

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#merton>

**Blessed Are The Meek:
The Roots of Christian Nonviolence**

by Thomas Merton

Nonviolence is perhaps the most exacting of all forms of struggle, not only because it demands first of all that one be ready to suffer evil and even face the threat of death without violent retaliation, but because it excludes mere transient self-interest from its considerations. In a very real sense, those who practice nonviolent resistance must commit themselves not to the defense of their own interests or even those of a particular group: they must commit themselves to the defense of objective truth and right and above all of *human beings*.

Read more... <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/40merton.html>

[end box]

[box]

{This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#resources>}

Theologies of Liberation

Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm>

Change "Liberation Theology" to "Theologies of Liberation"

Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#liberationtheology>

Change "Liberation Theology" to "Theologies of Liberation"

Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm>

In the top index and the heading change "Liberation Theology" to "Theologies of Liberation"

Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#latinamerica>

Add "F." to author's name: Kevin F. Burke

For "Excerpt from first paragraph to be added", substitute the following:

On the evening of March 24, 1980, in the tiny Central American country of El Salvador, a hired gunman stole into the chapel of the Divine Providence Hospital during the celebration of the Eucharist and fired a fatal bullet into the heart of the Catholic archbishop of San Salvador, Oscar Romero. In the eyes of many, Romero was a prophet whose ringing denunciations of injustice and vigorous defense of the poor placed him at odds with the right-wing ruling elites and led him to a martyr's death. Others, however, saw him as a well-intentioned but misguided dupe who fell under the spell of leftists fighting to overthrow the Salvadoran government.

Woven through these various interpretations of Romero's legacy one finds frequent references to a movement called "liberation theology". It, too, has garnered a wide range of assessments. Its enemies claim that it endorses violent revolution under the guise of redressing social injustices. As such, they conclude, it represents a (communist) wolf in (religious) sheep's clothing. By contrast, advocates insist that it embodies the values of Jesus; its ethical and apocalyptic sense of urgency reflects, they argue, the earliest spirit of Christianity.

[Read more....](http://www.mupwj.org/burke.htm) [<http://www.mupwj.org/burke.htm>]

This goes to a new page for inserting the attached "Burke for web page.doc"

Set up is like <http://www.mupwj.org/hernandez.htm>, including the blue lines forming a box.

Create a PDF document, attached as "Burke PDF.doc".

Changes and additions to Tradition: Christian History

Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm>

1. For the index under the heading "Tradition: Christian History"

(a) Retain "Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace"

(b) Eliminate "Holy War" and "Within Methodism"

(c) Add the following entries so that the index reads with linkages to below as follows:

▶ Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace

<http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#warandpeace> (retained)

▶ Crusades <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#crusades>

▶ Orthodox <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#orthodox>

▶ Reformation and Peace Churches

<http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#reformation>

▶ Evangelical United Brethren <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#eub>

▶ Methodism <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#methodism>

2. Link the last five items to boxes below with title and text as follows:

Crusades (instead of Holy War)

To be added

Orthodox

To be added

Reformation and Peace Churches

To be added

War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition

[See below]

Methodism (instead of Within Methodism)

To be added.

3. The EUB box should be as follows:

War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition by J. Steven O'Malley

Based in a German-American revival movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) have left a record of involvement in issues of war and peace within the context of their North American environment and in their global missionary outreach.

Read more... [Link to <http://www.mupwj.org/eub.htm>]

4. (a) <http://www.mupwj.org/eub.htm> is a new web page. It is attached as O'Malley for web page.doc.

This should be formatted like <http://www.mupwj.org/dealingwithadversaries.htm>.

(b) This web page should be linked to a PDF document, sent to you as O'Malley - PDF.dpc

Changes in the Orthodox section.

Go to

1. Remove

Nonviolence and Peace Traditions In Early & Eastern Christianity by Fr. John McGuckin

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....

[Read more....](#)

2. In its place put the following:

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-Isaiah applies in its fullness to Christ, the 'king of peace'.

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'....

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. 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' and with all men.

Read more.... [<http://www.incommunion.org/articles/for-the-peace-from-above/the-orthodox-church-and-peace>]

3. Under also see:

a. Remove the Clement reference (which is covered above)

b. In its place insert:

Nonviolence and Peace Traditions In Early & Eastern Christianity by Fr. John McGuckin
[<http://incommunion.org/articles/essays/nonviolence-and-peace-traditions>]

c. Don't show any of the URLs. They aren't necessary because the linkage is provided by underlining.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/Christianresponses.htm>. . Heading as shown here. It links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition.htm#long>

Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace

by D. Stephen Long
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary

PDF View or print
this section

Any discussion of the early development of Christian responses to war and peace is complex and open to criticism. This is largely due to the fact that no simple or consistent response was possible. The early Church did not have a commission that gathered and issued a position statement on a Christian's participation or non-participation in war like the modern church does. It took some time for that kind of unity to develop before specific pronouncements could be made.

The Jerusalem Council

There was, however, the early Jerusalem council which is noted in Acts 15 where the Church met to determine what should be asked of Gentiles now grafted on to the Jewish covenant. James offered the following conclusion to that council: "Therefore I have reached the decision that we should not trouble those Gentiles who are turning to God, but we should write to them to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood" (Acts 15: 19).

Because Jesus did not overthrow the law of holiness but fulfilled it, the early Christians had to address what aspects of the Jewish holiness laws Gentiles would be asked to observe. Three commands were still binding: avoid participating in things associated with idols, fornication, and eating things that were not properly prepared. Or at least that is most likely what was intended by the third conclusion – "from whatever has been strangled and from blood."

However, some in the early Church interpreted these three conclusions from the Jerusalem Council as commands to avoiding apostasy (idolatry), fornication, and killing. The latter was a misunderstanding of the Jerusalem Council, but nevertheless consistent with the Sixth Commandment given to Moses: "Thou shalt not kill (or murder)." These three prohibited acts became the three grave sins for which the early Christians first suggested no repentance was possible after baptism, and then gradually permitted one repentance after baptism and finally would permit repentance for these sins as long as it was genuine.

Participation in War

The Jerusalem Council did not make a ruling on how Christians should or should not participate in war. The later tradition did interpret the Council's ruling as applying to

killing. Along with other biblical claims, such as Jesus' charge "to render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's" as well as the teaching in the Sermon on the Mount to turn the other cheek, the early Christians had to discern how best to witness to Christ's life, death and resurrection through participation or non-participation in violence.

To simplify matters greatly, let me suggest that as the Christian tradition developed, two passages of Scripture set the stage for various responses to the question of Christian participation in warfare. They are both found in the 22nd chapter of Luke and occur at the Last Supper and in Gethesemne. In the first story Jesus tells his disciples that even though he sent them out previously without "purse, bag or sandals" and that they lacked nothing, now they should sell their purse or bag and buy a sword. The disciples tell him they have two swords with them, and Jesus responds, "It is enough." In the second vignette, Jesus is being betrayed in the garden and one of the disciples whips out the sword and cuts off the ear of the slave of the high priest. Jesus undoes the violence and says "No more of this."

Two Swords and Just War Tradition

In the Christian tradition, the first story developed into the doctrine of the two swords. It stated that there are two swords by which God governs creation; one is wielded by the secular power and one by the Church. The secular sword is real; it is the means of violence, which should serve the end of justice. The Church's sword is allegorical; it is the power of "binding and loosing," or excommunication. It makes judgments as to what constitutes the holiness of life that the faith requires (See Matthew 16 and 18). Later in the Christian tradition, this meant that the Church had an obligation to determine the limits against which Christians could not transgress when they went to war as well as how they should wage war once they were in it.

Perhaps it was Bishop Ambrose (c. 340 – 397) who first developed this teaching by drawing on the wisdom of the pagan philosopher Cicero. Cicero wrote that people owe each other obligations even in wartime, especially not to kill the innocent or to use means that exceeded the justness of the end for which they fought. Ambrose developed this teaching for what became known as the Christian just war tradition. It permits Christians to participate in war, but it limits what they can do. Christians must not abandon Jesus' command to love their enemies.

For someone like St. Augustine (354 - 430) war is permissible only to defend against an unjust attack on one's neighbor and not to defend one's self. By the time we come to Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225 – 1274), the use of violence to defend one's self is possible not because one is directly defending one's self, but because by defending one's self one is indirectly defending others who depend upon you for their sustenance. But notice that the notion of mutual deterrence, torture, total warfare, genocide, terrorism or preemptive war – which are primarily modern inventions – violate just war teaching.

Most Christian churches, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutherans and Presbyterians for example, stand in the just war tradition. This teaching is also shared among Jews,

Muslims and Christians. We have not always practiced it even though we were commanded against unjust killing in the Sixth Commandment. But simply because we do not practice well our principles does not mean they should be ignored. That gives us all the more reason to abide by them.

Pacifist Tradition

The Roman Catholic Church once taught that pacifists were the enemies of humankind and that war was an obligation if it was a just war. However, this is no longer an official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. It now has a pacifist tradition as do what are called the historical peace churches. These churches argue that pacifism, or at least a Christian refusal to participate in violence such as abortion, capital punishment and warfare, bears witness to the most ancient tradition of thought in Christian tradition. They make nonviolence a necessary characteristic of Christian discipleship.

This brings us to the second vignette in Luke 24 when Jesus told his disciples “no more of this” when one of them (Peter) used the sword. For some in the early church, when Jesus took the sword away from this disciple, he took it away from every Christian. In fact, prior to the fourth century, the overwhelming testimony of the Church’s bishops, pastors and theologians was that they were not to be soldiers. Their political witness in the world was to be consistent with Jesus’ own, who did not seize power through the sword but endured the cross. For this reason, he was vindicated and revealed as the true Lord of all. As his obedient subjects, the sword has been taken away from us and we must follow their gentle Saviour by way of the Cross rather than the sword.

Not every theologian or bishop of the early church made such an explicit witness against Christian participation in warfare. But notice the following witnesses. Justin Martyr (c. 100 – c. 165) an early Christian apologist wrote,

“We [Christians] who had been filled with mutual slaughter and every wickedness, have each one – all the world over – changed the instruments of war, the swords into ploughs and the spears into farming instruments, and we cultivate piety righteousness, love for men, faith and hope which is from the Father Himself through the Crucified One.”¹

In his essay explaining idolatry, Tertullian (160-225) an African Church father gives us one of the most explicit statements that warfare is impermissible to Christians. He wrote:

“But how will a Christian war, nay, how will he serve even in peace without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed, still the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier.”²

Origen, (185-254), an Alexandrine church father, made a similar argument and explained that the Christians could not participate in violence because their origins were not like the

¹Quoted in Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War (New York: Seabury Press, 1982, p. 61.

² Tertullian, “On Idolatry” in *AnteNicene Fathers*, p. 73.

origins of all other nations. They were not founded in an act of violence against others, but by the cross endured by Jesus. He wrote,

If a revolt had been the cause of the Christians existing as a separate group, the lawgiver of the Christians would not have forbidden entirely the taking of human life. He taught that it was never right for his disciples to go so far against a man, even if he should be very wicked; for he did not consider it compatible with his inspired legislation to allow the taking of human life in any form at all. Moreover, if Christians had originated from a revolt, they would not have submitted to laws that were so gentle which caused them to be killed as sheep and made then unable even to defend themselves against their persecutors.³

And St. Athanasius (296-373), one of the leading bishops responsible for setting forth Christian orthodoxy, explains why it is Christians should believe Jesus was fully divine because of the peace his death accomplished.

Who, then, is he that has done this, or who is he that has united in peace men that hated one another, save the beloved Son of the Father, the common Saviour of all, even Jesus Christ, who by his own love underwent all things for our salvation? For even from of old it was prophesied of the peace he was to usher in, where the Scripture says: 'They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their pikes into sickles, and nation shall not take the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' And this is at least incredible, inasmuch as even now those Barbarians who have an innate savagery of manners . . . and cannot endure to be a single hour without weapons; but when they hear the teaching of Christ, straightway instead of fighting they turn to husbandry, and instead of arming their hands with weapons they raise them in prayer, and in a word, in place of fighting among themselves henceforth they arm against the devil and against evil spirits, subduing these by self-restraints and virtue of soul. Now this is at once a proof of the divinity of the Saviour, since what men could not learn among idols they have learned from him.⁴

In what is called the Hippolytean canons, which were once attributed to Hippolytus who lived from 170-236, but most likely written much later, we find rules for church membership and discipline that refuse to allow soldiers into the communion of faith. It states, "A person who has accepted the power of killing, or a soldier, may never be received [into the church] at all."⁵

Changing Attitudes

What do these early witnesses tell us about the early Christian's attitudes toward war and peace? One would be hard pressed to find a theologian or bishop of the church prior to St. Ambrose of Milan (339-397) who taught that Christians should be allowed to participate in warfare. Many said nothing about it. Many theologians, as the above quotes note, spoke against it. Some argued that those who wanted to be part of the faith must abandon

³ Origin, *Contra Celsum*, 3.7.

⁴ *On the Incarnation*, Library of Christian Classics, p. 106.

⁵ Cadoux, p. 122.

it. We do know that Christians were found in the military and that some refused soldiering, even though it cost them their lives to lay down their swords. This history is relatively non-controversial.

The controversy begins when we ask why? Why was the early church on the whole opposed to Christian participation in warfare?

Some argue that this primarily had to do with the fact that soldiers during this time were called upon to make sacrifices to the Roman gods and thus the problem with military service was primarily idolatry. But the quotes from Tertullian and Origen above suggest otherwise. For them the refusal of Christian participation in war and violence was directly related to the fact that Jesus inaugurated a new people who were commanded not to use the sword. They were to live holy lives that differed from the violence around them.

This began to change about the fourth century. The conversion of the emperor Constantine is often viewed as the key reason for the change, but the historical record is much more complex than simply blaming Constantine for a transition from the Church's non-participation in warfare to an enthusiastic participation. Nevertheless, we can invoke the conversion of Constantine as a symbol for what was a change with respect to the Christian Church's relationship to the warmaking power of governments. We became comfortable with it and merged "throne" and "altar."

In Our Era

Now in our post-Christendom era, it once again requires an intentional effort to be a Christian. It can no longer be acceptable that simply being a citizen of a so-called Christian nation makes one a Christian. While some bemoan this loss, others of us see in it a gift from God where the Church is given the opportunity to recover its witness without asserting the power of the sword. Refusing to participate in warfare and violence, as Jesus did and the early Church bore witness to, may be a crucial step in cultivating our own witness in this post-Christendom era.

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.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm>.

This links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/quadrilateral.htm#experience>.

Experience: Alternatives to War

> **Nonviolent Action** [<http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#nonviolentaction>]

> **20th Century Prophets and Theologians** [<http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#prophets>]

> **Diplomacy and International Law** [<http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#diplomacy>]

In the Wesleyan Quadrilateral practical experience provides insights on the applicability of scripture to daily living. Here we are particularly interested in experience with peaceable methods for dealing with war and other conflict situations. We are interested not only in what religious people do but also in secular undertakings that achieve the intent of scripture.

We first look at *nonviolent action*, particularly how it emerged during the 20th century as a practical tool for dealing with conflict and oppression. We consider some prominent *20th century prophets and theologians* who were actively engaged in public affairs. We touch on how *diplomacy and international law* prevent and settle conflict.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#nonviolentaction>]

Nonviolent Action [like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

During the two millennia of Christianity there is a continuous history of nonviolent responses to conflict situations. It began with Jesus and the apostles, continued in the early Christian church, and remained an approach used by Christians over the centuries. Secular society has also produced many examples of nonviolent action. The 20th century, which saw two world wars and many smaller ones, also saw the emergence of active nonviolence as a means for dealing with military aggression, political oppression, and colonialism.

Read more. [<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm>.]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#prophets>]

20th Century Prophets and Theologians [like Nonviolent Action above]

To be written

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#diplomacy>]

Diplomacy and International Law {Like Nonviolent Action above}

To be written.

Home page changes

New box for home page:

Study and Discuss

Theology of
War and Peace

click here

<http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofWarAndPeace.htm>

Could this be changed to all small letters?

<http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm>

New drop-down box:

<u>Theology of War and Peace</u>	http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofWarAndPeace.htm or http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm
Wesleyan Quadrilateral	http://www.mupwj.org/quadrilateral.htm
Scripture	http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm
Tradition	http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm
Reason	http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm
Experience	http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm
Study and Dialogue	http://www.mupwj.org/participate.htm
Conference	http://www.mupwj.org/conference.htm

A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism

by George Hunsinger

What is a Christian pacifist?

A Christian pacifist is someone who believes that in all situations of human life Jesus expects nothing less from his disciples than love. This love is especially marked by a spirit of forgiveness. Against those who inflict injury it refuses to retaliate, but instead responds with benevolence. "Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you; bless those who hurt you; pray for those who abuse you" (Luke 6:27-28).

Do Christian pacifists believe that the love expected by Jesus commits them to nonviolence?

Christian pacifists have never been able to understand how they could love their enemies by killing them. They believe that the love expected by Jesus involves more than just an inward attitude. It requires the corresponding action. Christian pacifists, therefore, believe they must be willing if necessary to lay down their own lives, but not to take the life of another. "No human being has greater love than this, that one lay down one's life for one's friends" (John 15:13).

What is the biblical basis for Christian pacifism?

The biblical basis for Christian pacifism is not primarily the Sermon on the Mount, nor even the life of Jesus. Its primary basis is the theology of the cross. For the cross shows us how God deals with God's enemies. Quite amazingly, they are not destroyed, but met with an abundance of love. Christian pacifists believe that God's nonviolent love, even to the point of death on a cross, sets the norm for all our behavior. We are not to respond otherwise to God and one another than God has responded to us. "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us While we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Rom. 5:8, 10).

Doesn't Christian pacifism retreat from social responsibility?

Some of the most socially responsible people the church has ever produced have been Christian pacifists. Dorothy Day, Martin Luther King, Jr., and A.J. Muste, for example, were all Christian pacifists. Christian nonviolent resistance to Nazism was widespread and often had significant results. In Brazil today, base communities are actively protecting and extending the rights of urban workers and landless peasants. For such Christians, the question is not whether but how to oppose social injustice. Their Christian pacifism has allowed them, when necessary, to be as militant as Jesus when he denounced hypocrisy and drove the money changers from the temple. What Christian pacifism does not allow is strategies based on killing. What it encourages is the formation of socially responsible communities dedicated to the creative use of nonviolence. "Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good" (Rom. 12:21).

Isn't nonviolence ineffective as a means of social change and national defense?

In nonviolence, as Christian pacifists understand it, there can be no such thing as defeat. For they regard nonviolence as a matter of faithfulness to Jesus Christ, from whose love no tribulation

will ever separate us. Christian faithfulness and political effectiveness are not incompatible, but neither are they always the same. Faithfulness can lead to effective action in the world, including nonviolent strategies for social change and national defense. What Christian pacifists question is the supposed "effectiveness" of violent strategies, in which cycles of retaliation and counter-retaliation are merely perpetuated. Nevertheless, when faced with hard choices, Christian pacifists are convinced that nothing surpasses the importance of faithfulness to Jesus Christ, and therefore that even the possible tragedies of nonviolence are better than violent success. "Seek first God's kingdom and God's righteousness, and all . . . things shall be yours as well" (Matthew 6:33)

lit the nuclear age how can pacifist and nonpacifist Christians work together for peace?

The nuclear weapon is not a weapon. It serves no rational purpose. It cannot be used without the massive and indiscriminate killing of noncombatants. It carries such grave risks as poisoning the environment irretrievably and exterminating human life on earth. By the standards of the historic "just war theory," to say nothing of more stringent standards like the Sermon on the Mount, the nuclear weapon is intrinsically immoral and has no right to exist. In a world bristling with nuclear weapons, all Christians, whether pacifist or nonpacifist, are called to oppose the escalating arms race and to strive for the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth. "Behold, how good and pleasant it is when brothers and sisters dwell in unity" (Psalm 133:1).

What is needed for the emergence of a peace church today?

The way for us to increase our commitment to peace is for us to increase our commitment to Jesus Christ. Increasing our commitment to Jesus Christ will lead us to that godly grief that produces repentance and brings no regret (II Con. 7:10). No peace church can emerge in America today which does not first grapple with its own fears and complicity—but a church which passes through the fires of self examination under the judgment of God's Word will renew its strength, and mount up with wings like eagles (Isa. 40:31). It will receive the courage to affirm what is needed for the emergence of a peace church today, for it will have recognized at last that saying "yes" to God without any "no" means saying "no" to nuclear weapons without any "yes." "And when he drew near and saw the city he wept over it saying, 'Would that even today you knew the things that make for peace!' " (Luke 19:41).

"A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism" was originally titled "A Short Catechism for Peace". It was written in 1985 by George Hunsinger for the United Church of Christ Peace Fellowship, which gave permission to the Fellowship of Reconciliation to reproduce it. The FOR has extended permission to this website.

This article is posted as 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.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/hunsinger.htm>. It links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#hunsinger>]

A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism

by George Hunsinger

PDF View or print
this section

What is a Christian pacifist?

A Christian pacifist is someone who believes that in all situations of human life Jesus expects nothing less from his disciples than love. This love is especially marked by a spirit of forgiveness. Against those who inflict injury it refuses to retaliate, but instead responds with benevolence. "Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you; bless those who hurt you; pray for those who abuse you" (Luke 6:27-28).

Do Christian pacifists believe that the love expected by Jesus commits them to nonviolence?

Christian pacifists have never been able to understand how they could love their enemies by killing them. They believe that the love expected by Jesus involves more than just an inward attitude. It requires the corresponding action. Christian pacifists, therefore, believe they must be willing if necessary to lay down their own lives, but not to take the life of another. "No human being has greater love than this, that one lay down one's life for one's friends" (John 15:13).

