



The ANGLICAN PACIFIST of Aotearoa/New Zealand

Newsletter of the New Zealand Branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

Chairman's Christmas Letter

GOD WITH US.

When a shocked and shattered Joseph was making arrangements to divorce Mary, he had a dream which restored the relationship and gave both of them the strength to face the difficult days ahead. In the dream an angel not only explained the source of the conception but also gave the foetus two names. One name was to be Jesus, meaning the one who will save his people, which most Jews would have interpreted as, get rid of the Romans. The other name was Emmanuel, meaning, God with us.

Emmanuel does not appear to have been used in practice and the accounts of the naming ceremonies mention only Jesus. However, Emmanuel defines the unprecedented uniqueness and unexpectedness of God's Christmas gift.

The world's people certainly needed to be saved from their folly and there has been no lack of suggestions as to how this could be done. A tainted but not uncommon solution has been that of Caesar Augustus, whose Pax Romana brought many benefits to his often bickering subjects, - as long as they were Rome compliant. His army and administrators worked hard enforcing the idea of a unified and efficient empire, and Augustus was very proud of his achievements, considering himself something of a saviour of mankind. Luke was probably thinking of this when he decided to bring Caesar Augustus into his account of the birth, so implying the subversiveness and difference of Jesus.

Jesus brought salvation to the world 30 years later and fully fulfilled the meaning of his name.

However at Christmas it is more appropriate to celebrate the miracle of his other name. The Almighty God has contracted to become not only a man but a baby, someone totally



dependent upon his parents for all his needs. A baby is not yet equipped to save others, but he is 'with us,' and what an amazing difference that makes to our lives.

God with us can be more certain, profound and deeper than putting the world to rights. A star was arranged for the Magi but Herod's cruel paranoia remained uncurbed. Independently of the circumstance God is with us. We are never alone.

Emmanuel, 'God with us' could only be encompassed

for all of us if the divine life experienced human life at its most vulnerable, for none of 'us' should feel left out. So the baby was a high-risk pregnancy amongst the rural poor, with parents outside the definition of respectability, and all too soon a refugee. Later the Son of Man would have no place to lay his head.

Christmas is a busy time with all its activities, the presents, the meals, the services and much else, and it is easy to hurry by other people in our doing of things for them.

In the rush let us not forget that other name, Emmanuel, and find the time to be with people. That 'with' may well be both their deepest need as well as our own.

Jesus believed that 'with' to be very important for his last words were 'I am with you, every single day, to the very end of the age.' Matthew 28.20.

Blessings, Jonathan.

JUST WAR? LECTURE AND STUDY DAY

HOLY TRINITY CATHEDRAL, AUCKLAND, NOVEMBER 18 AND 19. 2016



SYNOPSIS OF PAPERS

Chris has summarised the Memorial lecture and Study Day papers for us.

For the full text of Jenny's lecture, see page 8. The Study Day texts will be published in next year's newsletters.

Dr Jenny Te Paa,

Former Dean of Te Rau Kahikatea, St John's College, former Chair of international Anglican Peace and Justice Network

Just War theory – but just for whom?

Scottish philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre wrote that moral discourse in the West has lost its meaning and serves as a guise for the expression of preferences and attempts to gain power so that it has ceased to have any relationship to what is truly good and right. Classical liberalism needed to set itself free from entanglement with the tradition of the Just War theory which faces today a crisis of credibility and justice. The just war inflicts collateral damage on the most vulnerable, notably women and children and indigenous people because of "its deeply embedded male-centred, ethical understanding and its military myths about patriotism." Not found

in the traditional just war literature are the fatalities of war, the unnamed, unnoticed, unsung and unhonoured, not only the conscripts but all those affected by unjust wars made upon them." Jenny would raise the white flag "not only for specific military acts but other equally heinous acts of politically, racially and religiously inspired death dealing violence against powerless human communities." She illustrated this by reading a poem by Emmanuel Ortiz entitled A Moment of Silence, a moving litany of examples of unaddressed human oppression and injustice through the centuries and calling for silence for the victims in each instance. Traditional

just war theorists were silent about these tragedies and public narrative was used instead to “justify, magnify and sanctify... historic traditional war in the military mode.” Jenny mentioned the testimony before Senate

of young drone operators: “How can what I did ever be forgiven, how can what I did ever be seen as just” and then one of them added, barely audible. “Just for whom?”

