert, Theodore. "Warrior, Divine," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 6, pp. 876-880.

Niditch, Susan. War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.

[end box]

THE PROBLEM OF WAR AND HOPE FOR PEACE IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

by

Harold C. Washington

Professor of Hebrew Bible

Saint Paul School of Theology

I. Introduction

The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) makes clear that God's ultimate purpose for the world is peace and reconciliation among the nations, but it also contains troubling passages concerning warfare. How are we to understand the biblical praise of God as a mighty warrior (Exodus 15.3)? How can the biblical God of justice and mercy command wars of annihilation against Israel's enemies (e.g., 1 Samuel 15.2-3)? How can a Scripture containing such elements inspire peacemaking in the world today? To address these questions, we must recognize that the diverse writings of the Hebrew Scriptures took shape over the time span of a millennium, involving multiple authors and changing historical settings. Diverse points of view concerning war and peace inevitably found their way into these writings. The Hebrew Bible, moreover, is profoundly shaped by the ancient Near Eastern cultures from which it emerged. This is especially true regarding warfare.

II. The Divine Warrior and "Holy War" in Ancient Israel

In the world of the Hebrew Bible, war and religion were closely related. Ancient Near Eastern peoples such as the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians typically conceived of their high gods as divine warrior kings who accompanied their human kings in battle. Ancient Israel likewise thought of God as a divine warrior:

> Who is this King of Glory?
> The Lord, strong and mighty,
> The Lord, mighty in battle (Psalm 24.8).

Israel's divine warrior, however, first appears in the story of the Exodus, where God saves the fleeing Hebrew slaves from their Egyptian pursuers. After God's defeat of the Egyptian army, the people sing:

> The Lord is my strength and my might, and he has become my salvation.
> This is my God, and I will praise him, my father's God, and I will exalt him.

The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name (Exodus 15.2-3).

Israel's God is revealed as a liberator, a God of compassion and justice who frees slaves and defeats the oppressor. How different this is from other ancient Near Eastern national gods. The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian divine warriors sanctioned brutal conquest and exploitation, but here Israel's God defends the vulnerable.

Israel, however, has its own conquest story in the book of Joshua, where the Israelites wage total war aiming to annihilate the Canaanite population (e.g., Joshua 6.21). The biblical text speaks of sacral "utter destruction" to describe this practice: all the spoils of war, including captured humans and animals, are to be destroyed, rendered to God as a sacrifice (Deuteronomy 13.16). Like the divine warrior motif, this "holy war" language is common to Israel and other ancient Near Eastern nations. It is a way of asserting that wars are devoted to God and of claiming, or at least threatening, total defeat of enemies. The continued existence of Canaanites in the biblical record, however, makes clear that Joshua's armies did not exterminate them (Judges 1.1; cf. Joshua 15.63; 16.10; 17.12-13; 19.47; Deut 20.16-18). Historically speaking, Israel did not actually wage wars of total destruction, and scholars now generally agree that Israel's occupation of the Promised Land involved not the unified invasions that the book of Joshua recounts, but chaotic internecine conflicts among various groups, all of whom would have believed that they entered battle with God on their side.

The accounts of Joshua-Judges and the Deuteronomic commands to destroy the Canaanites (Deuteronomy 7.2; 13.15; 20.16-18) were composed centuries after the times that they describe. They are written in such a way as to emphasize the threat of Canaanite customs to Israelite faithfulness: if they had totally vanquished the Canaanites, perhaps the Israelites would have remained faithful and escaped their own downfall. In the present text, however, the legal provision for war of total destruction is framed so that it pertains only to the generation of Joshua (Deuteronomy 20.15-16). From the biblical author's point of view, such warfare is a thing of the past, not to be repeated.

The martial associations embedded in the theology of the Hebrew Bible are of great antiquity, they reflect ancient Near Eastern cultural assumptions, and as the biblical literature develops, they become significantly qualified or mitigated. Still, these elements of the Bible are problematic. Fortunately, the Hebrew Bible also offers a deeply

sustaining vision of peace, an affirmative ground for the work of peacemaking through the centuries.