What is the biblical basis for Christian pacifism?

The biblical basis for Christian pacifism is not primarily the Sermon on the Mount, nor even the life of Jesus. Its primary basis is the theology of the cross. For the cross shows us how God deals with God's enemies. Quite amazingly, they are not destroyed, but met with an abundance of love. Christian pacifists believe that God's nonviolent love, even to the point of death on a cross, sets the norm for all our behavior. We are not to respond otherwise to God and one another than God has responded to us. "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us While we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Rom. 5:8, 10).

Doesn't Christian pacifism retreat from social responsibility?

Some of the most socially responsible people the church has ever produced have been Christian pacifists. Dorothy Day, Martin Luther King, Jr., and A.J. Muste, for example, were all Christian pacifists. Christian nonviolent resistance to Nazism was widespread and often had significant results. In Brazil today, base communities are actively protecting and extending the rights of urban workers and landless peasants. For such Christians, the question is not whether but how to oppose social injustice. Their Christian pacifism has allowed them, when necessary, to be as militant as Jesus when he denounced hypocrisy and drove the money changers from the temple.

What Christian pacifism does not allow is strategies based on killing. What it encourages is the formation of socially responsible communities dedicated to the creative use of nonviolence. "Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good" (Rom. 12:21).

Isn't nonviolence ineffective as a means of social change and national defense?

In nonviolence, as Christian pacifists understand it, there can be no such thing as defeat. For they regard nonviolence as a matter of faithfulness to Jesus Christ, from whose love no tribulation will ever separate us. Christian faithfulness and political effectiveness are not incompatible, but neither are they always the same. Faithfulness can lead to effective action in the world, including nonviolent strategies for social change and national defense. What Christian pacifists question is the supposed "effectiveness" of violent strategies, in which cycles of retaliation and counter-retaliation are merely perpetuated. Nevertheless, when faced with hard choices, Christian pacifists are convinced that nothing surpasses the importance of faithfulness to Jesus Christ, and therefore that even the possible tragedies of nonviolence are better than violent success. "Seek first God's kingdom and God's righteousness, and all . . . things shall be yours as well" (Matthew 6:33)

lit the nuclear age how can pacifist and nonpacifist Christians work together for peace?

The nuclear weapon is not a weapon. It serves no rational purpose. It cannot be used without the massive and indiscriminate killing of noncombatants. It carries such grave risks as poisoning the environment irretrievably and exterminating human life on earth. By the standards of the historic "just war theory," to say nothing of more stringent standards like the Sermon on the Mount, the nuclear weapon is intrinsically immoral and has no right to exist. In a world bristling with nuclear weapons, all Christians, whether pacifist or nonpacifist, are called to oppose the escalating arms race and to strive for the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth. "Behold, how good and pleasant it is when brothers and sisters dwell in unity" (Psalm 133:1).

What is needed for the emergence of a peace church today?

The way for us to increase our commitment to peace is for us to increase our commitment to Jesus Christ. Increasing our commitment to Jesus Christ will lead us to that godly grief that produces repentance and brings no regret (II Con. 7:10). No peace church can emerge in America today which does not first grapple with its own fears and complicity—but a church which passes through the fires of self examination under the judgment of God's Word will renew its strength, and mount up with wings like eagles (Isa. 40:31). It will receive the courage to affirm what is needed for the emergence of a peace church today, for it will have recognized at last that saying "yes" to God without any "no" means saying "no" to nuclear weapons without any "yes." "And when he drew near and saw the city he wept over it saying, 'Would that even today you knew the things that make for peace!' " (Luke 19:41).

"A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism" was originally titled "A Short Catechism for Peace". It was written in 1985 by George Hunsinger for the United Church of Christ Peace Fellowship,

which gave permission to the Fellowship of Reconciliation to reproduce it. The FOR has extended permission to this website.

This article is posted as 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 Tradition and Christian Discipleship

Daniel M. Bell, Jr.

Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary

Setting forth the criteria of the Just War Tradition (JWT) can be relatively simple and straightforward, as evidenced by the abundance of treatments, secular and religious, that purport to present the tradition in the space of a few hundred words. The criteria of the tradition can be summarized as follows:

Justice in Going to War

1. Legitimate Authority
2. Just Cause
3. Right Intent
4. Last Resort
5. Probability of Success

Justice in Waging War

6. Non-Combatant Immunity
7. Proportionality

There are, however, several difficulties with simplistic presentations of the criteria. First, in spite of the fact that the tradition is frequently presented as a “theory,” there is no set, agreed upon, universally recognized “theory” of just war. Different thinkers and different eras describe the criteria of the tradition differently. Some, for example, follow the US Catholic Bishops who in their 1983 pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace*, identify a criterion of “comparative justice.” Others might add “proportionality” as a distinct criterion of justice in going to war.

Second, even the widely acknowledged criteria like those listed above are subject to debate regarding exactly how they are properly understood and implemented.

Third, the tradition is a *living* effort. It continues to evolve in the face of new realities. For example, there is today significant pressure to broaden the criterion of “legitimate authority” from its traditional locus in a national ruler to encompass the requirement of international authorization. Likewise, the reality that future wars are likely to include not only wars fought between recognizable national bodies but also may include wars fought between a nation and a more elusive, decentralized, international or at least non-national entity challenges traditional renderings of various criteria.

Two Just War Traditions

In addition to these difficulties, there is another more significant reason that commonplace presentations of the tradition are problematic. Namely, they assume that just war as a Christian discipline, as a form of discipleship, is no different from popular, secular renditions of the tradition. This is to say, it is taken for granted that what I will call the modern, legalistic “check-list” approach to just war is synonymous with the just war discipline that was nurtured and developed by Christian leaders and theologians such as Augustine, Aquinas, and Vitoria for the sake of guiding the Christian community in its life and witness in the world.

In fact, there is both significant overlap and divergence between the two approaches to the JWT.

In the account of criteria that follows, I will highlight some of those similarities and differences and suggest the difference the differences make for Christian reflection on and practice of just war. I begin by setting forth rather starkly, the basic difference between the two approaches.

Just war as a form of Christian discipleship has as its primary frame of reference the Christian community. By this I mean that the JWT developed as a guideline for how Christians embody love of neighbor in the midst of warfare. It developed as an extension of the *character* of the Christian community, of the community's on-going, day-to-day concern for justice and love of neighbor in the whole of its life. In other words, the Christian community engages in just war as a natural expression of its daily concern for its neighbors, for peace and justice.

What this emphasis on character means is that a people who are not virtuous, who are not committed to justice and genuine concern for their neighbor in their daily life, could not wage a war justly, even if there was a just cause, because they lack the character required to wage war justly. After all, under the stresses of warfare, a people who lack the requisite character will not be able to sustain the discipline that the criteria outline.

Just war as a legalistic check-list has as its frame of reference nation-states and international law. It presupposes no particular community. Likewise, character matters little. Anyone – regardless of their character, of whether they truly care about justice – may invoke the tradition. As long as I can check off each criterion, I may wage a just war. It matters little if my character is just or loving; it matters little if my intent in war is consistent with or grows out of an on-going, day-to-day concern with justice and love of neighbor. Indeed, I may be thoroughly vicious, but so long as I can check off each of the criteria, I can wage a war and call it just.

What difference does this distinction make? Generally speaking, when the JWT is no longer understood as a practice that grows out of the character of a community and it becomes a legalistic checklist that any scoundrel can use, Christians – and the tradition – become that much more vulnerable to manipulation by those who are adept at invoking the language of just war as a cover for wars driven by something other than a genuine concern for neighbor and justice. More concretely, as we shall see, when the tradition is used as a check-list disconnected from issues of character, the criteria lose much of their force. The discipline becomes much more lax and permissive.

The Criteria

1. Legitimate Authority

At the first level, legitimate authority refers to who may *wage* a war. The Christian tradition has long held that God alone has authority over life and death, and the just war tradition holds that God shares that authority with the prince, the head of state (cf. Romans 13:1ff.). Thus, the JWT holds that heads of state may wage war. It is worth noting that, to date, the tradition has not required international authorization, although there is increasing pressure in that direction and as the tradition develops it may indeed incorporate such an expectation.

Note that one expectation of a just war is that the legitimate authority will actually declare war. That a war be declared is important in that it provides the enemy with clarity regarding

conditions under which the fighting will stop.

At a second level, legitimate authority concerns who *determines* if a particular war is just. The modern, legalistic approach basically states that the ruler decides. Here is one point where that approach differs from the Christian tradition. The Christian tradition is more complicated, involving three points of decision. First, the prince, in consultation with wise advisors, determines the justness of a war. The assumption here is that the head of state is the office particularly charged with looking after the common good. And this is a matter as much of character as information.

Second, individual soldiers bear some level of responsibility for deciding on the justness of a war. Specifically, soldiers owe the prince the benefit of a doubt. They should defer to the head of state, unless they are sure the war is unjust, in which case they should refuse to fight. Third, the church bears responsibility for deciding on the justness of a war. Indeed, as the JWT developed, it entailed the church holding Christian princes and Christian soldiers accountable for the discipline.

2. *Just Cause*

Here the focus is on the enemy's behavior. Just cause has traditionally been spelled out in terms of the defense of an innocent third party, understood either as coming to the aid of an unjustly attacked neighbor or a government's defense of its own populace from unjust attack. In this regard, the JWT has not sanctioned self-defense. Indeed, the great thinkers of the JWT within Christianity were clear that the JWT did not sanction personal, lethal self-defense.

Here the tradition treats the issue of preventative and preemptive war. The bulk of the tradition prohibits *preemptive* strikes. However, there is a minor strand that permits preemptive strike *in extremis*, if the threat is both imminent and grave (the very survival of nation is at risk). A *preventative* war (one based on a threat that is not imminent, but speculative or merely possible at some point in the future) is absolutely prohibited.

3. *Right Intention*

Here the focus is on the would-be just warrior's behavior. And it is here that the difference between the two traditions – Christian and legalistic check-list – can be seen clearly.

The legalistic check-list approach reduces right intent to what might be called an “unreflective peace” and a disavowal of revenge. In other words, the criterion is met when a potential warring party asserts they desire peace and not revenge. Questions of character, consistency and the selective appeal to the tradition are not raised.

In contrast, just war as Christian discipleship involves a thicker account of right intent, revolving around issues of character, which is seen in three ways. First, right intent is a matter of a “just peace.” As Augustine noted long ago, everyone desires peace; wars are always fought for peace – for a peace that better suits the aggressor. Hence, it is not sufficient to be for peace. One must intend a peace that is truly just, and not merely self-serving.

Second, right intent entails that even in warfare we love our enemy. Anger is permitted, but not hatred. The JWT does not exempt Christians from loving their enemy neighbor. Indeed, in waging war, the right intent is not to destroy the enemy but to bring the benefits of a just peace to the enemy.

Third, right intent entails what can be called “complete justice.” How does one measure something as evasive as intent? Intent is evaluated by considering character and consistency. Thus, evaluating intent with regard to war might entail asking: Is this a people who characteristically and consistently seek justice? Is justice only selectively enforced? Is it carried out to completion? Complete justice entails looking forward – how justice will be implemented – and backwards – bringing the past before the bar of justice. In this regard, right intent is related to Matthew 7:5: “First take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your neighbor’s eye.” Thus, right intent may involve confessing one’s own complicity in past injustice as one confronts present injustice. This thicker understanding of right intent as complete justice provides space for considerations of “exit-strategies,” of justice after the shooting stops as well.

4. Last Resort

This criterion is pretty straight forward. The resort to arms can never be a first response to aggression; rather it must always be a last resort, after other feasible means of resolving the dispute (mediation, negotiation, arbitration, international tribunals, etc) have failed. This, of course, is a judgment call. But implicit in the criteria is a commitment to diplomacy in good faith, even if one’s opponent apparently is not engaged in good faith diplomacy.

5. Probability of Success

This criterion means that the goals of a stated war must be attainable. One can only enter into war if there is a likelihood of success. For example, if one has a just cause but clearly cannot win a war, then one is not justified in going to war. In such a situation, one must find other ways short of war to resist or address the injustice.

Closely related to the likelihood of success is the principle that a just war is a limited war for a limited end. A just war is waged to address a particular, declared injustice. Just wars are not waged to wipe out an ideology, to rid the world of evil or attain absolute security. Such goals are neither limited nor attainable. Accordingly, such goals are characteristic of a crusade, not a just war.

Under the heading of probability of success questions concerning the cost of success may also be raised (what traditionally identified as “proportionality” and is sometimes considered a distinct criterion). When considering waging war, one should consider the risks and harms attendant to warfare, including further destabilization of world, increased insecurity, the sacrifice of other values in the pursuit of war, the cost in terms of life and resources, etc. The tradition is clear: if the cost of warfare exceeds the cost of enduring the injustice, one may be obliged to refrain from waging war.

6. Non-Combatant Immunity / Discrimination

This is the first of the criteria that deals with justice in the conduct of warfare. It establishes that one cannot intentionally or directly kill noncombatants. Although the criterion is typically stated in this negative form; it can be stated positively. This criterion condemns civilian deaths that occur due to sheer lack of concern or neglect of the criterion, or out of negligence. In other words, the criterion suggests that one has a positive duty to distinguish civilians from soldiers.

There are several dimensions to this criterion. First, it addresses the matter of targets. One cannot target civilians for the sake of reducing combatant losses. (Fighting a war justly may mean *more* soldiers die, that the war lasts longer and is more costly than if it were fought unjustly). One cannot legitimately target the civilian infrastructure. Note that politicians are legitimate targets, whereas soldiers on leave and POW's are not.

At the level of targeting, a difference may appear between the Christian discipline and the legalistic check-list to the extent that the Christian discipline may grant the benefit of a doubt to civilians, whereas the legalistic check-list tends to favor the military. This is to say, the Christian discipline declares civilian infrastructure off limits as long as its primary use is indeed civilian. The legalistic check-list favors the military in that it tends to sanction targeting civilian infrastructure if that infrastructure is a matter of dual use – used by both civilian and military personnel.

Having said this, it is important to note that international law maintains a very rigorous standard with regard to water facilities and cultural / religious sites, saying that such sites cannot be attacked even if used by the enemy military, unless the enemy is actually using such sites to launch an attack.

Second, non-combatant immunity impacts choice of weaponry. Some weapons may be intrinsically indiscriminate and therefore unjust. Weapons that may fall into the category may include cluster bombs and land mines (unless they deactivate), and various forms of weapons of mass destruction – the very name suggesting they are indiscriminate. Some weapons may be unjust in particular contexts, like a densely populated urban setting. Likewise, some tactics have been declared unjust on the grounds that they violate the criterion of discrimination – carpet bombing, or declaring entire cities a single military target, for example.

Here again, the Christian discipline may prove more rigorous than the legalistic check-list insofar as the secular version of the JWT tends to relax this criterion by suggesting that all it means is that one is to use the most discriminating weapon you have.

Third, discrimination addresses the issue of the location of military installations. Inherent in this criterion is the obligation to respect not only the enemy civilian population by distinguishing between it and legitimate military targets but also one's own population by not locating military installations in midst of civilian populations, thus putting them at risk.

Here too there may be significant differences in the way Christian and the secular legalistic versions embody this. The modern secular version tends to weaken the criterion by shifting

responsibility for violations to the enemy. This is to say, there is a tendency to excuse violations of the criterion when the enemy violates it, say by using human shields or by locating a military installation in the midst of a civilian population. However, the proper response to the use of such shields is not simply to attack and blame the enemy, but to use of more precise/discriminating weaponry and tactics.

Lastly, the prohibition of torture falls under the heading of discrimination. The JWT prohibits the mistreatment of civilians as well as captured enemy combatants.

7. Proportionality

The final criterion insists that the means used in the prosecution of a war must be proportional to the ends. On one hand, this means that any intended destruction inflicted on the enemy must serve the stated ends of the just cause. For example, you cannot destroy an enemy battalion simply because you can and because you want to see your enemy weakened for the foreseeable future. Rather, that destruction must be related to the purpose of the war. This criterion prohibits wiping out a routed enemy at the war's conclusion (unless the route is only a retreat for the sake of regrouping to continue the battle).

On the other hand, proportionality insists that the actual means used do not exceed the force necessary to attain the proper end. In other words, the criterion prohibits "overkill," using disproportionate force, a hammer to kill a fly.

Conclusion

Because the JWT is a living tradition, the meaning of each of the criteria will remain a matter of dispute and discernment, especially as evolving forms of warfare present new challenges. Underlying these conversations, however, may rest a more fundamental decision: Will the Christian community engage the tradition as a form of discipleship? Will it embrace the costly discipline it entails as an expression not merely of an occasional, selective concern for neighbor and justice, but rather as an extension of the character of communities that love and seek justice for their neighbors consistently throughout the whole of their lives, in war and peace.

Note: A more extensive treatment of the tradition along the lines presented here, including questions for discussion, is available at <http://www.ekklesiaproject.org/> as a pamphlet entitled, "Just War as Christian Discipleship."

This article is posted as 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.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/bell.htm>. It links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#bell.>]

The Just War Tradition and Christian Discipleship

Daniel M. Bell, Jr.

Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary

PDF View or print
this section

Setting forth the criteria of the Just War Tradition (JWT) can be relatively simple and straightforward, as evidenced by the abundance of treatments, secular and religious, that purport to present the tradition in the space of a few hundred words. The criteria of the tradition can be summarized as follows:

Justice in Going to War

1. Legitimate Authority
2. Just Cause
3. Right Intent
4. Last Resort
5. Probability of Success

Justice in Waging War

6. Non-Combatant Immunity
7. Proportionality

There are, however, several difficulties with simplistic presentations of the criteria. First, in spite of the fact that the tradition is frequently presented as a “theory,” there is no set, agreed upon, universally recognized “theory” of just war. Different thinkers and different eras describe the criteria of the tradition differently. Some, for example, follow the US Catholic Bishops who in their 1983 pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace*, identify a criterion of “comparative justice.” Others might add “proportionality” as a distinct criterion of justice in going to war.

Second, even the widely acknowledged criteria like those listed above are subject to debate regarding exactly how they are properly understood and implemented.

Third, the tradition is a *living* effort. It continues to evolve in the face of new realities. For example, there is today significant pressure to broaden the criterion of “legitimate authority” from its traditional locus in a national ruler to encompass the requirement of international authorization. Likewise, the reality that future wars are likely to include not only wars fought between recognizable national bodies but also may include wars fought between a nation and a more elusive, decentralized, international or at least non-national entity challenges traditional renderings of various criteria.

Two Just War Traditions

In addition to these difficulties, there is another more significant reason that commonplace presentations of the tradition are problematic. Namely, they assume that just war as a Christian discipline, as a form of discipleship, is no different from popular, secular renditions of the

tradition. This is to say, it is taken for granted that what I will call the modern, legalistic “check-list” approach to just war is synonymous with the just war discipline that was nurtured and developed by Christian leaders and theologians such as Augustine, Aquinas, and Vitoria for the sake of guiding the Christian community in its life and witness in the world.

In fact, there is both significant overlap and divergence between the two approaches to the JWT. In the account of criteria that follows, I will highlight some of those similarities and differences and suggest the difference the differences make for Christian reflection on and practice of just war. I begin by setting forth rather starkly, the basic difference between the two approaches.

Just war as a form of Christian discipleship has as its primary frame of reference the Christian community. By this I mean that the JWT developed as a guideline for how Christians embody love of neighbor in the midst of warfare. It developed as an extension of the *character* of the Christian community, of the community’s on-going, day-to-day concern for justice and love of neighbor in the whole of its life. In other words, the Christian community engages in just war as a natural expression of its daily concern for its neighbors, for peace and justice.

What this emphasis on character means is that a people who are not virtuous, who are not committed to justice and genuine concern for their neighbor in their daily life, could not wage a war justly, even if there was a just cause, because they lack the character required to wage war justly. After all, under the stresses of warfare, a people who lack the requisite character will not be able to sustain the discipline that the criteria outline.

Just war as a legalistic check-list has as its frame of reference nation-states and international law. It presupposes no particular community. Likewise, character matters little. Anyone – regardless of their character, of whether they truly care about justice – may invoke the tradition. As long as I can check off each criterion, I may wage a just war. It matters little if my character is just or loving; it matters little if my intent in war is consistent with or grows out of an on-going, day-to-day concern with justice and love of neighbor. Indeed, I may be thoroughly vicious, but so long as I can check off each of the criteria, I can wage a war and call it just.

What difference does this distinction make? Generally speaking, when the JWT is no longer understood as a practice that grows out of the character of a community and it becomes a legalistic checklist that any scoundrel can use, Christians – and the tradition – become that much more vulnerable to manipulation by those who are adept at invoking the language of just war as a cover for wars driven by something other than a genuine concern for neighbor and justice. More concretely, as we shall see, when the tradition is used as a check-list disconnected from issues of character, the criteria lose much of their force. The discipline becomes much more lax and permissive.

The Criteria

1. Legitimate Authority

At the first level, legitimate authority refers to who may *wage* a war. The Christian tradition has long held that God alone has authority over life and death, and the just war tradition holds that God shares that authority with the prince, the head of state (cf. Romans 13:1ff.). Thus, the JWT

holds that heads of state made wage war. It is worth noting that, to date, the tradition has not required international authorization, although there is increasing pressure in that direction and as the tradition develops it may indeed incorporate such an expectation.

Note that one expectation of a just war is that the legitimate authority will actually declare war. That a war be declared is important in that it provides the enemy with clarity regarding conditions under which the fighting will stop.