Father Claude Mostowik

Chair of Pax Christi Australia; represented Australia and New Zealand at the Vatican Conference called by Pope Francis in April 2016
“Re-examining the Just War Theory”.

Each person bore the image of God. Pope Paul said there was no justice without forgiveness and Pope Francis said the mercy was at the heart of shalom, as Psalm 85 reminds us. The Just War had been ineffective in preventing war and had been responsible for a culture which glorified violence and took us away from modelling Christ. Unfortunately, Catholic social teaching represents a fall-back position which justifies war and has prevented discussion about other methods. Just peace criteria include participatory process, right relationships, restoration, reconciliation and sustainability. The Rome Conference called for a return to the sources of faith in the Early Church and for a rediscovery of the doctrine and practice of non-violence which is at the heart of the Gospel. The Conference heard of people practising non-violence in violent situations. The entry point was trust. The violence they experienced catapulted them into finding a faith-based alternative.

The Conference re-affirmed three things, the centrality of non-violence, the prophetic call for another way and a commitment to the long term vocation of healing and reconciliation according to the vision and message of Jesus. The goal of non-violence is the awakening of humanity in each person and requires reconciliation with the oppressor. The key goal is to outlaw war not to legitimate or refine it. A new moral framework was required. Holding to a just war approach limits our ability to find a non-violent alternative. If the church set the example to consistently promote non-violence, it would challenge the human community to do the same and draw society away from war sooner.



Professor Kevin Clements,

Director, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago
The Politics of Compassion in a World of Ruthless Power

The present state of the world is dysfunctional. This is evidenced in a imbalance of wealth where 1% of the world’s population owns 50% of the wealth. It is also seen in a move towards extremism and the politics of fear and domination, war, intervention, greed and self-serving leadership. Social order has become the priority at the expense of diversity. Collaborative leadership and a value-centred normative system based on reciprocity is being marginalised. Without this reciprocity and the social integration that it brings more

and more political systems are becoming dependent on force. Hence arises the need for the politics of compassion to create a new political paradigm for an interdependent world. A politics of compassion will resolve problems



non-violently and collaboratively and will promote positive relations and the wellbeing of society. It will analyse and negate the politics of domination. Leadership will be transparent, open and adaptable, starting with interpersonal relationships, committed to the welfare of others, working for equality and inclusion and giving priority to the weakest and most vulnerable. It will be

in touch with the local situation and will use inclusive participatory processes. The practice of kindness and compassion will increase people's capacity for empathy and compassion. The final word is from J.P. Lederach: "Reach out to those you fear, touch the heart of complexity, imagine beyond what is seen, risk vulnerability."

Professor Richard Jackson

National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago

Answering the Objections to Pacifism

Pacifism is held in low regard in our culture. It is regarded as ineffective naïve, unrealistic, immoral and dangerous, a term of shame and insult.

Is it ineffective or passive? It combats evil actively but by non-violence and in many cases effectively. Consider the witness of Gandhi or Martin Luther-King, the solidarity movement in Poland, the people power movement in the Philippines, the peaceful revolution in East Germany, the velvet revolution in Czechoslovakia and the Arab Spring. It works under dictatorships as is shown in the Polish and Czechoslovakian revolutions.

Does it fail to take action against an individual attacker? Most pacifist support use of defensive force by individuals or the police.

Is it naïve or unrealistic? Has fifteen years of the war against terrorism made the world more safe? In the post-war period there have been 300 wars and 30 to 40 million dead. A study of violent and non-violent movements in the last 100 years shows that non-violent

movements are twice as effective.