III. The Meaning of Biblical Shalom

The hope for peace in the Hebrew Bible is a deep longing because warfare was a constant reality in biblical antiquity. People lived in ever-present dread of being defeated by foreign enemies, their cities destroyed and population killed or enslaved—a fate that both the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel and Judah eventually met. Thus peace, Hebrew *shalom*, certainly includes the absence of warfare, but it also involves much more than that.

The basic meaning of the Hebrew term *shalom* is completeness, wholeness, or wellbeing in an all-inclusive sense. In peace, the necessities of life—food, shelter, health, safety—are secure for all. The prophet Micah's vision of peace foresees a time when everyone is provided for and all are free from even the threat of harm:

They shall all sit under their own vines and under their own fig trees,
And no one shall make them afraid;
For the mouth of the LORD of hosts has spoken (Micah 4.4)

Peace, righteousness, and justice come together in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Isaiah 32.16-18). In the beautiful vision of the Psalmist, "righteousness and peace will kiss," they are intimately related (Ps 85.10). The Psalmist also urges, "do good; seek peace, and pursue it" (Ps 34.14). Peace then is not simply still and quiet; it involves deep commitment to working for justice. If any members of a community are harmed, the *shalom* of the whole is broken: there is no peace. Jeremiah, for example, denounces the Jerusalem leadership for proclaiming "Peace, peace, when there is no peace" (Jeremiah 6.14; 8.11; cf. Ezekiel 13.10, 16). He rebukes the people's false confidence: their religiosity, wealth and power will not save them. The people will live in peace only if they act justly and care for the most vulnerable: the alien, the orphan, and the widow (Jeremiah 7.1-7). If Jeremiah were present today, we can imagine him joining in with those who chant: "No justice, no peace!"

God's *shalom* finally extends beyond human society, restoring the entire world to the original harmony and wholeness that God intended for it as part of a good creation (Genesis 1). Isaiah, for example, envisions the world as a peaceable kingdom where even

the violence among animals ends. Predator and prey will live together peaceably, the wolf will lie down with the lamb, and no one will hurt or destroy in God's entire realm (Isaiah 11.6-9).

Biblical peace therefore is truly universal in scope: God wills wholeness for all. In today's world still ravaged by war, we need ever more urgently to understand the biblical role of Israel as the Lord's servant who brings peace to all the nations of the earth. Christ embraced the role of God's servant Israel; Christian believers are called to do so too.

IV. God's Ultimate Purpose: Peace and Reconciliation of the Nations

From the beginning of Israel's story in God's call to Abraham, it is clear that God's blessing of Israel is linked with the blessing of "all the families of the earth" (Genesis 12.1-3; cf. 18.18; 22.18; 28.14). Historically, Israel saw this role in a new light after the Babylonian destruction of 587 BCE, when Jerusalem was burned, the leading population exiled, and Judah as an independent nation was effectively destroyed. Some of the Judeans in Babylonian exile hoped for a restored monarchy and the chance to avenge Judah's humiliation. In the book of Jeremiah (ch. 29), the prophet sends these exiles a word from the Lord: Do not fight, but build houses, plant gardens, have children, and finally:

> seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you,
> and pray to the Lord on its behalf,
> for in its *shalom* you will find your *shalom*" (Jeremiah 29.7).

Jeremiah tells the people to nurture life, to pray for their enemies, and work for reconciliation, even with Babylon, the deadliest foe.

The central section of the book of Isaiah (chs. 40-55), also addresses the exiles in Babylon. Here Israel, crushed and dispossessed by the nations, is reconceived as a "light to the nations" (Isa 42.6; 49.6; 51.4), the Lord's Servant, who for the sake of others yields even to profound suffering (52.13-53.12). The early Church of course recognized the figure of Christ in this depiction of the Lord's Suffering Servant. To grasp Isaiah's meaning for the original addressees in Babylonian exile only enhances our appreciation of the Christian interpretation. God's grace works reconciliation in the world; God's servant ends the cycle of violence by renouncing force, suffering for others rather than returning harm for harm, praying for enemies (Isaiah 53.12b).

Israel's role as a mediator of forgiveness to enemies and of blessing to the nations appears also in the remarkable proclamation of Isaiah 19.24-25:

> On that day Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom the Lord of hosts has blessed, saying, "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my heritage."

Here Egypt, the arch-oppressor of the Exodus, and Assyria, destroyer of the northern kingdom of Israel, are gathered with Israel as recipients of the Lord's blessing.