At a second level, legitimate authority concerns who *determines* if a particular war is just. The modern, legalistic approach basically states that the ruler decides. Here is one point where that approach differs from the Christian tradition. The Christian tradition is more complicated, involving three points of decision. First, the prince, in consultation with wise advisors, determines the justness of a war. The assumption here is that the head of state is the office particularly charged with looking after the common good. And this is a matter as much of character as information.

Second, individual soldiers bear some level of responsibility for deciding on the justness of a war. Specifically, soldiers owe the prince the benefit of a doubt. They should defer to the head of state, unless they are sure the war is unjust, in which case they should refuse to fight. Third, the church bears responsibility for deciding on the justness of a war. Indeed, as the JWT developed, it entailed the church holding Christian princes and Christian soldiers accountable for the discipline.

2. *Just Cause*

Here the focus is on the enemy's behavior. Just cause has traditionally been spelled out in terms of the defense of an innocent third party, understood either as coming to the aid of an unjustly attacked neighbor or a government's defense of its own populace from unjust attack. In this regard, the JWT has not sanctioned self-defense. Indeed, the great thinkers of the JWT within Christianity were clear that the JWT did not sanction personal, lethal self-defense.

Here the tradition treats the issue of preventative and preemptive war. The bulk of the tradition prohibits *preemptive* strikes. However, there is a minor strand that permits preemptive strike *in extremis*, if the threat is both imminent and grave (the very survival of nation is at risk). A *preventative* war (one based on a threat that is not imminent, but speculative or merely possible at some point in the future) is absolutely prohibited.

3. *Right Intention*

Here the focus is on the would-be just warrior's behavior. And it is here that the difference between the two traditions – Christian and legalistic check-list – can be seen clearly.

The legalistic check-list approach reduces right intent to what might be called an “unreflective peace” and a disavowal of revenge. In other words, the criterion is met when a potential warring party asserts they desire peace and not revenge. Questions of character, consistency and the selective appeal to the tradition are not raised.

In contrast, just war as Christian discipleship involves a thicker account of right intent, revolving around issues of character, which is seen in three ways. First, right intent is a matter of a “just peace.” As Augustine noted long ago, everyone desires peace; wars are always fought for peace – for a peace that better suits the aggressor. Hence, it is not sufficient to be for peace. One must intend a peace that is truly just, and not merely self-serving.

Second, right intent entails that even in warfare we love our enemy. Anger is permitted, but not hatred. The JWT does not exempt Christians from loving their enemy neighbor. Indeed, in waging war, the right intent is not to destroy the enemy but to bring the benefits of a just peace to the enemy.

Third, right intent entails what can be called “complete justice.” How does one measure something as evasive as intent? Intent is evaluated by considering character and consistency. Thus, evaluating intent with regard to war might entail asking: Is this a people who characteristically and consistently seek justice? Is justice only selectively enforced? Is it carried out to completion? Complete justice entails looking forward – how justice will be implemented – and backwards – bringing the past before the bar of justice. In this regard, right intent is related to Matthew 7:5: “First take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your neighbor’s eye.” Thus, right intent may involve confessing one’s own complicity in past injustice as one confronts present injustice. This thicker understanding of right intent as complete justice provides space for considerations of “exit-strategies,” of justice after the shooting stops as well.

4. Last Resort

This criterion is pretty straight forward. The resort to arms can never be a first response to aggression; rather it must always be a last resort, after other feasible means of resolving the dispute (mediation, negotiation, arbitration, international tribunals, etc) have failed. This, of course, is a judgment call. But implicit in the criteria is a commitment to diplomacy in good faith, even if one’s opponent apparently is not engaged in good faith diplomacy.

5. Probability of Success

This criterion means that the goals of a stated war must be attainable. One can only enter into war if there is a likelihood of success. For example, if one has a just cause but clearly cannot win a war, then one is not justified in going to war. In such a situation, one must find other ways short of war to resist or address the injustice.

Closely related to the likelihood of success is the principle that a just war is a limited war for a limited end. A just war is waged to address a particular, declared injustice. Just wars are not waged to wipe out an ideology, to rid the world of evil or attain absolute security. Such goals are neither limited nor attainable. Accordingly, such goals are characteristic of a crusade, not a just war.

Under the heading of probability of success questions concerning the cost of success may also be raised (what traditionally identified as “proportionality” and is sometimes considered a distinct criterion). When considering waging war, one should consider the risks and harms attendant to

warfare, including further destabilization of world, increased insecurity, the sacrifice of other values in the pursuit of war, the cost in terms of life and resources, etc. The tradition is clear: if the cost of warfare exceeds the cost of enduring the injustice, one may be obliged to refrain from waging war.

6. Non-Combatant Immunity / Discrimination

This is the first of the criteria that deals with justice in the conduct of warfare. It establishes that one cannot intentionally or directly kill noncombatants. Although the criterion is typically stated in this negative form; it can be stated positively. This criterion condemns civilian deaths that occur due to sheer lack of concern or neglect of the criterion, or out of negligence. In other words, the criterion suggests that one has a positive duty to distinguish civilians from soldiers.

There are several dimensions to this criterion. First, it addresses the matter of targets. One cannot target civilians for the sake of reducing combatant losses. (Fighting a war justly may mean *more* soldiers die, that the war lasts longer and is more costly than if it were fought unjustly). One cannot legitimately target the civilian infrastructure. Note that politicians are legitimate targets, whereas soldiers on leave and POW's are not.

At the level of targeting, a difference may appear between the Christian discipline and the legalistic check-list to the extent that the Christian discipline may grant the benefit of a doubt to civilians, whereas the legalistic check-list tends to favor the military. This is to say, the Christian discipline declares civilian infrastructure off limits as long as its primary use is indeed civilian. The legalistic check-list favors the military in that it tends to sanction targeting civilian infrastructure if that infrastructure is a matter of dual use – used by both civilian and military personnel.

Having said this, it is important to note that international law maintains a very rigorous standard with regard to water facilities and cultural / religious sites, saying that such sites cannot be attacked even if used by the enemy military, unless the enemy is actually using such sites to launch an attack.

Second, non-combatant immunity impacts choice of weaponry. Some weapons may be intrinsically indiscriminate and therefore unjust. Weapons that may fall into the category may include cluster bombs and land mines (unless they deactivate), and various forms of weapons of mass destruction – the very name suggesting they are indiscriminate. Some weapons may be unjust in particular contexts, like a densely populated urban setting. Likewise, some tactics have been declared unjust on the grounds that they violate the criterion of discrimination – carpet bombing, or declaring entire cities a single military target, for example.

Here again, the Christian discipline may prove more rigorous than the legalistic check-list insofar as the secular version of the JWT tends to relax this criterion by suggesting that all it means is that one is to use the most discriminating weapon you have.

Third, discrimination addresses the issue of the location of military installations. Inherent in this criterion is the obligation to respect not only the enemy civilian population by distinguishing between it and legitimate military targets but also one's own population by not locating military

installations in midst of civilian populations, thus putting them at risk.

Here too there may be significant differences in the way Christian and the secular legalistic versions embody this. The modern secular version tends to weaken the criterion by shifting responsibility for violations to the enemy. This is to say, there is a tendency to excuse violations of the criterion when the enemy violates it, say by using human shields or by locating a military installation in the midst of a civilian population. However, the proper response to the use of such shields is not simply to attack and blame the enemy, but to use of more precise/discriminating weaponry and tactics.

Lastly, the prohibition of torture falls under the heading of discrimination. The JWT prohibits the mistreatment of civilians as well as captured enemy combatants.

7. Proportionality

The final criterion insists that the means used in the prosecution of a war must be proportional to the ends. On one hand, this means that any intended destruction inflicted on the enemy must serve the stated ends of the just cause. For example, you cannot destroy an enemy battalion simply because you can and because you want to see your enemy weakened for the foreseeable future. Rather, that destruction must be related to the purpose of the war. This criterion prohibits wiping out a routed enemy at the war's conclusion (unless the route is only a retreat for the sake of regrouping to continue the battle).

On the other hand, proportionality insists that the actual means used do not exceed the force necessary to attain the proper end. In other words, the criterion prohibits "overkill," using disproportionate force, a hammer to kill a fly.

Conclusion

Because the JWT is a living tradition, the meaning of each of the criteria will remain a matter of dispute and discernment, especially as evolving forms of warfare present new challenges. Underlying these conversations, however, may rest a more fundamental decision: Will the Christian community engage the tradition as a form of discipleship? Will it embrace the costly discipline it entails as an expression not merely of an occasional, selective concern for neighbor and justice, but rather as an extension of the character of communities that love and seek justice for their neighbors consistently throughout the whole of their lives, in war and peace.

Note: A more extensive treatment of the tradition along the lines presented here, including questions for discussion, is available at <http://www.ekkesiaproject.org/> as a pamphlet entitled, "Just War as Christian Discipleship."

This article is posted as 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.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm> This links back to
<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justwar>
[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > [Reason](#) > **Just War**

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Just War [set up like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

In the 4th and 5th centuries under the influence of Bishop Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo the Christian Church began to develop [link to <http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm>] what became known as the just war tradition. The intent was to identify circumstances when war would be permissible and to specify acceptable behavior in the conduct of war. In the 13th century Thomas Aquinas developed these ideas further. Today it is the major approach of the Roman Catholic Church and a strong factor for many Protestant denominations.

- ❖ Just War Criteria
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>
- ❖ Articles on the Web
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>
- ❖ Contemporary Application
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>

[box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>

Just War Criteria

Excerpt from *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace* [<http://cokesbury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] by the United Methodist Council of Bishops (1986), pp. 33-34.

The principal criteria of the just-war tradition evolved over many centuries....A distinction was made between the principles concerning the *just resort to war* (*jus ad bellum*) and those concerning *just conduct in war* (*jus in bello*).

The five most common *jus ad bellum* principles are:

- (1) **Just cause.** A decision for war must vindicate justice itself in response to some serious evil, such as an aggressive attack.
- (2) **Just intent.** The ends sought in a decision for war must include the restoration of peace with justice and must not seek self-aggrandizement or the total devastation of another nation.
- (3) **Last resort.** This tradition shares with pacifism a moral presumption against going to war -- but is prepared to make exceptions. Every possibility of peaceful settlement of a conflict must be tried before war is begun.
- (4) **Legitimate authority.** A decision for war may be made and declared only by properly constituted governmental authority.

- (5) **Reasonable hope of success.** A decision for war must be based on a prudent expectation that the ends sought can be achieved. It is hardly an act of justice to plunge one's people into suffering and sacrifice of a suicidal conflict.

The two main *jus in bello* principles are:

- (6) **Discrimination.** Justice in the actual conduct of war requires respect for the rights of enemy peoples, especially for the immunity of noncombatants from direct attack. Such respect also rules out atrocities, reprisals, looting, and wanton violence.
- (7) **Proportionality.** The amount of damage inflicted must be strictly proportionate to the ends sought. Small-scale injuries should not be avenged by massive suffering, death, and devastation. The war's harm must not exceed the war's good. (Proportionality is also a criterion to be applied to *jus ad bellum* -- the decision whether to resort to war in the first place.)

These just-war principles remain morally stringent in our time. ▲

[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>]

Articles on the Web

The World Wide Web provides abundance of writings on Just War Theory. You can use Google or another search engine to find these articles. Here we cite three.

- **Just War Tradition** from Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life
<http://pewforum.org/just-war/>
- **Just War Theory** from The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/j/justwar.htm>
- **The Just War Theory** by Brother John Raymond
<http://www.monks-of-adoration.org/justwar.html>

[end box] ▲

[box]

{This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>}

Contemporary Application of Just War Theory

Insights on just war theory come from the way it is applied in concrete situations. Here we review its application regarding nuclear weapons and recent wars.

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*,

[<http://www.usccb.org/publishing/interpol.shtml#peacemaking>] 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*, [<http://cokesbury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] 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 revered 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 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/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)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._invasion_of_Afghanistan

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-Qaeda 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-Qaeda 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](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387)." [http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387] 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, [http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={3E12530E-E441-403F-A8F8-95F2F4B5A50D}&mid=3365] 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](http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={B90BF56D-3A4F-48B2-8CF7-E39F99C755B1}&mid=3365)". [http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={B90BF56D-3A4F-48B2-8CF7-E39F99C755B1}&mid=3365]. 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 [http://www.nccusa.org/news/01news100.html] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/sept11.htm>] 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 [<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/003/19.23.html>] 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-)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War

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 [<http://www.mupwj.org/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/bishops/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.cjd.org/paper/jp2war.html>] 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, [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3-disarmingiraq.html>] -- 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" [<http://www.goodnewsmag.org/magazine/3MayJune/mj03war.htm>] 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, [<http://www.frinstitute.org/rrjustwar.html>] a debate sponsored by the Faith and Reason Institute on September 24, 2001
- Would an Invasion of Iraq Be a "Just War"?, [<http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr98.html>] a forum held by the U.S. Institute of Peace on December 17, 2002.
- War in Iraq: Is it Just?, [http://www.eppc.org/publications/pubID.1595/pub_detail.asp] a seminar sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center on February 3, 2003.

Preemptive War

The debate over the Iraq War has led to consideration of the broader question whether preemptive or preventative war can be approved by just war criteria or other theological considerations. Two forums have provided a range of views on this matter.

- Papers on Ethical Issues Raised by Pre-Emptive War [<http://www.cctpp.org/papers.htm>] from a conference sponsored by the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy on May 1, 2003
- Preemptive Peace: Beyond Terrorism and Justified War, [http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=802] a conference organized by Pax Christi USA, Pax Christi International, and the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns on July 31, 2003. One set of papers addressed the question: "Just war or justified war? The use and misuse of just war criteria, including its application to the war against terrorism."



[end box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm> This links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justwar>
[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > [Reason](#) > **Just War**

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Just War [set up like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

In the 4th and 5th centuries under the influence of Bishop Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo the Christian Church began to develop [[link to http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm](http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm)] what became known as the just war tradition. The intent was to identify circumstances when war would be permissible and to specify acceptable behavior in the conduct of war. In the 13th century Thomas Aquinas developed these ideas further.

Today just war theory is the major approach of the Roman Catholic Church and is a strong factor for many Protestant denominations. Among them, however, there is no universal agreement on application or even on terminology for defining a just war.

- ❖ Just War Criteria
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>
- ❖ The Just War Tradition and Christian Discipleship
- ❖ <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#bell>
- ❖ Articles on the Web
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>
- ❖ Contemporary Application
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>

[box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>

Just War Criteria

Excerpt from *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*

[<http://cokesbury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] by the United Methodist Council of Bishops (1986), pp. 33-34.

The principal criteria of the just-war tradition evolved over many centuries....A distinction was made between the principles concerning the *just resort to war* (*jus ad bellum*) and those concerning *just conduct in war* (*jus in bello*).

The five most common *jus ad bellum* principles are:

- (1) **Just cause.** A decision for war must vindicate justice itself in response to some serious evil, such as an aggressive attack.
- (2) **Just intent.** The ends sought in a decision for war must include the restoration of peace with justice and must not seek self-aggrandizement or the total devastation of another nation.

- (3) **Last resort.** This tradition shares with pacifism a moral presumption against going to war -- but is prepared to make exceptions. Every possibility of peaceful settlement of a conflict must be tried before war is begun.
- (4) **Legitimate authority.** A decision for war may be made and declared only by properly constituted governmental authority.
- (5) **Reasonable hope of success.** A decision for war must be based on a prudent expectation that the ends sought can be achieved. It is hardly an act of justice to plunge one's people into suffering and sacrifice of a suicidal conflict.

The two main *jus in bello* principles are:

- (6) **Discrimination.** Justice in the actual conduct of war requires respect for the rights of enemy peoples, especially for the immunity of noncombatants from direct attack. Such respect also rules out atrocities, reprisals, looting, and wanton violence.
- (7) **Proportionality.** The amount of damage inflicted must be strictly proportionate to the ends sought. Small-scale injuries should not be avenged by massive suffering, death, and devastation. The war's harm must not exceed the war's good. (Proportionality is also a criterion to be applied to *jus ad bellum* -- the decision whether to resort to war in the first place.)

These just-war principles remain morally stringent in our time. ▲

[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#bell>]

The Just War Tradition and Christian Discipleship

by Daniel M. Bell, Jr.

Setting forth the criteria of the Just War Tradition (JWT) can be relatively simple and straightforward, as evidenced by the abundance of treatments, secular and religious, that purport to present the tradition in the space of a few hundred words.... There are, however, several difficulties with simplistic presentations of the criteria. First, in spite of the fact that the tradition is frequently presented as a “theory,” there is no set, agreed upon, universally recognized “theory” of just war.

Read more. <http://www.mupwj.org/bell.htm> ▲

[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>]

Articles on the Web

The World Wide Web provides abundance of writings on Just War Theory. You can use Google or another search engine to find these articles. Here we cite three.

- **Just War Tradition** from Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life

<http://pewforum.org/just-war/>

- **Just War Theory** from The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/j/justwar.htm>
- **The Just War Theory** by Brother John Raymond
<http://www.monks-of-adoration.org/justwar.html>

[end box]

[box]

{This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>}

Contemporary Application of Just War Theory

Insights on just war theory come from the way it is applied in concrete situations. Here we review its application regarding nuclear weapons and recent wars.

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*,

[<http://www.usccb.org/publishing/interpol.shtml#peacemaking>] 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*,

[<http://cokebury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] 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 revered 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 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/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)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._invasion_of_Afghanistan

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-Qaeda 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-Qaeda 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](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387)." [http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387] 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, [http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={3E12530E-E441-403F-

A8F8-95F2F4B5A50D}&mid=3365] 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".

[http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={B90BF56D-3A4F-48B2-8CF7-E39F99C755B1}&mid=3365]. 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 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/01news100.html>] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/sept11.htm>] 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 [<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/003/19.23.html>] 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-)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War

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 [<http://www.mupwj.org/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/bishops/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.cjd.org/paper/jp2war.html>] 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, [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3-disarmingiraq.html>] -- 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" [<http://www.goodnewsmag.org/magazine/3MayJune/mj03war.htm>] 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, [<http://www.frinstitute.org/rrjustwar.html>] a debate sponsored by the Faith and Reason Institute on September 24, 2001
- Would an Invasion of Iraq Be a "Just War"?, [<http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr98.html>] a forum held by the U.S. Institute of Peace on December 17, 2002.
- War in Iraq: Is it Just?, [http://www.eppc.org/publications/pubID.1595/pub_detail.asp] a seminar sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center on February 3, 2003.

Preemptive War

The debate over the Iraq War has led to consideration of the broader question whether preemptive or preventative war can be approved by just war criteria or other theological considerations. Two forums have provided a range of views on this matter.

- Papers on Ethical Issues Raised by Pre-Emptive War [<http://www.cctpp.org/papers.htm>] from a conference sponsored by the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy on May 1, 2003
- Preemptive Peace: Beyond Terrorism and Justified War, [http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=802] a conference organized by Pax Christi USA, Pax Christi International, and the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns on July 31, 2003. One set of papers addressed the question: "Just war or justified war? The use and misuse of just war criteria, including its application to the war against terrorism."



[end box]

Corrections for Just War page

We need to help readers navigate the long section on **Contemporary Application of Just War Theory**. Therefore, go to <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm>

After the two introductory paragraphs, change the URL for Contemporary Applications from <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwartheory> to <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#application>

You will also need to change where the linkage goes.

At that spot (1) change the title to caps. (2) Add an index to the major items and link them in the body of the text, as follows. (3) Make U.S. Catholic Bishops and United Methodist Bishops as paragraph headings embedded in the paragraph as indicated.

CONTEMPORARY APPLICATION OF JUST WAR THEORY

Insights on just war theory come from the way it is applied in concrete situations. Here we review its application regarding nuclear weapons and recent wars.

- Nuclear Weapons <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationnuclearweapons>
- Gulf War <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationgulfwar>
- U.S. Invasion of Afghanistan <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationafghanistan>
- Iraq War <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationiraqwar>
- Preemptive War <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationpreemptivewar>

Nuclear Weapons [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationnuclearweapons>]

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.

Etc.

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).

Etc.

Gulf War (1990-1991) [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationgulfwar>]

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.....,

Etc.

U.S. Invasion of Afghanistan (2001)

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationafghanistan>]

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-Qaeda leaders located in that country to the United States.....

Etc.

Iraq War (2003-) [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationiraqwar>]

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.....

Etc.

Preemptive War [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#applicationpreemptivewar>]

The debate over the Iraq War has led to consideration of the broader question whether preemptive or preventative war can be approved by just war criteria or other theological considerations.....

Etc.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm> This links back to
<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justwar>
[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > [Reason](#) > **Just War**

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Just War [set up like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

In the 4th and 5th centuries under the influence of Bishop Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo the Christian Church began to develop [link to <http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm>] what became known as the just war tradition. The intent was to identify circumstances when war would be permissible and to specify acceptable behavior in the conduct of war. In the 13th century Thomas Aquinas developed these ideas further. Today it is the major approach of the Roman Catholic Church and a strong factor for many Protestant denominations.

- ❖ Just War Criteria
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>
- ❖ Articles on the Web
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>
- ❖ Contemporary Application
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>

[box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>

Just War Criteria

Excerpt from *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace* [<http://cokesbury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] by the United Methodist Council of Bishops (1986), pp. 33-34.

The principal criteria of the just-war tradition evolved over many centuries....A distinction was made between the principles concerning the *just resort to war* (*jus ad bellum*) and those concerning *just conduct in war* (*jus in bello*).

The five most common *jus ad bellum* principles are:

- (1) **Just cause.** A decision for war must vindicate justice itself in response to some serious evil, such as an aggressive attack.
- (2) **Just intent.** The ends sought in a decision for war must include the restoration of peace with justice and must not seek self-aggrandizement or the total devastation of another nation.
- (3) **Last resort.** This tradition shares with pacifism a moral presumption against going to war -- but is prepared to make exceptions. Every possibility of peaceful settlement of a conflict must be tried before war is begun.
- (4) **Legitimate authority.** A decision for war may be made and declared only by properly constituted governmental authority.