There are four reasons why violence doesn't work. Firstly, it is not always effective as a means of coercion because the consequences are either deterrence or retaliation, submission or resistance. Secondly, it misunderstands the conditions or processes which make violence possible and offers only a short term solution. Thirdly, violence is not just a political tool but a system interwoven in society itself making killing normative. Lastly, violence misunderstands the relation between means and ends. The outcomes are always affected by the means used to procure them. Though violence is embedded in our society, "anything that exists is possible" (peace scholar Kenneth Boulding).



Dr Derek Woodard-Lehman

Lecturer in Theology and Public Issues, University of Otago

Ends Means, and the Meaning of War without end.

Just war theology frames its analysis from the perspective of the warrior, asking what ends may be rightly sought in war and which means may be justly employed to achieve them. Recently, Pope Francis has considered a new

orientation for the Catholic Church's attitude toward war that takes the perspective of the victims of war, those innocent noncombatants who suffer most of the harm inflicted by modern weaponry. Adriana Cavarero, an



Italian political philosopher, and Talal Asad, a Saudi anthropologist, take a similar perspective. Each argues that if we look at things from the perspective of the warrior, we overlook the fact that the just war of legitimate

combatants is more harmful to non-combatants than the terrorism of irregular combatants. Unintentional “collateral damage” kills and maims far more than intentional suicide bombing. When we pause and look at images of victims, just war distinctions

based on just cause and legitimate authority fade into the background. The flagrantly disproportionate force of modern weaponry and its negligently indiscriminate use comes into the foreground. Face to face with the wanton destruction of continuing drone strikes in war on terror, we must face up to the fact that no ends can redeem these means. No protest that these deaths are “unintentional” can justify these uses of these weapons. They are consistently employed in a manner that, in the words of Catholic philosopher Elizabeth Anscombe, make mass civilian casualties a “very great likelihood,” if not “an intrinsic certainty” given the nature of the case. If this is the case, then the case against the justice of modern warfare is indeed quite strong.

Keith Locke

Former Green Party MP

The Terrifying Consequences of High Tech War



War as an increasingly technological enterprise becomes even more barbaric with even less recognition that those who are being attacked are fellow human beings. Killing is now done from a distance so that

the victims are not seen. An example is the bombing of Hiroshima where 140,000 people died but the twelve members of the crew of the Enola Gay arrived home unharmed. UN figures show more civilians killed by US bombing than by Isis soldiers, but there is no tally kept and the victims are demonised and belittled. It is easier, more sanitised, less repulsive, to kill from a distance where the

victims are not seen. It is like a computer game. Under the mantle of the global war on terror the US gives itself the right to launch a drone missile attack on any country with or without the consent of the government concerned. Signature attacks are when the identity of the target is unknown but it appears to be an adversary. It is death by algorithm, that is, by a process of calculations on a computer, war without restraint of the Geneva Convention, or as a UN special rapporteur puts it, “illegal extra-judicial killing.” The process continues with ever more involvement by killer robots, unmanned and directed by remote control. The technological imbalance which this represents gives even more power to the rich and powerful nations to preserve their dominance, and ever more likely that the victims will retaliate by terrorist attacks.

Professor Margaret Bedggood and Chris Barfoot

Anglican Franciscan Third Order

What can St Francis teach us today?

Pope Francis in his encyclical *Laudato Si'* spoke of three interdependent relationships, with God, with one another and with the environment. War violates all three of these, yet is considered noble and just. The Pope's call for a re-examination of the Just War theory speaks to the strand in Christianity of reconciliation and non-violence, the strand



which St Francis followed and which the Pope in taking his name seeks to follow. Francis as a young man was much attracted to the honour and glory which war had to offer but was told in a vision to follow not the servant but his real master Christ. He also was helped to overcome his repugnance for lepers and all those who were outcast and despised. When the people of Gubbio were terrorised by a huge savage wolf, Francis went to meet the wolf in the forest and talked to him and found out the reason why he needed to kill the farm animals and the people sent to kill him. Francis got the people of the town to feed him and the wolf lived in the town loved by all until he died. This story relates to terrorism and the fear that it inspires and the best way to counter it.