We could multiply examples of this theological strain in the Hebrew Bible, but perhaps the most memorable is Isaiah 4.2-4. Here Jerusalem is envisioned as a fount of salvation flowing out to all the world. The nations will stream in to receive God's instruction, and the Lord will establish peace among them:

> They shall beat their swords into plowshares,
> And their spears into pruning hooks;
> Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
> Neither shall they learn war any more (Isaiah 2.4; cf. Micah 4.4).

God's ultimate aim is manifest here. The question for people of faith is, how shall we embrace this vision and live as God's servants, sacrificing and working for reconciliation in a world broken by violence?

Postscript: The Sixth Commandment, "You shall not kill"

What is the relevance of the sixth commandment, "You shall not kill" (Exodus 20.13, Deuteronomy 5.17) for ethical reflection on war and peace? In the strictest sense, the language of the commandment refers to murder, as both the NRSV and NIV translations indicate. Killing in war and capital punishment are licit in the Hebrew Bible (Deuteronomy 20.10-18; Exodus 21.12-17; 22.18-20), and biblical Hebrew denotes them with language different from that of the sixth commandment. But Christian tradition has often taken the sixth commandment more fundamentally to convey reverence for human life. Consider the following:

- In biblical perspective, all life belongs to God (Leviticus 17.11) and hence should be regarded as sacred.

- The taking of human life is especially unjustifiable, as humanity is made in the image of God (Genesis 1.27).
- Jesus' Sermon on the Mount affirms the sixth commandment and extends it beyond violence to include even the expression of anger, stressing reconciliation as the most important value (Matthew 5.21-24).

Many Christians therefore conclude, taking the sixth commandment broadly, that it obliges us to renounce all taking of human life, including in war.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Craigie, Peter C. The Problem of War in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Hanson, Paul D. "War and Peace in the Hebrew Bible." Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology Vol. 38, No. 4 (October, 1984), pp. 341-62.

Healey, Joseph P. "Peace: Old Testament," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 5, pp. 206-207.

Hiebert, Theodore. "Warrior, Divine," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 6, pp. 876-880.

Niditch, Susan. War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

War and Hope for Peace in the Hebrew Bible

by
Harold C. Washington
Saint Paul School of Theology

Introduction

The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) makes clear that God's ultimate purpose for the world is peace and reconciliation among the nations, but it also contains troubling passages concerning warfare. How are we to understand the biblical praise of God as a mighty warrior (Exodus 15.3)? How can the biblical God of justice and mercy command wars of annihilation against Israel's enemies (e.g., 1 Samuel 15.2-3)? How can a Scripture containing such elements inspire peacemaking in the world today?

To address these questions, we must recognize that the diverse writings of the Hebrew Scriptures took shape over the time span of a millennium, involving multiple authors and changing historical settings. Diverse points of view concerning war and peace inevitably found their way into these writings. The Hebrew Bible, moreover, is profoundly shaped by the ancient Near Eastern cultures from which it emerged. This is especially true regarding warfare.

The Divine Warrior and "Holy War" in Ancient Israel

In the world of the Hebrew Bible, war and religion were closely related. Ancient Near Eastern peoples such as the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians typically conceived of their high gods as divine warrior kings who accompanied their human kings in battle. Ancient Israel likewise thought of God as a divine warrior:

> Who is this King of Glory?
> The Lord, strong and mighty,
> The Lord, mighty in battle (Psalm 24.8).

Israel's divine warrior, however, first appears in the story of the Exodus, where God saves the fleeing Hebrew slaves from their Egyptian pursuers. After God's defeat of the Egyptian army, the people sing:

> The Lord is my strength and my might, and he has become my salvation.
> This is my God, and I will praise him, my father's God, and I will exalt him.
> The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name (Exodus 15.2-3).

Israel's God is revealed as a liberator, a God of compassion and justice who frees slaves and defeats the oppressor. How different this is from other ancient Near Eastern national gods. The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian divine warriors sanctioned brutal conquest and exploitation, but here Israel's God defends the vulnerable.

Israel, however, has its own conquest story in the book of Joshua, where the Israelites wage total war aiming to annihilate the Canaanite population (e.g., Joshua 6.21). The biblical text speaks of sacral "utter destruction" to describe this practice: all the spoils of war, including captured humans and animals, are to be destroyed, rendered to God as a sacrifice (Deuteronomy 13.16).