- (5) **Reasonable hope of success.** A decision for war must be based on a prudent expectation that the ends sought can be achieved. It is hardly an act of justice to plunge one's people into suffering and sacrifice of a suicidal conflict.

The two main *jus in bello* principles are:

- (6) **Discrimination.** Justice in the actual conduct of war requires respect for the rights of enemy peoples, especially for the immunity of noncombatants from direct attack. Such respect also rules out atrocities, reprisals, looting, and wanton violence.
- (7) **Proportionality.** The amount of damage inflicted must be strictly proportionate to the ends sought. Small-scale injuries should not be avenged by massive suffering, death, and devastation. The war's harm must not exceed the war's good. (Proportionality is also a criterion to be applied to *jus ad bellum* -- the decision whether to resort to war in the first place.)

These just-war principles remain morally stringent in our time. ▲

[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>]

Articles on the Web

The World Wide Web provides abundance of writings on Just War Theory. You can use Google or another search engine to find these articles. Here we cite three.

- **Just War Tradition** from Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life
<http://pewforum.org/just-war/>
- **Just War Theory** from The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/j/justwar.htm>
- **The Just War Theory** by Brother John Raymond
<http://www.monks-of-adoration.org/justwar.html>

[end box] ▲

[box]

{This is <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>}

Contemporary Application of Just War Theory

Insights on just war theory come from the way it is applied in concrete situations. Here we review its application regarding nuclear weapons and recent wars.

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*,

[<http://www.usccb.org/publishing/interpol.shtml#peacemaking>] 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*, [<http://cokesbury.com/search.aspx?scope=all&query=516641&pid=516641>] 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 revered 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 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/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)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._invasion_of_Afghanistan

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-Qaeda 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-Qaeda 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](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387)." [http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/viewnews.php?newsId=387] 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, [http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={3E12530E-E441-403F-A8F8-95F2F4B5A50D}&mid=3365] 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](http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={B90BF56D-3A4F-48B2-8CF7-E39F99C755B1}&mid=3365)". [http://www.umc.org/umns/news_archive2001.asp?ptid=2&story={B90BF56D-3A4F-48B2-8CF7-E39F99C755B1}&mid=3365]. 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 [http://www.nccusa.org/news/01news100.html] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/sept11.htm>] 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 [<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/003/19.23.html>] 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-)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War

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 [<http://www.mupwj.org/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>] 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. [<http://www.usccb.org/bishops/iraq.htm>] 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 [<http://www.cjd.org/paper/jp2war.html>] 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."

Other mainline Protestant denominations opposed going to war against Iraq. Some used just war arguments, others offered other theological perspectives. Their positions can be found on their websites.

Religious support for the Iraq war, though, has come from conservative Catholics and Evangelicals. The latter is represented by an article entitled "John Wesley & Just War" [<http://www.goodnewsmag.org/magazine/3MayJune/mj03war.htm>] by Peter R. McGuire 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, [<http://www.frinstitute.org/rrjustwar.html>] a debate sponsored by the Faith and Reason Institute on September 24, 2001
- Would an Invasion of Iraq Be a "Just War"?, [<http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr98.html>] a forum held by the U.S. Institute of Peace on December 17, 2002.
- War in Iraq: Is it Just?, [http://www.eppc.org/publications/pubID.1595/pub_detail.asp] a seminar sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center on February 3, 2003.

Preemptive War

The debate over the Iraq War has led to consideration of the broader question whether preemptive or preventative war can be approved by just war criteria or other theological considerations. Two forums have provided a range of views on this matter.

- Papers on Ethical Issues Raised by Pre-Emptive War [<http://www.cctpp.org/papers.htm>] from a conference sponsored by the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy on May 1, 2003
- Preemptive Peace: Beyond Terrorism and Justified War, [http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=802] a conference organized by Pax Christi USA, Pax Christi International, and the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns on July 31, 2003. One set of papers addressed the question: "Just war or justified war? The use and misuse of just war criteria, including its application to the war against terrorism."



[end box]

History of the Role Played by the United Methodist Church in the Reconciliation of Conflicts in the Kitenge District, Congo

**by Rev. Mujinga Muamba Kora,
Superintendent of Kitenge District**

History

Everything began in 1998 in Kitenge, Congo, headquarters of the ecclesiastic district of Kitenge, where I was assigned as pastor in order to form a second parish. Although this village had had only one parish for more than 20 years, at the suggestion of the District Superintendent, Rev. Kabonga Ilunga, it was proposed that, with my assignment there, we start a second parish, to be named "Mount Carmel."

A month after my arrival, Kabalo fell into the hands of the rebels during the Rwanda/Congo war of aggression. With the dispersal of everyone in Kitenge, I was left alone. Everyone had fled, not knowing what else to do. Being a pastor, I couldn't stand around doing nothing. I got myself assigned as Chaplain for the almost 16,000 soldiers who were regrouped in Kitenge. My work as a chaplain lasted from November 1998 to January 1999.

In January the people gradually began to come back, and we restarted activities with 30 members. During that 3-month period, I had the opportunity to learn the military life. The soldiers, too, in their camp, had need of divine help -- and a good number of them were converted.

Kitenge is a village of at least 24,000 people. Since there were so many, food became more and more scarce and expensive. Many were hungry. we couldn't stand around. Everyone anxiously searched for something to eat. I myself was not spared this misery. One day I decided, like many others, to go look for food more than 45 km. away. We arrived in Ngende at 5 p.m. Since troubles never come singly, that same night, September 22, 1999, we were encircled by the Congolese-Rwandan rebels, who took everything from us (money, clothes, bikes), but I got out of it alive. I came back on foot.

Having gotten out of that, we encountered still more difficulties, this time inflicted by our Simba-May May brothers. We were obliged to flee three times in three years to take refuge from the fighting. There was general insecurity in the whole ecclesiastical district of Kitenge.

Of the nine circuits that made up our district, only three were prepared to work; not the others. The churches were closed because the whole population was scattered either in the forest or in the villages on the other bank of the Lomani River. To visit the faithful, we were exposed to much danger; we wasted money to clear our way, negotiating with both sides (the May May and the government soldiers).

This ministry, in which our lives were always in peril, lasted almost three years. But in everything the hand of God was with us, and there were no major incidents for any of the teams which went out on evangelization tours. Since there were two camps, the center of Kitenge was protected by the government soldiers, and all the interior was inhabited by the May May, led by General Tsinga Tsinga. So the people were between the hammer and the forge, and they didn't

know on which foot to dance. If you supported the military, you were the enemy of the May May. If you supported the May May, you were the enemy of the military.

Even knowing that the church is apolitical and neutral, we couldn't do nothing and let the evil continue. We were obliged to get into it in spite of the possible cost to us. We sought a way to bring the two enemy brothers together around a single negotiation table. Although it was difficult, with God everything was possible. After two years of waiting, God answered our prayers. Because this was not only the concern of the churches, it had become the preoccupation of everyone. Together with the politico-administrative authorities, the military and the Congolese National Police (PNC), we tried to meet together to discuss the ways and means to put an end to police harassment, killings and general insecurity that was at its height.

The Administrator in the person of Mr. Pierre Damier Ndombe, the Commander of the 941st Battalion who was at Kitenge and the Commander of the Congolese National Police all came to my house to ask me if our church could be the locale of the negotiations since we were deeply involved. We did not hesitate to respond to them positively about this meeting. And I was chosen as preacher for this meeting we had waited for so long. The work was well done, all the parties agreed to bury the hatchet. Where the politicians failed, God alone is ready to provide the solution.

To understand these events, here are the reports of the work we accomplished:

Monday, March 24, 2003

Discussion with all the parties implicated in the re-establishment of the peace: the Assistant Administrator of the Territory of Kitenge, the Battalion Commander of the Congolese Armed Forces at Kitenge (Cmd Bn FAC), the Commanders of Battalions 2, 3 and 5 of FAC, Commander of the PNC, FAP, President of the CPP and his committee, the Chef Sous Poste ANR, the Representative of the Chief of the Nyembo Group, the Representative of the Catholic Church, the Representative of the Teachers' Union of Kitenge and the wise men and the Counselors of the Simba May May fighters came to the meeting organized in the locale of the United Methodist Parish of Kitenge. A group of May May fighters came, too, to help us prepare the welcome for their General Chinja Chinja. Unfortunately the General didn't come this Monday. However, we noticed that the May May fighters were more numerous than the FAC soldiers at the reconciliation place as well as in the city of Katenge.

Tuesday, March 25

About 7:05 a.m., Mr. Jackson Kabamba, the Administrator of Kabongo, came to join the meeting. It was only at 2:15 p.m. that General Chanja Chanja arrived at the meeting place. Thirty minutes later, some May May fighters (estimated at 6,000) came to join the reconciliation team. They invaded the court of the parish with the FAC soldiers. So we were all pressed to begin the ceremony of reconciliation which began at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. Pierre Ndombe, the Assistant Administrator, spoke first to introduce the meeting. He began by rendering glory to God for having permitted the holding of the meeting. He praised the meeting between brothers and so asked the Superintendent of the United Methodist Church, Rev,

Mujinga Mwamba Kora, to pray for the meeting and to preach the word of God before the discussion began.

Our intervention was based on the following points:

- The prayer
- The message: Luke 15:17-24
Theme: "We were all lost and we need to repent."

After my sermon, Mr. Ndombe took up the theme of this reunion by insisting on the fact that we are all lost as we said in our message. He proceeded to the presentation of the participants, beginning with Brigadier General Chinja Chinja and his suite, the Commander of the FAC Battalion and his suite, the FAP and the PNC and other members. He retraced the history of the war of aggression and the creation of the Forces of Popular Self-defense (FAP) and the movements of the May May. He also evoked the troubles between FAC and the May May and the resulting destabilization of villages and especially the loss of human lives, villages burned and massive displacement of the population.

Today, he said, we do not want to set up a court to find out who is right and who is wrong. But together let us seek the true causes which each time cause troubles so that we can talk together and find solid bases for the survival of our agglomeration which has suffered so much.

The declarations of Brigadier General Chinja Chinja: Me, I am a civilian. What sometimes shocked us was FAC's harassment and the lack of understanding on each side, the false reports about the population by both sides. Today is the first and the last meeting for me. I can't fight the FAC anymore because FAC is our father who beats us all. We owe it respect. In my village, there is no court. I ask everyone to go and pose their problems to the PNC instead. We recognize the State and all its force.

After this meeting, God truly manifested himself. The attitude of the Simbas changed rapidly. They conformed to the declarations of their chiefs. The mischief was terminated. We expect peace to arrive soon.

Long live the United Methodist Church which sheltered the belligerents and which played a catalyst's role through its servant, Rev. Mujinga Mwamba Kora.

Translated by Marianne Cook

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

History of the Role Played by the United Methodist Church in the Reconciliation of Conflicts in the Kitenge District, Congo

**by Rev. Mujinga Muamba Kora,
Superintendent of Kitenge District**

[box]

[VIEW OF PRINT](#) [PDF](#)

[THIS SECTION](#)

History

Everything began in 1998 in Kitenge, Congo, headquarters of the ecclesiastic district of Kitenge, where I was assigned as pastor in order to form a second parish. Although this village had had only one parish for more than 20 years, at the suggestion of the District Superintendent, Rev. Kabonga Ilunga, it was proposed that, with my assignment there, we start a second parish, to be named "Mount Carmel."

A month after my arrival, Kabalo fell into the hands of the rebels during the Rwanda/Congo war of aggression. With the dispersal of everyone in Kitenge, I was left alone. Everyone had fled, not knowing what else to do. Being a pastor, I couldn't stand around doing nothing. I got myself assigned as Chaplain for the almost 16,000 soldiers who were regrouped in Kitenge. My work as a chaplain lasted from November 1998 to January 1999.

In January the people gradually began to come back, and we restarted activities with 30 members. During that 3-month period, I had the opportunity to learn the military life. The soldiers, too, in their camp, had need of divine help -- and a good number of them were converted.

Kitenge is a village of at least 24,000 people. Since there were so many, food became more and more scarce and expensive. Many were hungry. we couldn't stand around. Everyone anxiously searched for something to eat. I myself was not spared this misery. One day I decided, like many others, to go look for food more than 45 km. away. We arrived in Ngende at 5 p.m. Since troubles never come singly, that same night, September 22, 1999, we were encircled by the Congolese-Rwandan rebels, who took everything from us (money, clothes, bikes), but I got out of it alive. I came back on foot.

Having gotten out of that, we encountered still more difficulties, this time inflicted by our Simba-May May brothers. We were obliged to flee three times in three years to take refuge from the fighting. There was general insecurity in the whole ecclesiastical district of Kitenge.

Of the nine circuits that made up our district, only three were prepared to work; not the others. The churches were closed because the whole population was scattered either in the forest or in the villages on the other bank of the Lomani River. To visit the faithful, we were exposed to much danger; we wasted money to clear our way, negotiating with both sides (the May May and the government soldiers).

This ministry, in which our lives were always in peril, lasted almost three years. But in everything the hand of God was with us, and there were no major incidents for any of the teams which went out on evangelization tours. Since there were two camps, the center of Kitenge was

protected by the government soldiers, and all the interior was inhabited by the May May, led by General Tsinga Tsinga. So the people were between the hammer and the forge, and they didn't know on which foot to dance. If you supported the military, you were the enemy of the May May. If you supported the May May, you were the enemy of the military.

Even knowing that the church is apolitical and neutral, we couldn't do nothing and let the evil continue. We were obliged to get into it in spite of the possible cost to us. We sought a way to bring the two enemy brothers together around a single negotiation table. Although it was difficult, with God everything was possible. After two years of waiting, God answered our prayers. Because this was not only the concern of the churches, it had become the preoccupation of everyone. Together with the politico-administrative authorities, the military and the Congolese National Police (PNC), we tried to meet together to discuss the ways and means to put an end to police harassment, killings and general insecurity that was at its height.

The Administrator in the person of Mr. Pierre Damier Ndombe, the Commander of the 941st Battalion who was at Kitenge and the Commander of the Congolese National Police all came to my house to ask me if our church could be the locale of the negotiations since we were deeply involved. We did not hesitate to respond to them positively about this meeting. And I was chosen as preacher for this meeting we had waited for so long. The work was well done, all the parties agreed to bury the hatchet. Where the politicians failed, God alone is ready to provide the solution.

To understand these events, here are the reports of the work we accomplished:

Monday, March 24, 2003

Discussion with all the parties implicated in the re-establishment of the peace: the Assistant Administrator of the Territory of Kitenge, the Battalion Commander of the Congolese Armed Forces at Kitenge (Cmd Bn FAC), the Commanders of Battalions 2, 3 and 5 of FAC, Commander of the PNC, FAP, President of the CPP and his committee, the Chef Sous Poste ANR, the Representative of the Chief of the Nyembo Group, the Representative of the Catholic Church, the Representative of the Teachers' Union of Kitenge and the wise men and the Counselors of the Simba May May fighters came to the meeting organized in the locale of the United Methodist Parish of Kitenge. A group of May May fighters came, too, to help us prepare the welcome for their General Chinja Chinja. Unfortunately the General didn't come this Monday. However, we noticed that the May May fighters were more numerous than the FAC soldiers at the reconciliation place as well as in the city of Katenge.

Tuesday, March 25

About 7:05 a.m., Mr. Jackson Kabamba, the Administrator of Kabongo, came to join the meeting. It was only at 2:15 p.m. that General Chanja Chanja arrived at the meeting place. Thirty minutes later, some May May fighters (estimated at 6,000) came to join the reconciliation team. They invaded the court of the parish with the FAC soldiers. So we were all pressed to begin the ceremony of reconciliation which began at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. Pierre Ndombe, the Assistant Administrator, spoke first to introduce the meeting. He began by rendering glory to God for having permitted the holding of the meeting. He praised the

meeting between brothers and so asked the Superintendent of the United Methodist Church, Rev, Mujinga Mwamba Kora, to pray for the meeting and to preach the word of God before the discussion began.

Our intervention was based on the following points:

-- The prayer

-- The message: Luke 15:17-24

Theme: "We were all lost and we need to repent."

After my sermon, Mr. Ndombe took up the theme of this reunion by insisting on the fact that we are all lost as we said in our message. He proceeded to the presentation of the participants, beginning with Brigadier General Chinja Chinja and his suite, the Commander of the FAC Battalion and his suite, the FAP and the PNC and other members. He retraced the history of the war of aggression and the creation of the Forces of Popular Self-defense (FAP) and the movements of the May May. He also evoked the troubles between FAC and the May May and the resulting destabilization of villages and especially the loss of human lives, villages burned and massive displacement of the population.

Today, he said, we do not want to set up a court to find out who is right and who is wrong. But together let us seek the true causes which each time cause troubles so that we can talk together and find solid bases for the survival of our agglomeration which has suffered so much.

The declarations of Brigadier General Chinja Chinja: Me, I am a civilian. What sometimes shocked us was FAC's harassment and the lack of understanding on each side, the false reports about the population by both sides. Today is the first and the last meeting for me. I can't fight the FAC anymore because FAC is our father who beats us all. We owe it respect. In my village, there is no court. I ask everyone to go and pose their problems to the PNC instead. We recognize the State and all its force.

After this meeting, God truly manifested himself. The attitude of the Simbas changed rapidly. They conformed to the declarations of their chiefs. The mischief was terminated. We expect peace to arrive soon.

Long live the United Methodist Church which sheltered the belligerents and which played a catalyst's role through its servant, Rev. Mujinga Mwamba Kora.

Translated by Marianne Cook

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]

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'aumonie a commencé de novembre 1998 à Janvier 1999.

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

Dans ce trois mois, j'ai eu l'occasion 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 évangélisation. 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 être ennemi de May-May et être dans le camp de May-May c'est être ennemi 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 ennemis 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 cherchions 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 être la cible de notre négociation comme c'était notre préoccupation. Nous n'avions pas hésité à leur répondre positivement pour cette rencontre. Et j'ai été 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 cheze 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 Bataillon 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'accueil 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 débiter 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 secondaire, à la PNC. Nous reconnaissons l'état 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 nâtre la paix.

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

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, Congo 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'aumonie a commencé de novembre 1998 à Janvier 1999.

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

Dans ce trois mois, j'ai eu l'occasion 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 tout 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 évangélisation. Comme il y avait deux camps, 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 ennemi de May-May et etre dans le camp de May-May c'est etre ennemi 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 ennemis 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 cherchions 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 Bataillon 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'accueil 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 débiter 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 réjoui 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 secondaire, à la PNC. Nous reconnaissons l'état et toute sa force.

Après ce meeting, Dieu s'est vraiment manifesté, l'attitude des Simbas s'est vite changée. 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 belligérants et qui avait joué un rôle de catalyseur à travers son serviteur Rév. Mujinga Mwamba Kora.

History of the Role Played by the United Methodist Church in the Reconciliation of
Conflicts in the Kitenge District
by Rev. Mujinga Muamba Kora, Superintendent of Kitenge District

I. History

Everything began in 1998 in Kitenge, headquarters of the ecclesiastic district of Kitenge, where I was assigned as pastor in order to form a second parish. Although this village had had only one parish for more than 20 years, at the suggestion of the District Superintendent, Rev. Kabonga Ilunga, it was proposed that, with my assignment there, we start a second parish, to be named "Mount Carmel."

A month after my arrival, Kabalo fell into the hands of the rebels during the Rwanda/Congo war of aggression. With the dispersal of everyone in Kitenge, I was left alone. Everyone had fled, not knowing what else to do. Being a pastor, I couldn't stand around doing nothing; I got myself assigned as Chaplain for the almost 16,000 soldiers who were regrouped in Kitenge. My work as a chaplain lasted from November 1998 to January 1999.

In January, the people gradually began to come back and we restarted activities with 30 members. During that 3-month period, I had the opportunity to learn the military life. The soldiers, too, in their camp, had need of divine help--and a good number of them were converted.

Kitenge is a village of at least 24,000 people; since there were so many, food became more and more scarce and expensive, many were hungry; we couldn't stand around; everyone anxiously searched for something to eat. I myself was not spared this misery. One day I decided, like many others, to go look for food more than 45 km. away. We arrived in Ngende at 5 p.m. Since troubles never come singly, that same night, Sept. 22, 1999, we were encircled by the Congolese-Rwandan rebels, who took everything from us (money, clothes, bikes) but I got out of it alive. I came back on foot.

Having gotten out of that, we encountered still more difficulties, this time inflicted by our Simba-May May brothers. We were obliged to flee three times in three years to take refuge from the fighting. There was general insecurity in the whole ecclesiastical district of Kitenge.

Of the nine circuits that made up our district, only three were prepared to work; not the others. The churches were closed because the whole population was scattered either in the forest or in the villages on the other bank of the Lomani River. To visit the faithful, we were exposed to much danger; we wasted money to clear our way, negotiating with both sides (the May May and the government soldiers). This ministry, in which our lives were always in peril, lasted almost three years, but in everything the hand of God was with us and there were no major incidents for any of the teams which went out on evangelization tours. Since there were two camps, the center of Kitenge was protected by the government soldiers, and all the interior was inhabited by the May May led by General Tsinga Tsinga. So the people were between the hammer and the forge and they didn't know on which foot to dance. If you supported the military, you were the enemy of the May May and if you supported the May May, you were the enemy of the military.