From the minutes of the

APFNZ AGM

20 November 2016

The following Officers were elected.

Chairperson: Jonathan Hartfield

Secretary: Indrea Alexander

Treasurer: Mary Davies

Newsletter editor: Pat Barfoot

Auckland Study Day representative: Chris Barfoot

Executive Committee: Margaret Bedggood, Meg Hartfield, Helen Roud.

NEW SECRETARY FOR APFNZ

The Revd Indrea Alexander was born and brought up in the APF. Her parents, Dudley and Margaret Mander, were amongst the most active members of the active Wellington group. They were the prime movers of the APF nationwide mission project which saw Sidney and Elsie Hinkes spending 1991 travelling New Zealand with the message of peace to the Anglican Church. Indrea writes:

To the best of my recollection I joined the APF at the age of 16, welcoming the opportunity to participate alongside my parents. When I left school I spent a year working for the IHC and then trained as a journalist and spent seven years working for newspapers in Balclutha and Wellington.

I trained for ordination at St Johns College, Auckland and was ordained priest in 1996. My ordained ministry began in Wellington Diocese, living in Feilding and then Foxton. I moved to Christchurch Diocese in 2002 where I have been based at Diamond Harbour, Timaru and now Waimate.

I believe there are many people within the Anglican Church with an inclination toward peace and justice who are yet to explore Christian pacifism. I look forward to playing a part in the APF's work of challenging the church with the gospel of peace.



Indrea's brother, Nigel Mander, is also a member of APF, and her sister, Bronwn Tucker, with husband Wayne, was a member until they went to live in China a few years ago.

AND THE "OLD" SECRETARY?

As Chris Barfoot hands on the task of secretary of the APF, it seems a good time to reflect on and rejoice in the very many years of service he has given to the NZ Branch of the Fellowship and to us all. Most of us cannot imagine the APF without Chris. And this is not surprising: he was secretary for the first time for a period of 5 or 6 years in the 60s, again from 1992 to 2000 and then 2003 to 2016. The gap in between was when he served as our Chairman from 2000 to 2003! That is a formidable record in itself. But it would be fair to say that Chris has been more than the [minutes and correspondence] secretary during this time; with Pat's help and support, he has been the driving force behind the Fellowship's activities, organising its retreats, its committee meetings and especially in the last few years the study days in Auckland.

So thank you Chris for all those years of service and the devotion to the search for God's peace which lies behind them. We are not saying goodbye, of course. I know you are planning next year's study day already!

Margaret Bedggood

MORE FROM THE AGM

Four members who had died during the year were remembered in a moment of silence at the AGM. They were Mary Brokenshire, Joan Hepple, Joan McDonald, Trish Nicolas and Moya Shaw.

Pat, or Trish, Nicolas (pictured) died on 9th October this year. She was Treasurer of the Fellowship for eighteen years and the committee used to meet in her home in Onehunga until she and her husband Bill MacCormick moved to Rotorua. It was Bill who drew the cartoons for the Studies on Christ and War.



Just War Theory - but 'just' for whom?

Dr Jenny Te Paa Daniel,

former Dean of Te Rau Kahikatea, St John's College, former Chair of international Anglican Peace and Justice Network



“The real evils in war are love of violence, revengeful cruelty, fierce and implacable enmity, wild resistance, and the lust of power, and such like; and it is generally to punish these things, when force is required to inflict the punishment, that, in obedience to God or some lawful authority, good men undertake wars.”

Saint Augustine was most definitely on to something when he wrote these enduring words in *City of God*, the pity of it remains that he didn't take advantage of the guaranteed added benefit of having an indigenous woman alongside to mediate his limited presumptions and to further enhance his insights . . .