Like the divine warrior motif, this "holy war" language is common to Israel and other ancient Near Eastern nations. It is a way of asserting that wars are devoted to God and of claiming, or at least threatening, total defeat of enemies.

The continued existence of Canaanites in the biblical record, however, makes clear that Joshua's armies did not exterminate them (Judges 1.1; cf. Joshua 15.63; 16.10; 17.12-13; 19.47; Deut 20.16-18). Historically speaking, Israel did not actually wage wars of total destruction. Scholars now generally agree that Israel's occupation of the Promised Land involved not the unified invasions that the book of Joshua recounts, but chaotic internecine conflicts among various groups, all of whom would have believed that they entered battle with God on their side.

The accounts of Joshua-Judges and the Deuteronomic commands to destroy the Canaanites (Deuteronomy 7.2; 13.15; 20.16-18) were composed centuries after the times that they describe. They are written in such a way as to emphasize the threat of Canaanite customs to Israelite faithfulness: if they had totally vanquished the Canaanites, perhaps the Israelites would have remained faithful and escaped their own downfall. In the present text, however, the legal provision for war of total destruction is framed so that it pertains only to the generation of Joshua (Deuteronomy 20.15-16). From the biblical author's point of view, such warfare is a thing of the past, not to be repeated.

The martial associations embedded in the theology of the Hebrew Bible are of great antiquity. They reflect ancient Near Eastern cultural assumptions. As the biblical literature develops, they become significantly qualified or mitigated. Still, these elements of the Bible are problematic. Fortunately, the Hebrew Bible also offers a deeply sustaining vision of peace, an affirmative ground for the work of peacemaking through the centuries.

The Meaning of Biblical Shalom

The hope for peace in the Hebrew Bible is a deep longing because warfare was a constant reality in biblical antiquity. People lived in ever-present dread of being defeated by foreign enemies, their cities destroyed and population killed or enslaved—a fate that both the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel and Judah eventually met. Thus peace, Hebrew *shalom*, certainly includes the absence of warfare, but it also involves much more than that.

The basic meaning of the Hebrew term *shalom* is completeness, wholeness, or well-being in an all-inclusive sense. In peace, the necessities of life—food, shelter, health, safety—are secure for all. The prophet Micah's vision of peace foresees a time when everyone is provided for and all are free from even the threat of harm:

> They shall all sit under their own vines and under their own fig trees,
> And no one shall make them afraid;
> For the mouth of the LORD of hosts has spoken (Micah 4.4)

Peace, righteousness, and justice come together in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Isaiah 32.16-18). In the beautiful vision of the Psalmist, "righteousness and peace will kiss," they are intimately related (Ps 85.10). The Psalmist also urges, "do good; seek peace, and pursue it" (Ps 34.14).

Peace then is not simply still and quiet; it involves deep commitment to working for justice. If any members of a community are harmed, the *shalom* of the whole is broken: there is no peace.

Jeremiah, for example, denounces the Jerusalem leadership for proclaiming "Peace, peace, when there is no peace" (Jeremiah 6.14; 8.11; cf. Ezekiel 13.10, 16). He rebukes the people's false confidence: their religiosity, wealth and power will not save them. The people will live in peace only if they act justly and care for the most vulnerable: the alien, the orphan, and the widow (Jeremiah 7.1-7). If Jeremiah were present today, we can imagine him joining in with those who chant: "No justice, no peace!"

God's *shalom* finally extends beyond human society, restoring the entire world to the original harmony and wholeness that God intended for it as part of a good creation (Genesis 1). Isaiah, for example, envisions the world as a peaceable kingdom where even the violence among animals ends. Predator and prey will live together peaceably, the wolf will lie down with the lamb, and no one will hurt or destroy in God's entire realm (Isaiah 11.6-9).

Biblical peace therefore is truly universal in scope: God wills wholeness for all. In today's world still ravaged by war, we need ever more urgently to understand the biblical role of Israel as the Lord's servant who brings peace to all the nations of the earth. Christ embraced the role of God's servant Israel. Christian believers are called to do so too.