Even knowing that the church is apolitical and neutral, we couldn't do nothing and let the evil continue. We were obliged to get into it in spite of the possible cost to us. We sought a way to bring the two enemy brothers together around a single negotiation table. Although it was difficult, with God everything was possible. After two years of waiting, God answered our prayers. Because this was not only the concern of the churches, it had become the preoccupation of everyone. Together with the politico-administrative authorities, the military and the Congolese National Police (PNC), we tried to meet together to discuss the ways and means to put an end to police harassment, killings and general insecurity that was at its height.

The Administrator in the person of Mr. Pierre DAMIER NDOMBE, the Commander of the 941st Battalion who was at Kitenge and the Commander of the Congolese National Police all came to my house to ask me if our church could be the locale of the negotiations since we were deeply involved. We did not hesitate to respond to them positively about this meeting. And I was chosen as preacher for this meeting we had waited for so long. The work was well done, all the parties agreed to bury the (hatchet ?). Where the politicians failed, God alone is ready to provide the solution. To understand these events, here are the reports of the work we accomplished:

Monday, March 24, '03

Discussion with all the parties implicated in the re-establishment of the peace: the Assistant Administrator of the Territory of Kitenge, the Battalion Commander of the Congolese Armed Forces at Kitenge (Cmd Bn FAC), the Commanders of Battalions 2, 3 and 5 of FAC, Commander of the PNC, FAP, President of the CPP and his committee, the Chef Sous Poste ANR ?, the Representative of the Chief of the Nyembo Group, the Representative of the Catholic Church, the Representative of the Teachers' Union of Kitenge and the wise men and the Counselors of the Simba May May fighters came to the meeting organized in the locale of the United Methodist Parish of Kitenge. A group of May May fighters came too to help us prepare the welcome for their General Chinja Chinja; unfortunately the General didn't come this Monday; however we noticed that the May May fighters were more numerous than the FAC soldiers at the reconciliation place as well as in the city of Katenge

Tuesday, March 25, '03

About 7:05 a.m., Mr. Jackson Kabamba, the Administrator of Kabongo, came to join the meeting. It was only at 2:15 p.m. that General Chanja Chanja arrived at the meeting place. Thirty minutes later, some May May fighters (estimated at 6,000) came to join the reconciliation team. They invaded the court of the parish with the FAC soldiers. So we were all pressed to begin the ceremony of reconciliation which began at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. Pierre Ndombe, the Assistant Administrator, spoke first to introduce the meeting. He began by rendering glory to God for having permitted the holding of the meeting. He praised the meeting between brothers and so asked the Superintendent of the United Methodist Church, Rev. Mujinga Mwamba Kora, to pray for the meeting and to preach the word of God before the discussion began.

Our intervention was based on the following points:

--The prayer

--The message: Luke 15:17-24 Theme: "We were all lost and we need to repent."

After my sermon, Mr. Ndombe took up the theme of this reunion by insisting on the fact that we are all lost as we said in our message. He proceeded to the presentation of the participants, beginning with Brigadier General Chinja Chinja and his suite, the Commander of the FAC Battalion and his suite, the FAP and the PNC and other members. He retraced the history of the war of aggression and the creation of the Forces of Popular Self-defense (FAP) and the movements of the May May. He also evoked the troubles between FAC and the May May and the resulting destabilization of villages and especially the loss of human lives, villages burned and massive displacement of the population.

Today, he said, we do not want to set up a court to find out who is right and who is wrong. But together let us seek the true causes which each time cause troubles so that we can talk together and find solid bases for the survival of our agglomeration which has suffered so much.

The declarations of Brigadier General Chinja Chinja: "Me, I am a civilian. What sometimes shocked us was FAC's harassment and the lack of understanding on each side, the false reports about the population by both sides. Today is the first and the last meeting for me. I can't fight the FAC anymore. because FAC is our father who beats us all. We owe it respect. In my village, there is no court. I ask everyone to go and pose their problems to the PNC instead. We recognize the State and all its force."

After this meeting, God truly manifested himself. The attitude of the Simbas changed rapidly. They conformed to the declarations of their chiefs. The mischief was terminated. We expect peace to arrive soon.

Long live the United Methodist Church which sheltered the belligerents and which played a catalyst's role through its servant, Rev. Mujinga Mwamba Kora.

Translated by Marianne Cook

Liberation Theology

1. Go to <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#liberationtheology>
Add:

The 1960s and 1970s saw the emergence of liberation theology as a new, vital force within Christianity. It had three major expressions: *Latin American*, *Black*, and *Feminist*. All three varieties of liberation theology favor political, social, and economic change. Some proponents accept selective use of violence to bring about change. Others would rely upon nonviolent means. To this extent they offer insights on the theology of war and peace.

Read more..... [go to <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm>. This is a new item shown below]

2. Create a new page for the following.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm>
The model is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm>

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Liberation Theology [brown type]

The 1960s and 1970s saw the emergence of liberation theology as a new, vital force within Christianity. It had three major expressions: *Latin American*, *Black*, and *Feminist*. As Ron Rhodes [<http://www.ronrhodes.org/RonRhodes.html>], an evangelical scholar, indicates: "All three respond to some form of oppression: Latin American liberation theologians say their poverty-stricken people have been oppressed and exploited by rich, capitalist nations. Black liberation theologians argue that their people have suffered oppression at the hands of racist whites. Feminist liberation theologians lay heavy emphasis upon the status and liberation of women in a male-dominated society."

All three varieties of liberation theology favor political, social, and economic change. Some proponents accept selective use of violence to bring about change. Others would rely upon nonviolent means. To this extent they offer insights on the theology of war and peace.

Here we take up these three varieties of liberation theology.

- ❖ Latin American Liberation Theology
[<http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#latinamerican>
- ❖ Black Theology
[<http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#black>]
- ❖ Feminist Theology
[<http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#feminist>]

[box] [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#latinamerican>]

Latin America

Liberation Theology in Latin America

by Kevin Burke, S.J.

Excerpt from first paragraph to be added.

Read more.... [citation to be added]

Also see:

Liberation Theology: Introduction [[http://www.goacom.com/overseas-digest/Religion/Theology%20\(liberation\)/lib-theo-1.html](http://www.goacom.com/overseas-digest/Religion/Theology%20(liberation)/lib-theo-1.html)]

A Concise History of Liberation Theology [<http://www.landreform.org/boff2.htm>] by Leonardo and Clodovis Boff

Theology of Liberation: Bibliography [<http://www.providence.edu/las/theology.htm>]

Liberation Theology [<http://www.christendom-awake.org/pages/ratzinger/liberationtheol.htm>] by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (1984)

Instruction on Certain Aspects of "Theology of Liberation"

[http://www.newadvent.org/library/docs_df84lt.htm] by Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (August 6, 1984)

Christian Revolution in Latin America: The Changing Face of Liberation Theology

[<http://home.earthlink.net/~ronrhodes/Liberation.html>] by Ron Rhodes

An Evangelical Theology of Liberation [<http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1757>] by Ronald J. Sider



[end box]

[box] [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#black>]

Black Theology

Featured article to be added.

Also see:

To be added.

[end box]

[box] [This is <http://www.mupwj.org/liberationtheology.htm#feminist>]

Feminist Theology

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.

[Read more.....](http://www.mupwj.org/mitchell.htm) [<http://www.mupwj.org/mitchell.htm>]

[end box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm>

Experience: Alternatives to War

Nonviolent Action [like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

During the two millennia of Christianity there is a continuous history of nonviolent responses to conflict situations. It began with Jesus and the apostles, [<http://www.mupwj.org/dealingwithadversaries.htm>] continued in the early Christian church, [<http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm>] and remained an approach used by Christians over the centuries. Secular society has also produced many examples of nonviolent action. The 20th century, which saw two world wars and many smaller ones, also saw the emergence of active nonviolence as a means for dealing with military aggression, political oppression, and colonialism.

In this section we look at *experience in the 20th and early 21st centuries*. We consider *principles and techniques* of active nonviolence. We provide *sources for further information* on the subject.

- ❖ A Century of Experience
[<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#experience>]
- ❖ Principles and Techniques
[<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#techniques>]
- ❖ Resources
[<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#resources>]

[box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#experience>

A Century of Experience

In 1906 Mohandas K. Gandhi [linkage to be supplied] began developing techniques of nonviolence to oppose oppressive laws in South Africa. Returning to India in 1915, he turned his attention to British colonialism and the quest for Indian independence. Gandhi's experience provide a base of practical knowledge for Martin Luther King, Jr. [linkage to be supplied] in 1955 and thereafter in the American civil rights movement. In the 1980s as the Soviet Empire began to crumble, nonviolence became the hallmark of liberation in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself. Others around the globe have engaged in nonviolent action for a variety of causes.

Here we offer several articles dealing with this experience. In the section on resources [<http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#resources>] we provide reference to other sources for accounts of experience with nonviolent action.

The Global Spread of Active Nonviolence by Richard Deats

More and more, active nonviolence is taking the center stage in the struggle for liberation among oppressed peoples across the world. This is an alternative history, one that most people are scarcely aware of. What follows, in necessarily broad strokes, are some of the highlights of this alternative history.

Read more. [http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/0900_73deats.html]

The Year 1989

by Pope John Paul II

Excerpts from *Centesimus annus*, 1991.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html

It seemed that the European order resulting from the Second World War and sanctioned by the *Yalta Agreements* could only be overturned by another war. Instead, it has been overcome by the non-violent commitment of people who, while always refusing to yield to the force of power, succeeded time after time in finding effective ways of bearing witness to the truth....

Read more. [<http://www.mupwj.org/year1989.htm>]

One Story of Nonviolence: the Palestinian Experience **by Mubarak Awad**

It is unfortunate that we Palestinians have not properly chronicled our stories and the history of the Palestinian nonviolent struggle.... In 1983, I returned to Palestine as a psychologist who was interested in counseling Palestinians and soon found myself immersed in nonviolent activism. I opened the Palestinian Center for Nonviolence to bring alternative solutions to the Palestinians with an emphasis on nonviolence....

Read more. <http://www.commongroundnews.org/article.php?mode=3&id=43>

Also see:

"Nonviolence in the Middle East: A Talk with Mubarak Awad"

[<http://www.peacemagazine.org/archive/v16n4p13.htm>] (Peace Magazine Oct-Dec 2000).

"Palestinians need to adopt nonviolent strategy"

[<http://www.progressive.org/Media%20Project%202/mpaa1002.html>] by Mubarak Awad

(Progressive Media Project, April 10, 2002)

Activist Mubarak Awad on Resisting the Occupation

[<http://www.palestinenet.org/english/archive2004/apr/week4/250404/mubarak25apr.htm>]

(Palestine News Network, April 25, 2004)

Increasing Use of Nonviolence in History **by Sanderson Beck**

A listing of examples from the last 500 years plus one from 454 BCE is contained in a *Nonviolent Action Handbook* by Sanderson Beck.

Read more. <http://www.nonviolenceworks.net/NVWSite.htm/resources/NVhandbook.htm#9>

Other articles to be added.

You can find information about Mahatma Gandhi [linkage to be supplied] and the Indian independence movement and about Martin Luther King, Jr. [linkage to be supplied] and the U.S. civil rights movement in the section on 20th Century Prophets and Theologians of this website. ▲

[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#techniques>]

Principles and Techniques

Experience with nonviolent action during the 20th century has helped develop deeper understanding of basic principles and practical knowledge in using various action techniques. This has occurred in many countries in varied circumstances.

In many instances the application of nonviolent techniques is accompanied by other means for accomplishing campaign goals. This can include moral, political, and economic support from allies; elections and plebiscites; reliance upon legal rights carried out through courts and even by the police or military in a protective manner; publicity through newspapers, radio, television, internet. But usually nonviolent action serves as the catalyst for change.

Blessed Are The Meek: The Roots of Christian Nonviolence by Thomas Merton

It would be a serious mistake to regard Christian nonviolence simply as a novel tactic which is at once efficacious and even edifying, and which enables the sensitive person to participate in the struggles of the world without being dirtied with blood. Nonviolence is not simply a way of proving one's point and getting what one wants without being involved in behavior that one considers ugly and evil. Nor is it, for that matter, a means which anyone legitimately can make use of according to his fancy for any purpose whatever. To practice nonviolence for a purely selfish or arbitrary end would in fact discredit and distort the truth of nonviolent resistance. Read more. <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/40merton.html>

How Nonviolence Works by Glenn Smiley

While in all societies throughout history, there must have been men and women who, by reason of superior intelligence were able to compensate for lack of strength by more innovative means, it has not been until the relatively recent past that an organized third way of addressing conflict has emerged. It is to this third way that we address ourselves, as we seek to develop a method of training in nonviolence.

Read more. <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/65smiley.html>

198 Methods of Nonviolent Action by Gene Sharp

Gene Sharp, long-time researcher on nonviolence, has identified 198 methods of nonviolent action.

[<http://www.aeinstein.org/organizations.php3?orgid=88&typeID=15&action=printContentTypeHome>] They include the following major categories:

- Nonviolent Protest and Persuasion
- Social Noncooperation
- Economic Noncooperation: Boycotts
- Economic Noncooperation: Strikes
- Political Noncooperation
- Nonviolent Intervention

These methods were compiled by Dr Sharp and first published in his 1973 book, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action, Vol. 2: The Methods of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, 1973). The book outlines each method and gives information about its historical use.



[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm#resources>]

Resources

Albert Einstein Institution [<http://www.aeinstein.org>]

Founded in 1983 by Dr. Gene Sharp, The Albert Einstein Institution is dedicated to advancing the study and use of strategic nonviolent action in conflicts throughout the world. It is committed to the defense of freedom, democracy, and the reduction of political violence through the use of nonviolent action. The Institution has actively consulted with resistance and pro-democracy groups (including groups in Burma, Thailand, Tibet, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Belarus, Serbia, and the Occupied Territories).

Its publications on nonviolent action

[<http://www.aeinstein.org/organizations.php3?orgid=88&typeID=16&action=printContentItem&itemID=31&templateID=34&sortField=alpha>], some of them downloadable, include strategies for resisting coups, going from dictatorship to democracy, and self-reliance defense without war. There is a listing of Dr. Sharp's many books on nonviolence, including the latest, Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential (2005),

[<http://www.aeinstein.org/organizations.php3?action=printContentItem&orgid=88&typeID=16&itemID=356>] that includes 23 case studies of nonviolent action..

Nonviolence International [<http://www.nonviolenceinternational.net/>]

Nonviolence International promotes nonviolent action and seeks to reduce the use of violence worldwide. NI believes that every cultural and religious tradition can discover and employ culturally appropriate nonviolent methods for positive social change and international peace. Founded by Palestinian activist Mubarak Awad in 1989, NI has resource centers and affiliates in Aceh, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Jerusalem, Bangkok, Moscow, and Washington, D.C.

Nonviolence International has available an [Annotated Bibliography of Nonviolent Action Training](http://www.nonviolenceinternational.net/biblio_000.htm) [http://www.nonviolenceinternational.net/biblio_000.htm] containing basic training resources for those who engage in nonviolent action training.

Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival

<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/ponsacs/index.htm>

The website of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival (PONSACS), housed at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, has a section on

Transforming Struggle

[<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/ponsacs/seminars/TransformingStruggle/index.htm>] that contains nine years of seminar reports on global experience with nonviolent direct action. This includes A Geography of Nonviolent Struggles

<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/ponsacs/seminars/TransformingStruggle/geography.htm>] with individual reports from countries around the globe.

Fellowship of Reconciliation

Another excellent resource is the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Information on this organization is provided on this website in the section on Pacifism. Go to.

<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistresources>

Other Organizations

Center for the Advancement of Nonviolence <http://www.nonviolenceworks.com/>

Christian Peacemaker Teams <http://www.cpt.org/>

M.K. Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence <http://www.gandhiinstitute.org>

The King Center <http://www.thekingcenter.org>

Nonviolence Works <http://www.nonviolenceworks.net>

Nonviolent Peaceforce <http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/english/welcome.asp>

War Resisters League <http://www.warresisters.org>

[end box]



War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition

by J. Steven O'Malley
Asbury Theological Seminary

Based in a German-American revival movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) have left a record of involvement in issues of war and peace within the context of their North American environment and in their global missionary outreach.

These bodies include the Evangelical Association (die Evangelische Gemeinschaft; 1816-1922), the United Evangelical Church (1894-1922), the Evangelical Church (1922-1946), and the Church of the United Brethren in Christ (1800-1946). The first two denominations united to form the third in 1922, following a division in 1891-1894, and the last two united to form the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) in 1946. Then in 1968, the EUB united with The Methodist Church to form the current United Methodist Church. Total EUB membership peaked at 763,000 in the early 1960s in almost 5,000 congregations. The global constituency, including persons in indigenous church bodies that were related to the denomination, reached a peak that approached one million adherents.

United Brethren Origin

Earlier United Brethren (UB) historians identified their denomination as the first American-born denomination since roots were traced to the encounter between Philip William Otterbein (1726-1813) and Martin Boehm (1725-1812) at a barn revival meeting in 1767 (the Long's barn meeting, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania). Here, the German Reformed missionary pastor from Baltimore (Otterbein) embraced the "awakened" Mennonite preacher (Boehm) with the salutary "wir sind Brüder" ("we are brethren"). Their constituency represented a body of immigrants from Germany and their descendants, many of whom had fled the scourge of warfare in Europe. Meetings of "awakened" German preachers began in the 1770s that developed into the UB by 1800, when these men were elected general "elders" (later called bishops).

A significant percentage of early UB members and preachers had Mennonite background, which blended with the Pietistic emphasis upon the new birth as the central Christian experience. Anabaptists, the ancestors of the Mennonites, were early proponents of a "believers' church", built on adult baptism and avoidance of the marks of the "fallen" society, including oath-taking, public office holding, and participation in military conflict. The Christian life was modeled on "nachfolge Christi", or a literal following after the way of Jesus. Pacifist sentiment was also introduced by converts from the Dunkers (Church of the Brethren).

Early UB and Evangelicals sometimes held dual allegiance to these peace church traditions and to the newly formed revival denominations, which included participating in

the “love feasts” of the Dunkers and the foot-washing practice of the Mennonites. The latter is reflected in the first Confession of Faith of the United Brethren, adopted in 1815, where “the washing of feet” is “recommended”, along with baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

Civil War

In 1849, in the wake of the American acquisition of Texas in the Mexican War, United Brethren voted in General Conference, by a vote of twenty-one to one, with several abstentions, the declaration that “Resolved, we believe that the spirit that leads men to engage voluntarily in national warfare is unholy and unchristian and ought not to be tolerated by us.”¹ This resolution was modified during the Civil War, reflecting the position that morally justified the military defense of duly constituted government, particularly when threatened by forces that had instituted the enslavement of humanity. A resolution from the 1865 UB General Conference asserted that “We believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly constituted authorities of our government for its preservation and defense.”²

From that time, the denomination sought to balance its abhorrence of war with a realistic assessment of the obligation to bear arms for causes deemed just.³ Support for the Union position in the Civil War was also congruent with longstanding UB policy of forbidding slaveholders or slave traders from membership in the church.⁴ The change from the 1849 to the 1865 position reflects as well the transition of the UB from a sectarian body to a rapidly growing regional denomination that was increasingly identifying the coming Kingdom of God with the Christianizing of the American social order.

United Brethren placed a high priority upon being an “unpartisan” fellowship, and they did not allow even the division of the nation during the Civil War to disrupt that unity. A case in point is Bishop John J. Glossbrenner, who served the Virginia Conference. Its northern half embraced the state of Maryland, while its southern half was in pro-slavery Virginia. Glossbrenner was granted safe passage by both warring sides to pass through the lines for the purpose of holding conference in the two divided segments of that conference.

Influence of German Pietism

To understand these developments, it may be observed that the United Brethren were chiefly influenced by radical German Pietism in their ethos and theological idiom. Inherent within this ethos is the centrality given to the theme of Pentecost and the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which anticipates a new millennial age of peace and justice, which Otterbein called “a more glorious state of the church on earth than ever has been.”⁵ The barn meeting of Otterbein and Boehm that launched their movement occurred on Pentecost, 1767. This motif suggests that they were not called to replicate a sectarian (Anabaptist) stance of ecclesial separation from the world. Instead, their movement was

seen as the vanguard for the universal transformation of history into the Kingdom of God, that was commencing with the great awakening in the New World.

Otterbein wrote that “these great events are at the door,” and “the prophecies will be fulfilled, and they are being fulfilled from day to day, and you may live to see great things.”⁶ Their hope was for a Kingdom of peace, devoid of warfare, which the 1849 resolution reflected. Otterbein had also noted that this new order cannot break into history until “the seven vials of the wrath of God will be poured out” (an allusion to Revelation 14:19-15:1). The tribulation that precedes the full manifestation of the Kingdom involved the purging of the ungodly, since only those washed and reborn in the Lamb will inherit citizenship in that new historical order. The 1865 resolution suggests that the people of God had been enduring their tribulation in the era of the Civil War. In its wake, they were seeking to remain faithful in retaining their “unpartisan” (“unpartheiisch”) unity in Christ, which was also their solidarity in the emerging, final “victory of Jesus Christ over the devil and death”.⁷

That unity was dramatically highlighted by the passage of Bishop Glossbrenner back and forth across the warring lines of North and South—protected from harm as a man of God’s peace, as he faithfully maintained the unity of the United Brethren in Virginia in the midst of the hatred and division of war. There were voices among the UB on both sides of this divide that called for division of the church, even as the Methodists and Baptists had divided in the heat of this conflict. However, unity prevailed within the Virginia Conference, despite the fact that some UB men were serving in the Union army out of their commitment to preserving the federal union of free men and women who rejected slavery. Likewise, most of those on the Southern side of this divide sought to remain faithful to their church’s opposition to slavery,⁸ even as they weathered tribulation, with congregational life disrupted, at the hands of the Confederate authorities.