I am profoundly humbled to stand before you all this evening. There is one reason with two aspects for my professed humility. Firstly, I am most definitely standing on holy ground – ground which has been and will always be precious to me and to my whanau.

We have been members of the Holy Trinity worshipping community for many years now. This historic building therefore is indeed an integral part of our special place of holiness, a place to which I will always bow in deep reverence.

First equally then I bow also to the sacred memory of Dorothy Brown, a woman I stood in awe of for her unerring altruism, her moral and intellectual fearlessness, her fabulous sense of humour and her extraordinary kindness. It mattered hugely to Dorothy that Maori in Aotearoa remained too marginalized and it certainly mattered to her that women also were (and we remain) far from being equal on all the fronts that affect what ought to be our taken for granted ability to fully flourish.

I miss her and especially I miss hearing voices like hers in our public square - feisty and determined, courageous and unwavering, sincere and unequivocal about the need for justice and thus the prospect of peace for all and not just for some. Can you imagine what Dorothy would have had to say about last

week's fearful political monstrosity. . . ?

Regrettably but I think unavoidably, I will later on make further mention of what has just happened in the United States but for now and to begin with, let me with greatest respect offer first a little context . . .

I was inspired in the approach I have taken in preparing this contribution by the title and the working thesis of one of my favourite philosophers, Scottish born Alasdair MacIntyre. In particular I have taken my cue from his acclaimed 1988 publication, *Whose Justice, Which Rationality?*

This book followed on from his earlier tome, *After Virtue*. In this, MacIntyre proffers the disquieting suggestion that 'moral discourse in the West has lost its meaning, that it serves as a disguise for the expression of preferences, attempts to gain power, emotions and attitudes, but that it has ceased to have any relation to what is truly good or right'.

In thinking about the long-standing uninterrogated tradition of just war theory and of its relatively privileged status within the realm of moral discourse, I am completely in accord.

Furthermore MacIntyre concluded and again I think quite accurately, that “ in spite of the efforts of three centuries of moral philosophy and one of sociology, there is still lacking any

coherent rationally defensible statement of a liberal individualist point of view”.

It is my contention that up until the advent of Pope Francis urging long overdue critique, that the tradition of just war theory indeed fitted very neatly within this alleged ‘incoherence’, notwithstanding the fact that the advent of just war was considerably prior to liberal individualism.

An advocate of a return to Aristotelian traditions, MacIntyre posits a way of restoring rationality and intelligibility to our moral and social attitudes but cautions the need to first provide an account of what rationality itself is. [In other words] there remains the need to say what makes it rational to act in one way rather than another and what makes it rational to advance and defend one conception of practical rationality rather than another”.

With MacIntyre I firmly believe, that “rationality and ethics are inseparable; that it is impossible for the unjust person to think rationally, or for the irrational person to be just. [And that] as a consequence, the liberal presumption of a shared, a historical, “objective” rationality which can be brought to bear to resolve differences in values and conceptions of justice, is indeed a delusion”.

And no more startling example of this, is that which has just occurred in what may now be merely, ‘once upon a time’, ‘the land of the free and the home of the brave’. To imagine for a moment that the beast will be tamed, that this narcissistic, misogynistic, homophobic, racist, despicable inhuman being will be magically transformed is about as irrational as believing in the power of the ‘other’ Dorothy’s ruby slippers!

Whose Justice, Which Rationality is therefore a brilliantly nuanced retort to those whose philosophical intelligence was disturbed by MacIntyre’s apparently ‘unpalatable’ ‘After Virtue’ claims’. What really upset most were his particularly unrelenting challenges to the taken for granted tenets of liberalism, that all pervasive governmental and social power which has permeated all of our lives for way too long.