God's Ultimate Purpose: Peace and Reconciliation of the Nations

From the beginning of Israel's story in God's call to Abraham, it is clear that God's blessing of Israel is linked with the blessing of "all the families of the earth" (Genesis 12.1-3; cf. 18.18; 22.18; 28.14). Historically, Israel saw this role in a new light after the Babylonian destruction of 587 BCE, when Jerusalem was burned, the leading population exiled, and Judah as an independent nation was effectively destroyed. Some of the Judeans in Babylonian exile hoped for a restored monarchy and the chance to avenge Judah's humiliation.

In the book of Jeremiah (ch. 29), the prophet sends these exiles a word from the Lord: Do not fight, but build houses, plant gardens, have children, and finally:

> seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you,
> and pray to the Lord on its behalf,
> for in its *shalom* you will find your *shalom*" (Jeremiah 29.7).

Jeremiah tells the people to nurture life, to pray for their enemies, and work for reconciliation, even with Babylon, the deadliest foe.

The central section of the book of Isaiah (chs. 40-55), also addresses the exiles in Babylon. Here Israel, crushed and dispossessed by the nations, is reconceived as a "light to the nations" (Isaiah 42.6; 49.6; 51.4), the Lord's Servant, who for the sake of others yields even to profound suffering (52.13-53.12). The early Church, of course, recognized the figure of Christ in this depiction of the Lord's Suffering Servant. To grasp Isaiah's meaning for the original addressees in Babylonian exile only enhances our appreciation of the Christian interpretation. God's grace works reconciliation in the world. God's servant ends the cycle of violence by renouncing force, suffering for others rather than returning harm for harm, praying for enemies (Isaiah 53.12b).

Israel's role as a mediator of forgiveness to enemies and of blessing to the nations appears also in the remarkable proclamation of Isaiah 19.24-25:

> On that day Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth, whom the Lord of hosts has blessed, saying, "Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my heritage."

Here Egypt, the arch-oppressor of the Exodus, and Assyria, destroyer of the northern kingdom of Israel, are gathered with Israel as recipients of the Lord's blessing.

We could multiply examples of this theological strain in the Hebrew Bible, but perhaps the most memorable is Isaiah 4.2-4. Here Jerusalem is envisioned as a fount of salvation flowing out to all the world. The nations will stream in to receive God's instruction, and the Lord will establish peace among them:

> They shall beat their swords into plowshares,
> And their spears into pruning hooks;
> Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
> Neither shall they learn war any more (Isaiah 2.4; cf. Micah 4.4).

God's ultimate aim is manifest here. The question for people of faith is, how shall we embrace this vision and live as God's servants, sacrificing and working for reconciliation in a world broken by violence?

Postscript: The Sixth Commandment, "You shall not kill"

What is the relevance of the sixth commandment, "You shall not kill" (Exodus 20.13, Deuteronomy 5.17) for ethical reflection on war and peace? In the strictest sense, the language of the commandment refers to murder, as both the NRSV and NIV translations indicate. Killing in war and capital punishment are licit in the Hebrew Bible (Deuteronomy 20.10-18; Exodus 21.12-17; 22.18-20), and biblical Hebrew denotes them with language different from that of the sixth commandment.

Christian tradition, though, has often taken the sixth commandment more fundamentally to convey reverence for human life. Consider the following:

- In biblical perspective, all life belongs to God (Leviticus 17.11) and hence should be regarded as sacred.
- The taking of human life is especially unjustifiable, as humanity is made in the image of God (Genesis 1.27).
- Jesus' Sermon on the Mount affirms the sixth commandment and extends it beyond violence to include even the expression of anger, stressing reconciliation as the most important value (Matthew 5.21-24).

Many Christians therefore conclude, taking the sixth commandment broadly, that it obliges us to renounce all taking of human life, including in war.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Craigie, Peter C. The Problem of War in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Hanson, Paul D. "War and Peace in the Hebrew Bible." Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology Vol. 38, No. 4 (October, 1984), pp. 341-62.

Healey, Joseph P. "Peace: Old Testament," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 5, pp. 206-207.

Hiebert, Theodore. "Warrior, Divine," in David. N. Freedman, ed. The Anchor Bible Dictionary. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 6, pp. 876-880.

Niditch, Susan. War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

This article is part of a project on "The Theology of War and Peace". For further information, go to http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm. Or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C.20036 or at mupwj@mupwj.org.