In the twentieth century, United Brethren further modified its stance on war by officially recognizing the right of conscientious objection.

War is contrary to the spirit and message of Christ. The church should never prepare for or make war. The Church of the United Brethren in Christ recognizes the many Christians who, because of conscience find it inconsistent with their principles to participate or sanction war. A judgment of a citizen’s loyalty to his country should not be based on his willingness to bear arms.⁹

Evangelical Association

The history of the Evangelical Association/Church reveals a similar influence from the themes of radical German Pietism, including the central motif of Pentecost and Spirit baptism. As with the UB, their concern was to bring vital, experiential Christianity to the “unawakened” and self-absorbed German-Americans, including their nominal “church Dutch” (Lutherans and Reformed) and “plain Dutch” (Mennonite, Dunker) neighbors. In fact, their early gatherings in the revival among the Germans led by the lay preacher Jacob Albright (1759-1808) are referenced as “Pentecostal meetings”.¹⁰ Their celebrated

missionary bishop, John Seybert (1791-1860), wrote in his Journal that converts were baptized by all three modes, but that what was essential was that they “the baptism of the Holy Ghost came down upon all.”¹¹ By comparison with the UB, Albright’s followers readily adopted a Methodist form of church order, reflected in the “Doctrines and Discipline” of 1809, published after the death of their founder, Jacob Albright. Their Articles of Faith were an adaptation in German translation of the Methodist Articles of Religion.¹²

Before his encounter with the new birth in Christ, Albright had served as a soldier in the colonial army during the Revolutionary War, with particular responsibility being the guarding of German-speaking Hessian soldiers. However, reflecting radical Pietist influence probably more than that of the peace church traditions of the Mennonites and Dunkers, the statement was added to Article XVII of the Articles of Faith in 1839 that declared, “we believe that wars and bloodshed are not agreeable to the Gospel and Spirit of Christ.”¹³ Although this position remained officially in place, the General Conference of 1863, meeting during the Civil War, declared as part of its war resolution that “it is the imperative duty of our Government, to use the sword entrusted to it by God,...and it is the holiest duty of every citizen, faithfully to support the Government in the important duties devolving upon the same.”¹⁴

As with the UB, Evangelical support for the Union cause was influenced by their ardent opposition to slavery, as reflected in their 1839 General Conference resolution that no member “shall be allowed under any pretence or condition whatsoever the holding of slaves or the trafficking in the same.”¹⁵ For Evangelicals, antislavery was rather explicitly linked to their emphasis on the living out the doctrine of entire sanctification, and that government which defended human liberty was deemed worthy of support.

World Wars I & II

In the twentieth century, Evangelicals were particularly saddened by American entry into the First World War, given their strong connections with the German branch of their church. It was the result of missionary activity by Evangelicals from America that began in 1845. By the twentieth century, that mission had grown under state persecution to thrive as a free church with seminary, hospitals, benevolent homes, and a strong deaconess society. As Evangelical youth were drafted into the armed services of both opposing armies, there was anguish that Evangelical boys from America would be made to face in battle their counterparts from Germany. As the War progressed, support for the American government grew strong within the American “mother” church, and a significant number of Evangelical as well as United Brethren ministers volunteered for duty in the military chaplaincy.

A similar pattern of participation was observed in the Second World War. However, Evangelicals, United Brethren, and EUB allowed members the conscientious choice whether to support military service or opt for alternative service. As the official commentary on the EUB Confession of Faith (1962) declared, war “is a compounding of offenses against the ‘gospel and Spirit of Christ.’...Bloody struggle confronts us often in

this floundering world, but it simply has no place at all in the eventual divine plan.” In addition,

Our Statement of Faith concerning war rests on the principle that it is contrary to Christian idealism. The individual Christian must make the agonizing choice as to where duty and justice point him in a specific engagement and how much blood shall stain his hand or soul in the common defense. How close to the spirit and kingdom of Christ dare he aspire to come in this mortal life?¹⁶

Present and Future Kingdom

The issue for EUB was, to what extent can we live now by the norms of the future Kingdom, whose standards are our ultimate guide and yet cannot be prematurely interposed within a fallen world where evil still reigns? The peace church tradition would opt for a present, uncompromised identity with Jesus’ beatitudes, with a sharp delineation between the way of violence and the way of peace. The EUB and their predecessors would agree that the goal of the church’s witness was a community of grace and peace in the Resurrected Lord. But their present course, en route to that future goal, was set in the midst of a fallen world, which obliged them to support the righteous actions of duly-constituted civil government in promoting the conditions of freedom and justice.

When those actions enable the onslaught of human oppression and genocide to be replaced by conditions enabling freedom of assembly and the protection of life, including the free exercise of divine worship, the governments which facilitate that goal, even by coercive force, when necessary, may be deemed congruent with God’s ultimate redemptive concerns for human society. It is for this reason that many present-day heirs of Otterbein and Albright would prayerfully support the actions of democratic societies that rightly seek to replace regimes and movements which terrorize and dehumanize humanity with those committed to norms of peace and justice.

On related issues, EUB declared themselves opposed to nuclear testing, and the General Conference of 1962 fell only one vote short of opposing capital punishment.¹⁷

The EUB legacy and stance on war and peace was to live out their witness to Christ on the crucible of the two kingdoms, to which they gave allegiance: the one which was coming, and which was the source of their eternal hope, and the other which was strategically directed by God to be the theater of God’s testing and sifting of humanity, in preparation for the inexorable Day of the Lord.

¹ UB General Conference Minutes (1849), 127.

² Religious Telescope (May 31, 1865), 158.

³ “We most positively record our disapproval of engaging in voluntary, national, aggressive warfare; yet, we recognize the rightful authority of the civil government, and hold it responsible for the preservation and defense of our national compact, against treason, or invasion by any belligerent force, and we believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly-constituted authorities of our government, for its preservation and defense.”—UB Discipline, 1865, 87.

⁴ Resolution of the 1821 General Conference (UB), cited in J. Bruce Behney and Paul H. Eller, The History of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Nashville: Abingdon: 1979), 124.

⁵ Philip William Otterbein, "Letter Concerning the Millennium." In Arthur Core, ed., Philip William Otterbein: Pastor, Ecumenist (Dayton: EUB Board of Publication, 1968), 102f.

⁶ Otterbein, "Letter", 103.

⁷ See "The Protocol of the United Brethren in Christ" (1800-1812), in Core, 121, and Otterbein, "The Salvation Bringing and Glorious Incarnation of Jesus Christ over the Devil and Death," in Core, 77.

⁸ There had been a minority of UB in Virginia who strongly opposed abolitionism and their leader, W.M.K. Cain, had started the "Virginia Telescope" to counter the denominational paper, "The Religious Telescope" in 1840; in the interests of peace, the discussion of slavery was forbidden in that paper in 1841.—Paul Eller, These Evangelical United Brethren (Dayton: Otterbein Press, 1957), 72.

⁹ UB Discipline, 1937, 89.

¹⁰ The first of these was held at the home of Peter Walter in Quakertown, Pennsylvania, in 1799.—Behney and Eller, 73

¹¹ The Journal of Bishop John Seybert, cited in Spreng, Life of Bishop John Seybert (Cleveland, 1888), 162.

See also the author's Bishop John Seybert and the Evangelical Heritage (Topeka, KS, 1986).

¹² The Discipline and Articles of Faith (1809) were prepared by George Miller, a convert under Albright's ministry, and included an article on the Last Judgment from the Augsburg Confession (Albright had been catechized a Lutheran) and an extended essay on entire sanctification, appended to the articles. The translation from English had been completed by a physician, Dr. Ignatius Roemer. For a full discussion of these events, see Raymond Albright, History of the Evangelical Church (Harrisburg, PA, 1956), 83-125.

¹³ Discipline of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Harrisburg and Dayton: Board of Publication, 1959), par.31; see also Behney and Eller, 147.

¹⁴ Evangelical General Conference Minutes (1863), 59, 60.

¹⁵ Evangelical General Conference resolution (1839) cited in Behney and Eller, 146.

¹⁶ Dale M. Phillippi, "Civil Government," in This We Believe: A Commentary on the Confession of Faith of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Dayton, 1964), 98.

¹⁷ "Therefore, we urge the abolition of nuclear testing by all nations including our own and commend efforts being made to secure international agreements banning nuclear tests."—EUB General Conference Minutes (n.d.), cited in Arthur Core, "The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader", (unpub., 1963), L-6; and "The Grand Rapids Journal Herald," (November 1, 1962), n.p., cited by Core, "The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader," L-7.

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.

War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition

by J. Steven O'Malley
Asbury Theological Seminary

[box]

View or print PDF
this section

Based in a German-American revival movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) have left a record of involvement in issues of war and peace within the context of their North American environment and in their global missionary outreach.

These bodies include the Evangelical Association (die Evangelische Gemeinschaft; 1816-1922), the United Evangelical Church (1894-1922), the Evangelical Church (1922-1946), and the Church of the United Brethren in Christ (1800-1946). The first two denominations united to form the third in 1922, following a division in 1891-1894, and the last two united to form the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) in 1946. Then in 1968, the EUB united with The Methodist Church to form the current United Methodist Church. Total EUB membership peaked at 763,000 in the early 1960s in almost 5,000 congregations. The global constituency, including persons in indigenous church bodies that were related to the denomination, reached a peak that approached one million adherents.

United Brethren Origin

Earlier United Brethren (UB) historians identified their denomination as the first American-born denomination since roots were traced to the encounter between Philip William Otterbein (1726-1813) and Martin Boehm (1725-1812) at a barn revival meeting in 1767 (the Long's barn meeting, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania). Here, the German Reformed missionary pastor from Baltimore (Otterbein) embraced the "awakened" Mennonite preacher (Boehm) with the salutary "wir sind Brüder" ("we are brethren"). Their constituency represented a body of immigrants from Germany and their descendants, many of whom had fled the scourge of warfare in Europe. Meetings of "awakened" German preachers began in the 1770s that developed into the UB by 1800, when these men were elected general "elders" (later called bishops).

A significant percentage of early UB members and preachers had Mennonite background, which blended with the Pietistic emphasis upon the new birth as the central Christian experience. Anabaptists, the ancestors of the Mennonites, were early proponents of a "believers' church", built on adult baptism and avoidance of the marks of the "fallen" society, including oath-taking, public office holding, and participation in military conflict. The Christian life was modeled on "nachfolge Christi", or a literal following

after the way of Jesus. Pacifist sentiment was also introduced by converts from the Dunkers (Church of the Brethren).

Early UB and Evangelicals sometimes held dual allegiance to these peace church traditions and to the newly formed revival denominations, which included participating in the “love feasts” of the Dunkers and the foot-washing practice of the Mennonites. The latter is reflected in the first Confession of Faith of the United Brethren, adopted in 1815, where “the washing of feet” is “recommended”, along with baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

Civil War

In 1849, in the wake of the American acquisition of Texas in the Mexican War, United Brethren voted in General Conference, by a vote of twenty-one to one, with several abstentions, the declaration that “Resolved, we believe that the spirit that leads men to engage voluntarily in national warfare is unholy and unchristian and ought not to be tolerated by us.”¹ This resolution was modified during the Civil War, reflecting the position that morally justified the military defense of duly constituted government, particularly when threatened by forces that had instituted the enslavement of humanity. A resolution from the 1865 UB General Conference asserted that “We believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly constituted authorities of our government for its preservation and defense.”²

From that time, the denomination sought to balance its abhorrence of war with a realistic assessment of the obligation to bear arms for causes deemed just.³ Support for the Union position in the Civil War was also congruent with longstanding UB policy of forbidding slaveholders or slave traders from membership in the church.⁴ The change from the 1849 to the 1865 position reflects as well the transition of the UB from a sectarian body to a rapidly growing regional denomination that was increasingly identifying the coming Kingdom of God with the Christianizing of the American social order.

United Brethren placed a high priority upon being an “unpartisan” fellowship, and they did not allow even the division of the nation during the Civil War to disrupt that unity. A case in point is Bishop John J. Glossbrenner, who served the Virginia Conference. Its northern half embraced the state of Maryland, while its southern half was in pro-slavery Virginia. Glossbrenner was granted safe passage by both warring sides to pass through the lines for the purpose of holding conference in the two divided segments of that conference.

Influence of German Pietism

To understand these developments, it may be observed that the United Brethren were chiefly influenced by radical German Pietism in their ethos and theological idiom. Inherent within this ethos is the centrality given to the theme of Pentecost and the

baptism in the Holy Spirit, which anticipates a new millennial age of peace and justice, which Otterbein called “a more glorious state of the church on earth than ever has been.”⁵ The barn meeting of Otterbein and Boehm that launched their movement occurred on Pentecost, 1767. This motif suggests that they were not called to replicate a sectarian (Anabaptist) stance of ecclesial separation from the world. Instead, their movement was seen as the vanguard for the universal transformation of history into the Kingdom of God, that was commencing with the great awakening in the New World.

Otterbein wrote that “these great events are at the door,” and “the prophecies will be fulfilled, and they are being fulfilled from day to day, and you may live to see great things.”⁶ Their hope was for a Kingdom of peace, devoid of warfare, which the 1849 resolution reflected. Otterbein had also noted that this new order cannot break into history until “the seven vials of the wrath of God will be poured out” (an allusion to Revelation 14:19-15:1). The tribulation that precedes the full manifestation of the Kingdom involved the purging of the ungodly, since only those washed and reborn in the Lamb will inherit citizenship in that new historical order. The 1865 resolution suggests that the people of God had been enduring their tribulation in the era of the Civil War. In its wake, they were seeking to remain faithful in retaining their “unpartisan” (“unparteiisch”) unity in Christ, which was also their solidarity in the emerging, final “victory of Jesus Christ over the devil and death”.⁷

That unity was dramatically highlighted by the passage of Bishop Glossbrenner back and forth across the warring lines of North and South—protected from harm as a man of God’s peace, as he faithfully maintained the unity of the United Brethren in Virginia in the midst of the hatred and division of war. There were voices among the UB on both sides of this divide that called for division of the church, even as the Methodists and Baptists had divided in the heat of this conflict. However, unity prevailed within the Virginia Conference, despite the fact that some UB men were serving in the Union army out of their commitment to preserving the federal union of free men and women who rejected slavery. Likewise, most of those on the Southern side of this divide sought to remain faithful to their church’s opposition to slavery,⁸ even as they weathered tribulation, with congregational life disrupted, at the hands of the Confederate authorities.

In the twentieth century, United Brethren further modified its stance on war by officially recognizing the right of conscientious objection.

War is contrary to the spirit and message of Christ. The church should never prepare for or make war. The Church of the United Brethren in Christ recognizes the many Christians who, because of conscience find it inconsistent with their principles to participate or sanction war. A judgment of a citizen’s loyalty to his country should not be based on his willingness to bear arms.⁹

Evangelical Association

The history of the Evangelical Association/Church reveals a similar influence from the themes of radical German Pietism, including the central motif of Pentecost and Spirit

baptism. As with the UB, their concern was to bring vital, experiential Christianity to the “unawakened” and self-absorbed German-Americans, including their nominal “church Dutch” (Lutherans and Reformed) and “plain Dutch” (Mennonite, Dunker) neighbors. In fact, their early gatherings in the revival among the Germans led by the lay preacher Jacob Albright (1759-1808) are referenced as “Pentecostal meetings”.¹⁰ Their celebrated missionary bishop, John Seybert (1791-1860), wrote in his Journal that converts were baptized by all three modes, but that what was essential was that they “the baptism of the Holy Ghost came down upon all.”¹¹ By comparison with the UB, Albright’s followers readily adopted a Methodist form of church order, reflected in the “Doctrines and Discipline” of 1809, published after the death of their founder, Jacob Albright. Their Articles of Faith were an adaptation in German translation of the Methodist Articles of Religion.¹²

Before his encounter with the new birth in Christ, Albright had served as a soldier in the colonial army during the Revolutionary War, with particular responsibility being the guarding of German-speaking Hessian soldiers. However, reflecting radical Pietist influence probably more than that of the peace church traditions of the Mennonites and Dunkers, the statement was added to Article XVII of the Articles of Faith in 1839 that declared, “we believe that wars and bloodshed are not agreeable to the Gospel and Spirit of Christ.”¹³ Although this position remained officially in place, the General Conference of 1863, meeting during the Civil War, declared as part of its war resolution that “it is the imperative duty of our Government, to use the sword entrusted to it by God,...and it is the holiest duty of every citizen, faithfully to support the Government in the important duties devolving upon the same.”¹⁴

As with the UB, Evangelical support for the Union cause was influenced by their ardent opposition to slavery, as reflected in their 1839 General Conference resolution that no member “shall be allowed under any pretence or condition whatsoever the holding of slaves or the trafficking in the same.”¹⁵ For Evangelicals, antislavery was rather explicitly linked to their emphasis on the living out the doctrine of entire sanctification, and that government which defended human liberty was deemed worthy of support.

World War I & II

In the twentieth century, Evangelicals were particularly saddened by American entry into the First World War, given their strong connections with the German branch of their church. It was the result of missionary activity by Evangelicals from America that began in 1845. By the twentieth century, that mission had grown under state persecution to thrive as a free church with seminary, hospitals, benevolent homes, and a strong deaconess society. As Evangelical youth were drafted into the armed services of both opposing armies, there was anguish that Evangelical boys from America would be made to face in battle their counterparts from Germany. As the War progressed, support for the American government grew strong within the American “mother” church, and a significant number of Evangelical as well as United Brethren ministers volunteered for duty in the military chaplaincy.

A similar pattern of participation was observed in the Second World War. However, Evangelicals, United Brethren, and EUB allowed members the conscientious choice whether to support military service or opt for alternative service. As the official commentary on the EUB Confession of Faith (1962) declared, war “is a compounding of offenses against the ‘gospel and Spirit of Christ.’ . . . Bloody struggle confronts us often in this floundering world, but it simply has no place at all in the eventual divine plan.” In addition,

Our Statement of Faith concerning war rests on the principle that it is contrary to Christian idealism. The individual Christian must make the agonizing choice as to where duty and justice point him in a specific engagement and how much blood shall stain his hand or soul in the common defense. How close to the spirit and kingdom of Christ dare he aspire to come in this mortal life?¹⁶

Present and Future Kingdom

The issue for EUB was, to what extent can we live now by the norms of the future Kingdom, whose standards are our ultimate guide and yet cannot be prematurely interposed within a fallen world where evil still reigns? The peace church tradition would opt for a present, uncompromised identity with Jesus’ beatitudes, with a sharp delineation between the way of violence and the way of peace. The EUB and their predecessors would agree that the goal of the church’s witness was a community of grace and peace in the Resurrected Lord. But their present course, en route to that future goal, was set in the midst of a fallen world, which obliged them to support the righteous actions of duly-constituted civil government in promoting the conditions of freedom and justice.

When those actions enable the onslaught of human oppression and genocide to be replaced by conditions enabling freedom of assembly and the protection of life, including the free exercise of divine worship, the governments which facilitate that goal, even by coercive force, when necessary, may be deemed congruent with God’s ultimate redemptive concerns for human society. It is for this reason that many present-day heirs of Otterbein and Albright would prayerfully support the actions of democratic societies that rightly seek to replace regimes and movements which terrorize and dehumanize humanity with those committed to norms of peace and justice.

On related issues, EUB declared themselves opposed to nuclear testing, and the General Conference of 1962 fell only one vote short of opposing capital punishment.¹⁷

The EUB legacy and stance on war and peace was to live out their witness to Christ on the crucible of the two kingdoms, to which they gave allegiance: the one which was coming, and which was the source of their eternal hope, and the other which was strategically directed by God to be the theater of God’s testing and sifting of humanity, in preparation for the inexorable Day of the Lord.

¹ UB General Conference Minutes (1849), 127.

² Religious Telescope (May 31, 1865), 158.

³ “We most positively record our disapproval of engaging in voluntary, national, aggressive warfare; yet, we recognize the rightful authority of the civil government, and hold it responsible for the preservation and defense of our national compact, against treason, or invasion by any belligerent force, and we believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly-constituted authorities of our government, for its preservation and defense.”—UB Discipline, 1865, 87.

⁴ Resolution of the 1821 General Conference (UB), cited in J. Bruce Behney and Paul H. Eller, The History of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Nashville: Abingdon: 1979), 124.

⁵ Philip William Otterbein, ‘Letter Concerning the Millennium.’ In Arthur Core, ed., Philip William Otterbein: Pastor, Ecumenist (Dayton: EUB Board of Publication, 1968), 102f.

⁶ Otterbein, “Letter”, 103.

⁷ See The Protocol of the United Brethren in Christ” (1800-1812), in Core, 121, and Otterbein, “The Salvation Bringing and Glorious Incarnation of Jesus Christ over the Devil and Death,” in Core, 77.

⁸ There had been a minority of UB in Virginia who strongly opposed abolitionism and their leader, W.M.K. Cain, had started the “Virginia Telescope” to counter the denominational paper, “The Religious Telescope” in 1840; in the interests of peace, the discussion of slavery was forbidden in that paper in 1841.—Paul Eller, These Evangelical United Brethren (Dayton: Otterbein Press, 1957), 72.

⁹ UB Discipline, 1937, 89.

¹⁰ The first of these was held at the home of Peter Walter in Quakertown, Pennsylvania, in 1799.--Behney and Eller, 73

¹¹ The Journal of Bishop John Seybert, cited in Spreng, Life of Bishop John Seybert (Cleveland, 1888), 162.

See also the author’s Bishop John Seybert and the Evangelical Heritage (Topeka, KS, 1986).