The fact is that liberalism has sheltered or even deflected necessary critique of so many

now normative ‘traditions’ including just war theory and the implications of this are only now really being felt and understood. The problem is and has been, that liberalism itself does not recognise that it too is indeed a tradition. ‘It harbours instead the illusion that in its universality it is able to fully comprehend other traditional modes of thought, and to subsume their needs within itself. This historic invulnerability to criticism from outside of itself, this dangerous self-deception, is in fact what renders and has rendered liberalism deeply vulnerable’ (Blunden) and deeply wanting.

As with MacIntyre, I believe that ‘all the worthy life-giving traditions of life and therefore of philosophy have standards by which they are able to judge the adequacy of their own account’ and they must be able to do so under the impact of criticism from outside or by the disclosure of new problems from within.

As I see it, it is only by disentangling so much of the ‘tradition’ of just war theory from the ideological clutches of liberalism that we can really begin to see just how disingenuous it’s theological and philosophical premises ever were.

I celebrate the fact therefore that the tradition of just war theory is right now in the midst of epistemological crisis and deservedly so, for it is outmoded, insufficient, and it is certainly completely unable to withstand feminist or post-colonial critique.

It is therefore mostly within this particular philosophical mire that I have chosen to locate my thoughts on just war theory. Certainly my hope is as a result of its current ‘crisis of credibility, relevance and justness’ that just war theory will actually ultimately vaporize. But I don’t want that to happen before its advocates, its adherents and its pacifist critics, first concede and then commit to taking very serious account of the unconscionable collateral damage which traditional considerations of just war theory have shielded if not deflected from public view for way too long. It is this substantive matter, which is at the heart of what I want to share with you this evening.

But first and for now, I invite us to momentarily critically reflect, albeit with increasing shame, on the fact that it has actually taken so long for the very serious limitations of the 'tradition' of just war theory itself to have been noticed and named, much less reacted against.

And in seeking to understand just why this has been so, please let no one even for a moment, feign ignorance about the politics of knowledge. For what greater deterrent to critical enquiry exists than those deeply institutionally and attitudinally embedded gendered and racialised politics which continue without apology to exclude, discredit, ignore, erase, delegitimise knowledge's, wisdoms and insights other than those of dominant male stream powerbrokers.

Certainly in the case of 'just war', all of its historically derived conceptual divergences, of which there have been a few, share one consistent feature: they are all interpretations of pale male centred 'ethical' understanding.

And so I ask, is it really any wonder that it has also taken so long for the deficit of women's voices, women's critique, activist women's staunch opposition to just war's spurious claims to even be noticed, let alone taken seriously? And then of course there are all those undeclared ongoing wars on so many fronts which are intentionally pitched against the humanity of women . . . Ditto for indigenous peoples whose communities have been so historically ravaged as young men of a certain age eager for life chances like no others on offer, were so readily seduced by the military myths around patriotism, myths which were so dishonestly crafted and so cleverly deployed so as to secure unflinching loyalty. And then of course there are all those undeclared wars against the humanity of indigenous peoples, still ongoing, readily fuelled by blatant greed, racism, imperialism, but let me not get too far ahead of myself . . .

I do speak tonight quite unapologetically from an undeniably traditionally unrepresented vantage point or to use the more contemporary academic parlance, social location.

I felt that as a feminist indigenous academic

I could not in all conscience simply stand to speak about the tradition of just war theory in its dominant populist sense either theoretically, critically or pejoratively, and especially not in the intellectually sanctified abstract.

In this, I am ever conscious of Ivone Gerbara's acerbic reminder that 'when abstraction becomes an ideology that promotes the domination of the knowledge of some over others, then this abstraction is no longer knowledge but the politics of domination . . .'

As a critical theorist I am well trained in the art of first asking who is absent from the public discourses and why? Thus my question, 'just for whom?'

And of course in the case of virtually all traditional just war literature, the absentees are those hauntingly omnipresent but only as unnamed, unnoticed, unmentioned as fatalities of war declared or not; victims all for whom no impressive memorials will ever be erected, no florid eulogies written or spoken, no flags flown at half mast, no public holidays declared.