¹² The Discipline and Articles of Faith (1809) were prepared by George Miller, a convert under Albright’s ministry, and included an article on the Last Judgment from the Augsburg Confession (Albright had been catechized a Lutheran) and an extended essay on entire sanctification, appended to the articles. The translation from English had been completed by a physician, Dr. Ignatius Roemer. For a full discussion of these events, see Raymond Albright, History of the Evangelical Church (Harrisburg, PA, 1956), 83-125.

¹³ Discipline of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Harrisburg and Dayton: Board of Publication, 1959), par.31; see also Behney and Eller, 147.

¹⁴ Evangelical General Conference Minutes (1863), 59, 60.

¹⁵ Evangelical General Conference resolution (1839) cited in Behney and Eller, 146.

¹⁶ Dale M. Phillippi, “Civil Government,” in This We Believe: A Commentary on the Confession of Faith of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Dayton, 1964), 98.

¹⁷ “Therefore, we urge the abolition of nuclear testing by all nations including our own and commend efforts being made to secure international agreements banning nuclear tests.”—EUB General Conference Minutes (n.d.), cited in Arthur Core, “The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader”, (unpub., 1963), L-6; and “The Grand Rapids Journal Herald,” (November 1, 1962), n.p., cited by Core, “The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader,” L-7.

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]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition-christianhistory.htm#orthodox>

Orthodox

Nonviolence and Peace Traditions In Early & Eastern Christianity by Fr. John McGuckin

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....

[Read more.....](http://incommunion.org/articles/essays/nonviolence-and-peace-traditions) [<http://incommunion.org/articles/essays/nonviolence-and-peace-traditions>]

Also see:

War and Peace in The Eastern Orthodox Church

[Part 1](http://www.stgeorgecathedral.net/article_1202.html) [http://www.stgeorgecathedral.net/article_1202.html]

[Part 2](http://www.stgeorgecathedral.net/article_0103.html) [http://www.stgeorgecathedral.net/article_0103.html]

[The Orthodox Church and Peace: Some Reflections](http://www.incommunion.org/articles/for-the-peace-from-above/the-orthodox-church-and-peace) [<http://www.incommunion.org/articles/for-the-peace-from-above/the-orthodox-church-and-peace>] by Olivier Clément

[The Teaching of Peace in the Fathers](http://www.incommunion.org/articles/essays/peace-in-the-fathers) [<http://www.incommunion.org/articles/essays/peace-in-the-fathers>] by Fr. Stanley S. Harakas

Fr. Alexander F. C. Webster and Darrell Cole, *The Virtue of War: Reclaiming the Classic Christian Traditions East and West*. Regina Orthodox Press, 2004.

[The Question of Justifiable War](http://www.svots.edu/SVTQ/special-issue-war/index.html) [<http://www.svots.edu/SVTQ/special-issue-war/index.html>] St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, Volume 47, No. 1, 2003

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm>

[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > [Reason](#) > **Pacifism**

Reason: Theological Perspectives

Christian Pacifism [set up like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

Pacifism is simultaneously negation and affirmation. It is refusal to participate in war and other conflict situations with hate and violence. Instead the pacifist responds with love and nonviolence to achieve peace and reconciliation. Some pacifists engage in nonviolent direct action to resist aggression and oppose injustice.

Christian pacifism derives from teachings and practices of Jesus and the apostles. It was a major factor in early Christianity. [link to <http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm>] Even as other approaches, developed such as just war theory, pacifism has remained as a strong current in Christianity. Some churches, such as Mennonites, Brethren, and Quaker, are strictly pacifist. Other denominations consider some wars to be acceptable but take the pacifist perspective into consideration in their decision making on issues of war and peace. Most of them support members who are conscientious objectors to war.

- ❖ [A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism](#)
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#hunsinger>
- ❖ [Articles on the Web](#)
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistarticles>
- ❖ [Resources](#)
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistresources>
- ❖ [Applied Pacifism](#)
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#appliedpacifism>



[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#hunsinger>]

A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism

by George Hunsinger

What is a Christian pacifist?

A Christian pacifist is someone who believes that in all situations of human life Jesus expects nothing less from his disciples than love. This love is especially marked by a spirit of forgiveness. Against those who inflict injury it refuses to retaliate, but instead responds with benevolence. "Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you; bless those who hurt you; pray for those who abuse you" (Luke 6:27-28).

Read more..... <http://www.mupwj.org/hunsinger.htm>



[end box]

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistarticles>]

Articles on the Web

Christian Pacifism by Myron S. Augsburg

http://www.intervarsity.org/news/news.php?item_id=1161

A Practical Christian Pacifism by David A. Hoekema [<http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=115>]

The Way of Peace [<http://www.brudershof.com/articles/WayOfPeace.htm>] by John Howard Yoder

The Early Christian Attitude to War [<http://www.compassionatespirit.com/Cadoux/Cadoux-home.htm>] (1919) by C. John Cadoux

Writings of the Early Church [<http://www.jeramnyt.org/papers/peace.html#cfat>] ▲

[end box]

[box]

{This is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistresources>}

Resources

Fellowship of Reconciliation

The Fellowship of Reconciliation [<http://www.forusa.org/>] (FOR) is a major resource for information on pacifism. Formed in the United States in 1915, it carries on programs and educational projects concerned with domestic and international peace and justice, nonviolent alternatives to conflict, and the rights of conscience. Its membership includes Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Muslims, and people of other faith traditions, as well as those with no formal religious affiliation. It is part of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation [<http://www.ifor.org/>] (IFOR) with branches in over 40 countries and on every continent.

A particularly good source is *Peace Is the Way: Writings on Nonviolence from the Fellowship of Reconciliation*

[http://www.forusa.org/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=PROD&Store_Code=books&Product_Code=banww&Category_Code=AN] (2000), edited by Walter Wink. Other available writings are identified on the FOR website. [<http://www.forusa.org/>]

Bibliographies

Biblical Basis of Pacifism [<http://www.pym.org/library/lists/biblpeac.htm>]

Pacifist/Nonviolence Bibliography [<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifismbibliography.htm>]

Writings on Christian Nonresistance and Pacifism from Anabaptist-Mennonite Sources [<http://www.bluffton.edu/~mastg/pacifism.htm>]

[end box] ▲

[box]

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#appliedpacifism>]

Applied Pacifism

On another page we consider applications of pacifism in the section on Experience: Alternatives to War where we review expressions of nonviolent action. [linkage]

- ❖ The Global Spread of Nonviolence
[linkage]
- ❖ Nonviolent Practices
[linkage]
- ❖ 20th Century Prophets and Theologians
[linkage]

[end box]



Pacifist/Nonviolence Bibliography

View or print PDF
this section

- Bainton, Roland. **Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace.** Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.
- Brown Dale. W., **Biblical Pacifism**, 2nd ed. Nappanee, IN: Evangel Publishing House, 2003.
- Buttry, Daniel L. **Christian Peacemaking. From Heritage to Hope.** Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1994.
- Dear, John. **Living Peace. A Spirituality of Contemplation and Action.** New York: Doubleday, 2001
- Deats, Richard. **Ambassador of Reconciliation: A Muriel Lester Reader.** Philadelphia, PA: New Society Pub., 1991.
- _____ **Mahatma Gandhi. Nonviolent Liberator.** Hyde Park, NY, 2005.
- Goss-Mayr, Hildegard and Jean. **The Gospel and the Struggle for Justice and Peace.** Alkmaar, Holland: The International Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1990.
- Jones, E. Stanley. **Mahatma Gandhi. A Christian Interpretation.** Nashville, TN, 1948.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. **Strength to Love.** New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- _____ **Stride toward Freedom: the Montgomery Story.** San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1987.
- King, Mary. **Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. The Power of Nonviolent Action.** Paris: UNESCO, 1999.
- Merton, Thomas. **Faith and Violence: Christian Teaching and Christian Practice.** Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- _____, ed. **Gandhi on Nonviolence**, New York: New Directions, 1965.
- Nagler, Michael. **Is There No Other Way? The Search for a Nonviolent Future.** Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Hills Books, 1991.
- Smiley, Glenn. **Nonviolence: The Gentle Persuader.** Nyack, NY: Fellowship Publications. 1991.
- Stassen, Glen H., ed. **Peacemaking: Ten Steps for Abolishing War/** Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1998.
- Wink, Walter. **Engaging the Powers.** Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992
- _____, ed. **Peace is the Way Writings on Nonviolence from the Fellowship of Reconciliation.** Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000.
- Yoder, John Howard. **The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster**, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Prepared by Richard Deats, Fellowship of Reconciliation, for a project on "The Theology of War and Peace" of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. For further information, go <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.

Prophets (2)

Photo of Rauschenbusch at

http://chuckcurrie.blogs.com/chuck_currie/2005/01/walter_rauschen.html

Photo of Muriel Lester

<http://deatspeace.tripod.com/muriel.html>

Photo of Gandhi

<http://www.mkgandhi-sarvodaya.org/gphotgallery/1933-1948/pages/g98.htm>

* <http://www.mkgandhi-sarvodaya.org/gphotgallery/1933-1948/pages/j5.htm>

<http://www.mkgandhi.org/index.htm>

Others to be added:

> Dorothy Day

Responding to Nazi Germany: > Confessing Church > Karl Barth > Martin Niemoeller

> Dietrich Bonhoeffer > Andre Trocme > Righteous of the World > Other Resisters

> A.J. Muste > Reinhold Niebuhr > Martin Luther King, Jr. > Daniel and Philip Berrigan

> Archbishop Oscar Romero > Archbishop Desmond Tutu,.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/prophets.htm>.

This links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/experience.htm#prophets>.

Experience: Alternatives to War

20th Century Prophets and Theologians

[like style of <http://www.mupwj.org/nonviolentaction.htm>]

To learn more about alternatives to war, we can benefit from reviewing the experience and ideas of prominent individuals who led the way in the 20th century. We offer a sample drawn from liberation movements, parish churches, seminaries, and church hierarchy.

[Each of these should be linked to place where their name appears below as <http://www.mupwj.org/prophets.htm#name>]

> Walter Rauschenbusch > Mohandas K. Gandhi > Muriel Lester
Others to be added.

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/prophets.htm#rauschenbusch>.

Walter Rauschenbusch

Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918) was a prominent leader of the social gospel movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the United States. Ordained in 1886, he served for 13 years as pastor of the Second German Baptist Church in "Hell's Kitchen" on the West Side in New York City. Living with persons mired in poverty, he saw first hand social and economic inequities of capitalism. He broadened his perspective by studying theology and economics at the University of Berlin and industrial relations in England in 1891-92.

Rauschenbusch became professor of church history at Rochester Theological Seminary in 1902. From this base he presented his ideas in a series of influential books: *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (1907), *Prayers for the Social Awakening* (1910), *Christianizing the Social Order* (1912), *The Social Principles of Jesus* (1916), and *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1917). The latter related the social gospel to traditional concerns of Christian theology: sin and evil, salvation, conception of God, baptism, the Lord's Supper, atonement, the Holy Spirit, Kingdom of God, eschatology.

Rauschenbusch focused particularly on social and economic injustice and did not delve deeply into issues of war and peace. However, *Prayers for the Social Awakening* contain a passionate prayer "Against War" and an eloquent, still relevant prayer "For the Church." [Read these two prayers.](http://www.mupwy.org/rauschenbuschprayers.htm) [<http://www.mupwy.org/rauschenbuschprayers.htm>.]

Rauschenbush's Influence

by Martin Luther King, Jr.

(Recalling his days at Crozer Theological Seminary, 1948)

I came early to Walter Rauschenbusch's *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, which left an indelible imprint on my thinking by giving me a theological basis for the social concern which had already grown up in me as a result of my early experiences. Of course there were points at

which I differed with Rauschenbusch. I felt that he had fallen victim to the nineteenth century "cult of inevitable progress" which led him to a superficial optimism concerning man's nature. Moreover, he came perilously close to identifying the Kingdom of God with a particular social and economic system—a tendency which should never befall the Church.

But in spite of these shortcomings Rauschenbusch had done a great service for the Christian Church by insisting that the gospel deals with the whole man, not only his soul but his body; not only his spiritual well-being but his material well-being. It has been my conviction ever since reading Rauschenbusch that any religion which professes to be concerned about the souls of men and is not concerned about the social and economic conditions that scar the soul, is a spiritually moribund religion only waiting for the day to be buried. It well has been said: "A religion that ends with the individual, ends."

From "My Pilgrimage to Nonviolence" <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/30king.html>

Also see:

Paul Minus *Walter Rauschenbusch: American Reformer* (Macmillan, 1988)

Max L. Stackhouse, Rauschenbusch Today: The Legacy of a Loving Prophet (1989)

<http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=803>

[end box]

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/prophets.htm#gandhi>

[box]

Mohandas K. Gandhi

Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948) developed techniques of nonviolence first in South Africa (1893-1915) in opposing discrimination against persons from India, and then in India (1915 - 1946) in the quest for independence from Great Britain. He called his method *satyagraha* (soul force).

Gandhi was deeply influenced by the *Bhagavad Gita* from the Hindu epic *Mahabharata*, the Sermon on the Mount, and writings of Leo Tolstoy, who in turned was inspired by Jesus' teachings. Gandhi was an important influence on Martin Luther King, Jr., who introduced nonviolence into the U.S. civil right movement.

A Biography of Mahatma Gandhi

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahatma_Gandhi

Chronology: The Life of Mahatma Gandhi

<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/LibraryItem.cfm?LibraryID=774>

Non-Violence—The Greatest Force

M. K. Gandhi (1926)

Non-violence is the greatest force man has been endowed with. Truth is the only goal he has. For God is none other than Truth. But Truth cannot be, never will be reached except through non-violence.

Read more. <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/07gandhi.html>

Nonviolence -- The Only Hope by Arun Gandhi

It is difficult to reconcile Gandhian thought with the modern theory that nonviolence is simply a strategy of convenience. In the words of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi nonviolence "is not a coat that you can wear today and take off tomorrow."....For Gandhi living nonviolence was a practical necessity. Unless one lives it, one cannot practice nonviolence....
Read more. <http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/upload/Nonviolence.pdf>

M.K. Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence [<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org>]

This Institute was founded in 1991 by the grandson of Mahatma Gandhi, Arun Gandhi, and his wife, Sunanda, to teach nonviolence and create a network of organizations dedicated to nonviolence worldwide. Among resources on its web-based library are the following:

Fasts: A Chronology of Mahatma Gandhi's Fasts & His Reasons

<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/LibraryItem.cfm?LibraryID=775>

Gandhi's Words - Quotations

<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/LibraryItem.cfm?LibraryID=777>

Gandhi's Peace Prayers

<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/LibraryItem.cfm?LibraryID=784>

Grandfather Gandhi: Peace Was His Way"

[<http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/Library/LibraryItem.cfm?LibraryID=747>] Arun Gandhi recalls how his grandfather comforted him after Arun was beaten by whites in South Africa.

Another source:

Comprehensive Site by Gandhian Institute Bombay Savrodaya Mandal

[<http://www.mkgandhi.org/index.htm>]

The Experiments of Gandhi: Nonviolence in the Nuclear Age by John Dear (1988)

What has become of Gandhi's experiments in truth, his rediscovery of nonviolence as the personal and public method for positive social change? What does Gandhi's nonviolent resistance and truth force mean for North Americans, forty years after his death?

Read more, <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/62dear.html>

Reflections on the Fiftieth Anniversary of Gandhi's Assassination by Mairead Maguire (1998)

Gandhi realized that the spirit of nonviolence begins within us and moves out from there. The life of active nonviolence is the fruit of an inner peace and spiritual unity already realized in us, and not the other way around. I have come to believe, with Gandhi, that through our own personal, inner conversion, our own inner peace, we are sensitized to care for God, ourselves, each other, for the poor, and for our world. Then we can become true servants of peace in the world. Herein lies the power of nonviolence.

Read more. <http://www.forusa.org/nonviolence/74maguire.html>

Also see:

John Dear, editor, Mohandas Gandhi: Essential Writings. 2002.

http://www.forusa.org/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=PROD&Store_Code=books&Product_Code=bmgew&Category_Code=NV

Richard Deats, Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent Liberator. New City Press, 2005.

http://www.forusa.org/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=PROD&Store_Code=books&Product_Code=brdgandhi&Category_Code=NV

Vinay Lal, Gandhi -- A Select Bibliographic Guide

<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/southasia/History/Gandhi/Gandhibiblio.html>



[end box]

[box] This is <http://www.mupwj.org/prophets.htm#lester>

Muriel Lester

Muriel Lester (1883 - 1968): Ambassador of Reconciliation

by Michael L. Westmoreland-White

Muriel Lester, once one of the world's most famous Christian pacifists, is today little known. This deserves correction since Lester has been positively compared to both Dorothy Day and Jane Addams in her work for the poor and for peace. As far as I can determine, she never participated in a campaign of active nonviolence personally, but she was a key link in the convergence of several movements: the mystical Christian pacifism of Tolstoy, the pragmatic peacebuilding of the early 20th C. labor and feminist movements, the "liberal" pacifism of mainstream non-sectarian Protestantism between the 2 World Wars, and Gandhian satyagraha or active nonviolent direct action. Since Lester, like Day, was a witness to Christian pacifism through the very difficult days of World War II, her story deserves recovery for us, today. [Read more.](http://www.ecapc.org/articles/WestmoW_2003.04.21.asp)

No Moratorium on the Sermon on the Mount Remembering Muriel Lester

by Richard L. Deats

The job of the peacemaker is "to stop war, to purify the world, to get it saved from poverty and riches ... to heal the sick, to comfort the sad, to wake up those who have not yet found God, to create joy and beauty wherever you go, to find God in everything and in everyone." I heard Muriel Lester say this when I was a senior at McMurray College in Texas in 1951. In a campus-wide address, this perky Englishwoman went on to say a number of uncommon things as she examined the Cold War from the vantage point of the Kingdom of God. [Read more.](#)

[end box]

From
Prayers of the Social Awakening
by Walter Rauschenbusch
1910

View or print
this section PDF

AGAINST WAR

O Lord, since first the blood of Abel cried to thee from the ground that drank it, this earth of thine has been defiled with the blood of man shed by his brother's hand, and the centuries sob with the ceaseless horror of war. Ever the pride of kings and the covetousness of the strong has driven peaceful nations to slaughter. Ever the songs of the past and the pomp of armies have been used to inflame the passions of the people. Our spirit cries out to thee in revolt against it, and we know that our righteous anger is answered by thy holy wrath.

Break thou the spell of the enchantments that make the nations drunk with the lust of battle and draw them on as willing tools of death. Grant us a quiet and steadfast mind when our own nation clamors for vengeance or aggression. Strengthen our sense of justice and our regard for the equal worth of other peoples and races. Grant to the rulers of nations faith in the possibility of peace through justice, and grant to the common people a new and stern enthusiasm for the cause of peace.

Bless our soldiers and sailors for the swift obedience and their willingness to answer the call of duty, but inspire them none the less with a hatred of war, and may they never for love of private glory or advancement provoke its coming. May our young men still rejoice to die for their country with the valor of their fathers, but teach our age nobler methods of matching our strength and more effective ways of giving our life for the flag.

O thou strong Father of all nations, draw all thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace may come on earth at last, and thy sun may shed its light rejoicing on a holy brotherhood of peoples.

FOR THE CHURCH

O God, we pray for thy Church, which is set today amid the perplexities of a changing order, and face to face with a great new task. We remember with love the nurture she gave to our spiritual life in its infancy, the tasks she set for our growing strength, the influence of the devoted hearts she gathers, the steadfast power for good she has exerted. When we compare her with all human institutions, we rejoice, for there is none like her. But when we judge her by the mind of her Master, we bow in pity and contrition.

O baptize her afresh in the life-giving spirit of Jesus! Grant her a new birth, though it be with the travail of repentance and humiliation. Bestow upon her a more imperious responsiveness to duty, a swifter compassion with suffering, and an utter loyalty to the will of God. Put upon her lips the ancient gospel of her Lord. Help her to proclaim boldly the coming of the Kingdom of God and the doom of all that resist it. Fill her with the prophets' scorn of tyranny, and with a Christ-like tenderness for the heavy-laden and down-trodden.

Give her faith to espouse the cause of the people, and in their hands that grope after freedom and light to recognize the bleeding hands of Christ. Bid her cease from seeking her own life, lest she lose it. Make her valiant to give her life to humanity, that like her crucified Lord she may mount by the path of the cross to a higher glory.

In the 1910 edition of *Prayers of the Social Awakening* Walter Rausenbusch gave permission "to reprint single prayers in newspapers, church programs, and similar publications, provide no change is made in the wording except by omission or abbreviation." He asked for proper acknowledgement.

This reprint is part of a project on the Theology of War and Peace. For further information on this project go to <http://www.mupwj.org/theologyofwarandpeace.htm> or contact Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm>
It links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/quadrilateral.htm#reason>

[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > **Reason**

Reason: Theological Perspectives

> **Christian Pacifism**

<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#pacifism>

> **Just War**

<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justwar>

> **Liberation Theology**

<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#liberation>

> **Armageddon**

<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#armageddon>

> **Just Peace**

<http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justpeace>

The application of reason to Christian faith gains expression in theological analysis and pronouncement. In the Wesleyan Quadrilateral this is a source of guidance for understanding and interpreting scripture.

Two millennia of Christianity have yielded a variety of theological perspectives on war and peace, some of them contradictory. Here we are particularly interested in theologies that undergird belief and action in the 21st century. First we examine the two oldest and most prominent expressions: pacifism and just war theory. Then we look at Liberation Theology as it has developed in the last fifty years; the theology of Armageddon, the final battle of good and evil; and an emerging theology of Just Peace.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#pacifism>.]

Christian Pacifism [set up like Old Testament at <http://www.mupwj.org/biblical.htm>]

[link to <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm>]

Christian pacifism derives from teachings and practices of Jesus and the apostles. It was a major factor in early Christianity. [link to <http://www.mupwj.org/stephenlong.htm>] Even as other approaches developed, such as just war theory, pacifism has remained a strong current in Christianity.

Some churches, such as Mennonites, Brethren, and Quaker, are strictly pacifist. Other denominations consider some wars to be acceptable but take the pacifist perspective into consideration in their decision making on issues of war and peace. Most of them support members who are conscientious objectors to war. [Read more.....](#)

[<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm>]

In this website we offer:

❖ [A Short Catechism on Christian Pacifism](#)

- ❖ <http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#hunsinger>
- ❖ Articles on the Web
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistarticles>
- ❖ Resources
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#pacifistresources>
- ❖ Applied Pacifism
<http://www.mupwj.org/pacifism.htm#appliedpacifism>



[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justwar>.]

Just War [set up like Christian Pacifism above]

[link to <http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm>]

In the 4th and 5th centuries under the influence of Bishop Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo the Christian Church began to develop what became known as the just war tradition. The intent was to identify circumstances when war would be permissible and to specify acceptable behavior in the conduct of war. In the 13th century Thomas Aquinas developed these ideas further. Today it is the major approach of the Roman Catholic Church and a strong factor for many Protestant denominations. Read more.... [<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm>]

In this website we offer:

- ❖ Just War Criteria
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarcriteria>
- ❖ Articles on the Web
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwararticles>
- ❖ Contemporary Application
<http://www.mupwj.org/justwar.htm#justwarapplication>



[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#liberation>]

Liberation Theology [set up like Christian Pacifism above]

[link to <http://www.mupwj.org/liberation.htm> when it is set up]

To be written.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#armageddon>]

Armageddon [set up like Christian Pacifism above]

[link to <http://www.mupwj.org/armageddon.htm> when it is set up]

To be written.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/reason.htm#justpeace>]

Just Peace [set up like Christian Pacifism above]

[link to <http://www.mupwj.org/justpeace.htm> when it is set up]

To be written.

[This is <http://www.mupwj.org/year1989.htm>.]

The Year 1989 **by Pope John Paul II**

Excerpt from *Centesimus annus*,

[http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html (a papal encyclical issued on the hundredth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*), 1991.

PDF View or print
this section

22. It is on the basis of the world situation just described, and already elaborated in the Encyclical *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, that the unexpected and promising significance of the events of recent years can be understood. Although they certainly reached their climax in 1989 in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, they embrace a longer period of time and a wider geographical area. In the course of the 80s, certain dictatorial and oppressive regimes fell one by one in some countries of Latin America and also of Africa and Asia. In other cases there began a difficult but productive transition towards more participatory and more just political structures. An important, even decisive, contribution was made by *the Church's commitment to defend and promote human rights*. In situations strongly influenced by ideology, in which polarization obscured the awareness of a human dignity common to all, the Church affirmed clearly and forcefully that every individual — whatever his or her personal convictions — bears the image of God and therefore deserves respect. Often, the vast majority of people identified themselves with this kind of affirmation, and this led to a search for forms of protest and for political solutions more respectful of the dignity of the person.

From this historical process new forms of democracy have emerged which offer a hope for change in fragile political and social structures weighed down by a painful series of injustices and resentments, as well as by a heavily damaged economy and serious social conflicts. Together with the whole Church, I thank God for the often heroic witness borne in such difficult circumstances by many Pastors, entire Christian communities, individual members of the faithful, and other people of good will; at the same time I pray that he will sustain the efforts being made by everyone to build a better future. This is, in fact, a responsibility which falls not only to the citizens of the countries in question, but to all Christians and people of good will. It is a question of showing that the complex problems faced by those peoples can be resolved through dialogue and solidarity, rather than by a struggle to destroy the enemy through war.

23. Among the many factors involved in the fall of oppressive regimes, some deserve special mention. Certainly, the decisive factor which gave rise to the changes was the violation of the rights of workers. It cannot be forgotten that the fundamental crisis of systems claiming to express the rule and indeed the dictatorship of the working class began with the great upheavals which took place in Poland in the name of solidarity. It was the throngs of working people which foreswore the ideology which presumed to speak in their name. On the basis of a hard, lived

experience of work and of oppression, it was they who recovered and, in a sense, rediscovered the content and principles of the Church's social doctrine.

Also worthy of emphasis is the fact that the fall of this kind of "bloc" or empire was accomplished almost everywhere by means of peaceful protest, using only the weapons of truth and justice. While Marxism held that only by exacerbating social conflicts was it possible to resolve them through violent confrontation, the protests which led to the collapse of Marxism tenaciously insisted on trying every avenue of negotiation, dialogue, and witness to the truth, appealing to the conscience of the adversary and seeking to reawaken in him a sense of shared human dignity.

It seemed that the European order resulting from the Second World War and sanctioned by the *Yalta Agreements* could only be overturned by another war. Instead, it has been overcome by the non-violent commitment of people who, while always refusing to yield to the force of power, succeeded time after time in finding effective ways of bearing witness to the truth. This disarmed the adversary, since violence always needs to justify itself through deceit, and to appear, however falsely, to be defending a right or responding to a threat posed by others. Once again I thank God for having sustained people's hearts amid difficult trials, and I pray that this example will prevail in other places and other circumstances. May people learn to fight for justice without violence, renouncing class struggle in their internal disputes, and war in international ones....

25. The events of 1989 are an example of the success of willingness to negotiate and of the Gospel spirit in the face of an adversary determined not to be bound by moral principles. These events are a warning to those who, in the name of political realism, wish to banish law and morality from the political arena. Undoubtedly, the struggle which led to the changes of 1989 called for clarity, moderation, suffering and sacrifice. In a certain sense, it was a struggle born of prayer, and it would have been unthinkable without immense trust in God, the Lord of history, who carries the human heart in his hands. It is by uniting his own sufferings for the sake of truth and freedom to the sufferings of Christ on the Cross that man is able to accomplish the miracle of peace and is in a position to discern the often narrow path between the cowardice which gives in to evil and the violence which, under the illusion of fighting evil, only makes it worse.

This excerpt is posted as 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.

This is <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition.htm>. It links back to <http://www.mupwj.org/quadrilateral.htm#tradition>.

[Home](#) > [Theology of War and Peace](#) > [Quadrilateral](#) > **Tradition**

Tradition: Christian History

> **Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace**

<http://www.mupwj.org/tradition.htm#long>

> **Holy War** [to be added]

> **Within Methodism** [to be added]

> [Others to be added]

As Christianity spread from the Holy Land and interacted with different cultures and political systems, approaches to war and peace multiplied. Today how Christians think about war and peace issues is influenced by these traditions.

We first look at how the early church emphasized pacifism until the just war doctrine emerged in the fifth century and thereafter. We note how crusades took the form of "holy wars". We trace approaches to war and peace within Methodism and the Evangelical United Brethren traditions. [Others to be added.]

[box]

[this is <http://www.mupwj.org/tradition.htm#long>]

Development of Christian Responses to War and Peace

by D. Stephen Long

Any discussion of the early development of Christian responses to war and peace is complex and open to criticism. This is largely due to the fact that no simple or consistent response was possible. The early Church did not have a commission that gathered and issued a position statement on a Christian's participation or non-participation in war like the modern church does. It took some time for that kind of unity to develop before specific pronouncements could be made.

[Read more....](http://www.mupwj.org/Christianresponses.htm) [<http://www.mupwj.org/Christianresponses.htm>]

[end box]

War and Peace in the Evangelical United Brethren Tradition

J. Steven O'Malley

Based in a German-American revival movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) have left a record of involvement in issues of war and peace, within the context of their North American environment and in their global missionary outreach. These bodies include the Evangelical Association (die Evangelische Gemeinschaft; 1816-1922), the United Evangelical Church (1894-1922), the Evangelical Church (1922-1946), and the Church of the United Brethren in Christ (1800-1946). The first two denominations united to form the third in 1922, following a division in 1891-1894, and the last two united to form the EUB in 1946. Then, in 1968, the EUB united with The Methodist Church to form the current United Methodist Church. Total EUB membership peaked at 763,000 in the early 1960s in almost 5,000 congregations, and the global constituency, including persons in indigenous church bodies that were related to the denomination, reached a peak that approached one million adherents.

Earlier UB historians identified their denomination as the first American-born denomination, since roots were traced to the encounter between Philip William Otterbein (1726-1813) and Martin Boehm (1725-1812) at a barn revival meeting in 1767 (the Long's barn meeting, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania.) Here, the German Reformed missionary pastor from Baltimore (Otterbein) embraced the "awakened" Mennonite preacher (Boehm), with the salutary "wir sind Brüder" ("we are brethren"). Their constituency represented a body of immigrants from Germany and their descendants, many of whom had fled the scourge of warfare in Europe. Meetings of "awakened" German preachers began in the 1770s that developed into the UB by 1800, when these men were elected general "elders" (later called bishops). A significant percentage of early UB members and preachers had Mennonite background, which blended with the Pietistic emphasis upon the new birth as the central Christian experience. Anabaptists, the ancestors of the Mennonites, were early proponents of a "believers' church", built on adult baptism, and avoidance of the marks of the "fallen" society, including oath-taking, public office holding, and participation in military conflict. The Christian life was modeled on "nachfolge Christi", or a literal following after the way of Jesus. Pacifist sentiment was also introduced by converts from the Dunkers (Church of the Brethren). Early UB and Evangelicals sometimes held dual allegiance to these peace church traditions and to the newly formed revival denominations, which included participating in the "love feasts" of the Dunkers and the foot-washing practice of the Mennonites. The latter is reflected in the first Confession of Faith of the United Brethren, adopted in 1815, where "the washing of feet" is "recommended", along with baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In 1849, in the wake of the American acquisition of Texas in the Mexican War, United Brethren voted in General Conference, by a vote of twenty-one to one, with several abstentions, the declaration that "Resolved, we believe that the spirit that leads men to engage voluntarily in national warfare is unholy and unchristian and ought not to be

tolerated by us.”¹ This resolution was modified during the Civil War, reflecting the position that morally justified the military defense of duly constituted government, particularly when threatened by forces that had instituted the enslavement of humanity. A resolution from the 1865 UB General Conference asserted that “We believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly constituted authorities of our government for its preservation and defense.”² From that time, the denomination sought to balance its abhorrence of war with a realistic assessment of the obligation to bear arms for causes deemed just.³ Support for the Union position in the Civil War was also congruent with longstanding UB policy of forbidding slaveholders or slave traders from membership in the church.⁴ The change from the 1849 to the 1865 position reflects as well the transition of the UB from a sectarian body to a rapidly growing regional denomination that was increasingly identifying the coming Kingdom of God with the Christianizing of the American social order.

United Brethren placed a high priority upon being an “unpartisan” fellowship, and they did not allow even the division of the nation during the Civil War to disrupt that unity. A case in point is Bishop John J. Glossbrenner, who served the Virginia Conference. Its northern half embraced the state of Maryland, while its southern half was in pro-slavery Virginia. Glossbrenner was granted safe passage by both warring sides to pass through the lines for the purpose of holding conference in the two divided segments of that conference.

To understand these developments, it may be observed that the United Brethren were chiefly influenced by radical German Pietism in their ethos and theological idiom. Inherent within this ethos is the centrality given to the theme of Pentecost and the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which anticipates a new millennial age of peace and justice, which Otterbein called “a more glorious state of the church on earth than ever has been.”⁵ The barn meeting of Otterbein and Boehm that launched their movement occurred on Pentecost, 1767. This motif suggests that they were not called to replicate a sectarian (Anabaptist) stance of ecclesial separation from the world. Instead, their movement was seen as the vanguard for the universal transformation of history into the Kingdom of God, that was commencing with the great awakening in the New World. Otterbein wrote that “these great events are at the door,” and “the prophecies will be fulfilled, and they are being fulfilled from day to day, and you may live to see great things.”⁶ Their hope was for a Kingdom of peace, devoid of warfare, which the 1849 resolution reflected. Otterbein had also noted that this new order cannot break into history until “the seven

¹ UB General Conference Minutes (1849), 127.

² Religious Telescope (May 31, 1865), 158.

³ “We most positively record our disapproval of engaging in voluntary, national, aggressive warfare; yet, we recognize the rightful authority of the civil government, and hold it responsible for the preservation and defense of our national compact, against treason, or invasion by any belligerent force, and we believe it to be entirely consistent with the spirit of Christianity to bear arms when called upon to do so by the properly-constituted authorities of our government, for its preservation and defense.”—UB Discipline, 1865, 87.

⁴ Resolution of the 1821 General Conference (UB), cited in J. Bruce Behney and Paul H. Eller, The History of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Nashville: Abingdon: 1979), 124.

⁵ Philip William Otterbein, “Letter Concerning the Millennium.” In Arthur Core, ed., Philip William Otterbein: Pastor, Ecumenist (Dayton: EUB Board of Publication, 1968), 102f.

⁶ Otterbein, “Letter”, 103.

vials of the wrath of God will be poured out” (an allusion to Revelation 14:19-15:1). The tribulation that precedes the full manifestation of the Kingdom involved the purging of the ungodly, since only those washed and reborn in the Lamb will inherit citizenship in that new historical order. The 1865 resolution suggests that the people of God had been enduring their tribulation in the era of the Civil War. In its wake, they were seeking to remain faithful in retaining their “unpartisan” (“unparteiisch”) unity in Christ, which was also their solidarity in the emerging, final “victory of Jesus Christ over the devil and death”.⁷

That unity was dramatically highlighted by the passage of Bishop Glossbrenner back and forth across the warring lines of North and South—protected from harm as a man of God’s peace, as he faithfully maintained the unity of the United Brethren in Virginia in the midst of the hatred and division of war. There were voices among the UB on both sides of this divide that called for division of the church, even as the Methodists and Baptists had divided in the heat of this conflict. However, unity prevailed within the Virginia Conference, despite the fact that some UB men were serving in the Union army out of their commitment to preserving the federal union of free men and women who rejected slavery. Likewise, most of those on the Southern side of this divide sought to remain faithful to their church’s opposition to slavery,⁸ even as they weathered tribulation, with congregational life disrupted, at the hands of the Confederate authorities.

In the twentieth century, United Brethren further modified its stance on war by officially recognizing the right of conscientious objection.

War is contrary to the spirit and message of Christ. The church should never prepare for or make war. The Church of the United Brethren in Christ recognizes the many Christians who, because of conscience find it inconsistent with their principles to participate or sanction war. A judgment of a citizen’s loyalty to his country should not be based on his willingness to bear arms.⁹

The history of the Evangelical Association/Church reveals a similar influence from the themes of radical German Pietism, including the central motif of Pentecost and Spirit baptism. As with the UB, their concern was to bring vital, experiential Christianity to the “unawakened” and self-absorbed German-Americans, including their nominal “church Dutch” (Lutherans and Reformed) and “plain Dutch” (Mennonite, Dunker) neighbors. In fact, their early gatherings in the revival among the Germans led by the lay preacher Jacob Albright (1759-1808) are referenced as “Pentecostal meetings”.¹⁰ Their celebrated missionary bishop, John Seybert (1791-1860), wrote in his Journal that converts were baptized by all three modes, but that what was essential was that they “the baptism of the

⁷ See “The Protocol of the United Brethren in Christ” (1800-1812), in Core, 121, and Otterbein, “The Salvation Bringing and Glorious Incarnation of Jesus Christ over the Devil and Death,” in Core, 77.

⁸ There had been a minority of UB in Virginia who strongly opposed abolitionism and their leader, W.M.K. Cain, had started the “Virginia Telescope” to counter the denominational paper, “The Religious Telescope” in 1840; in the interests of peace, the discussion of slavery was forbidden in that paper in 1841.—Paul Eller, *These Evangelical United Brethren* (Dayton: Otterbein Press, 1957), 72.

⁹ UB Discipline, 1937, 89.

¹⁰ The first of these was held at the home of Peter Walter in Quakertown, Pennsylvania, in 1799.—Behney and Eller, 73

Holy Ghost came down upon all.”¹¹ By comparison with the UB, Albright’s followers readily adopted a Methodist form of church order, reflected in the “Doctrines and Discipline” of 1809, published after the death of their founder, Jacob Albright. Their Articles of Faith were an adaptation in German translation of the Methodist Articles of Religion.¹²

Before his encounter with the new birth in Christ, Albright had served as a soldier in the colonial army during the Revolutionary War, with particular responsibility being the guarding of German-speaking Hessian soldiers. However, reflecting radical Pietist influence probably more than that of the peace church traditions of the Mennonites and Dunkers, the statement was added to Article XVII of the Articles of Faith in 1839 that declared, “we believe that wars and bloodshed are not agreeable to the Gospel and Spirit of Christ.”¹³ Although this position remained officially in place, the General Conference of 1863, meeting during the Civil War, declared as part of its war resolution that “it is the imperative duty of our Government, to use the sword entrusted to it by God,...and it is the holiest duty of every citizen, faithfully to support the Government in the important duties devolving upon the same.”¹⁴ As with the UB, Evangelical support for the Union cause was influenced by their ardent opposition to slavery, as reflected in their 1839 General Conference resolution that no member “shall be allowed under any pretence or condition whatsoever the holding of slaves or the trafficking in the same.”¹⁵ For Evangelicals, antislavery was rather explicitly linked to their emphasis on the living out the doctrine of entire sanctification, and that government which defended human liberty was deemed worthy of support.

In the twentieth century, Evangelicals were particularly saddened by American entry into the First World War, given their strong connections with the German branch of their church. It was the result of missionary activity by Evangelicals from America that began in 1845. By the twentieth century, that mission had grown under state persecution to thrive as a free church with seminary, hospitals, benevolent homes, and a strong deaconess society. As Evangelical youth were drafted into the armed services of both opposing armies, there was anguish that Evangelical boys from America would be made to face in battle their counterparts from Germany. As the War progressed, support for the American government grew strong within the American “mother” church, and a significant number of Evangelical as well as United Brethren ministers volunteered for duty in the military chaplaincy.

A similar pattern of participation was observed in the Second World War. However, Evangelicals, United Brethren, and EUB allowed members the conscientious choice

¹¹ The Journal of Bishop John Seybert, cited in Spreng, Life of Bishop John Seybert (Cleveland, 1888), 162.

See also the author’s Bishop John Seybert and the Evangelical Heritage (Topeka, KS, 1986).

¹² The Discipline and Articles of Faith (1809) were prepared by George Miller, a convert under Albright’s ministry, and included an article on the Last Judgment from the Augsburg Confession (Albright had been catechized a Lutheran) and an extended essay on entire sanctification, appended to the articles. The translation from English had been completed by a physician, Dr. Ignatius Roemer. For a full discussion of these events, see Raymond Albright, History of the Evangelical Church (Harrisburg, PA, 1956), 83-125.

¹³ Discipline of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Harrisburg and Dayton: Board of Publication, 1959), par.31; see also Behney and Eller, 147.

¹⁴ Evangelical General Conference Minutes (1863), 59, 60.

¹⁵ Evangelical General Conference resolution (1839) cited in Behney and Eller, 146.

whether to support military service or opt for alternative service. As the official commentary on the EUB Confession of Faith (1962) declared, war “is a compounding of offenses against the ‘gospel and Spirit of Christ.’ . . . Bloody struggle confronts us often in this floundering world, but it simply has no place at all in the eventual divine plan.” In addition,

Our Statement of Faith concerning war rests on the principle that it is contrary to Christian idealism. The individual Christian must make the agonizing choice as to where duty and justice point him in a specific engagement and how much blood shall stain his hand or soul in the common defense. How close to the spirit and kingdom of Christ dare he aspire to come in this mortal life?¹⁶

The issue for EUB was, to what extent can we live now by the norms of the future Kingdom, whose standards are our ultimate guide and yet cannot be prematurely interposed within a fallen world where evil still reigns? The peace church tradition would opt for a present, uncompromised identity with Jesus’ beatitudes, with a sharp delineation between the way of violence and the way of peace. The EUB and their predecessors would agree that the goal of the church’s witness was a community of grace and peace in the Resurrected Lord, but their present course, en route to that future goal, was set in the midst of a fallen world, which obliged them to support the righteous actions of duly-constituted civil government in promoting the conditions of freedom and justice. When those actions enable the onslaught of human oppression and genocide to be replaced by conditions enabling freedom of assembly and the protection of life, including the free exercise of divine worship, the governments which facilitate that goal, even by coercive force, when necessary, may be deemed congruent with God’s ultimate redemptive concerns for human society. It is for this reason that many present-day heirs of Otterbein and Albright would prayerfully support the actions of democratic societies that rightly seek to replace regimes and movements which terrorize and dehumanize humanity with those committed to norms of peace and justice.

On related issues, EUB declared themselves opposed to nuclear testing, and the General Conference of 1962 fell only one vote short of opposing capital punishment.¹⁷

The EUB legacy and stance on war and peace was to live out their witness to Christ on the crucible of the two kingdoms, to which they gave allegiance: the one which was coming, and which was the source of their eternal hope, and the other which was strategically directed by God to be the theater of God’s testing and sifting of humanity, in preparation for the inexorable Day of the Lord.

¹⁶ Dale M. Phillippi, “Civil Government,” in This We Believe; A Commentary on the Confession of Faith of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (Dayton, 1964), 98.

¹⁷ “Therefore, we urge the abolition of nuclear testing by all nations including our own and commend efforts being made to secure international agreements banning nuclear tests.”—EUB General Conference Minutes (n.d.), cited in Arthur Core, “The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader”, (unpub., 1963), L-6; and “The Grand Rapids Journal Herald,” (November 1, 1962), n.p., cited by Core, “The Evangelical United Brethren Church Reader,” L-7.