And I am here speaking not only of those minorities whose conscripted military services was ultimately undervalued, undermined, under-recognised, but I am here speaking of all those who have been and still are being brutalized, oppressed, displaced, maimed, murdered, made mad in any number of unjust 'wars' being exacted upon them.

I want therefore here and now to very firmly raise a white flag in favour

of those millions of human beings never named, never humanely regarded as victims, casualties, collateral damage, targets of equally unspeakably cruel acts of war, whether primarily psychologically, spiritually, economically, politically or militarily sanctioned.

I want to point toward the utterly amoral delusion, which has had us all for way too long passively and or ignorantly categorising only very specific intentional acts of militarily supported aggression as war, and not other equally heinous acts of politically, racially, religiously inspired death dealing violence against powerless human communities.

I do so here because being ever the intellectual heretic; it seemed to me far more important and dutiful for me to follow the dictates of my indigenous feminist, heart.

I do so now because firstly I believe it is always right and proper to draw public attention to ongoing injustice especially that which is so often 'hidden in plain sight' but never actually seen.

I do so now because I am so conscious that the destinies of my indigenous sisters and brothers and those of vulnerably dependent women and children everywhere has been and to the largest extent, still is, proscribed by the life chance limitations imposed by those with unfettered political and economic power so to do.

I do so now because conversely and perversely, all of the public narrative pertaining to the tradition of just war has been deafeningly silent on the extraordinarily brutal 'wars' waged and still being waged against those whose particular his and herstories are constantly being denied their proper legitimacy, are deftly and often brutally denied any media mention or worse are utterly misrepresented.

I do so because the stark unconscionable gender and racial imbalance among the world's political and economic leaders remains as an ominous portend of things yet to come

I do so now (and I pray this is the last time I will ever mention his name), because of the outrageous rise of the megalomaniac Trump. There is most definitely exponentially renewed danger now lurking in very plain sight in the global neighbourhood. There is I believe every indication that he and his equally obnoxious sycophants will now proceed and likely with haste, to enact their own versions of 'just war' against any or all of those vulnerable publicly targeted human communities now justifiably very afraid of these ultra conservative predominantly old white men who are so terrifyingly seized of power in Washington.

Some of you may know that for fifteen years I was Chair of the global Anglican Peace and Justice Network. During my tenure I was

simultaneously so richly blessed and so inexorably challenged by many of the realities of war and humanitarian crises so pervasive in places I was privileged beyond measure to visit – many are where the people of whom I now speak are located – the hidden, the unmentioned, unnoticed, the deliberately ignored, completely understated or falsely represented communities of suffering.

One of the most courageous and memorable colleagues from that time was Emmanuel Ortiz who worked with the Minnesota Alliance for the Indigenous Zapatistas.

His poem, entitled A Moment of Silence, far more eloquently and I hope unforgettably encapsulates the plight and the political reality of those for whom I am now advocating, those for whom I am now pleading that we, collectively, never ever again lose sight of.

While it is now 14 years since he wrote this poem, nothing of substance has changed, the despicable injustices Ortiz enunciates remain unaddressed. Written on the first anniversary after 9/11 he links the histories of colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialism, the war on terror, structural and environmental racism.

Although his poem is understandably somewhat UScentric, as you listen can I urge you to substitute local equivalencies – it ought not be difficult.

A MOMENT OF SILENCE, BEFORE I START THIS POEM

Before I start this poem, I'd like to ask you to join me
In a moment of silence
In honor of those who died in the World Trade Center and the Pentagon last September 11th.
I would also like to ask you
To offer up a moment of silence
For all of those who have been harassed, imprisoned,
disappeared, tortured, raped, or killed in retaliation for those strikes,
For the victims in both Afghanistan and the U.S.

And if I could just add one more thing...

A full day of silence
 For the tens of thousands of Palestinians who
 have died at the
 hands of U.S.-backed Israeli
 forces over decades of occupation.
 Six months of silence for the million and-a-half
 Iraqi people,
 mostly children, who have died of
 malnourishment or starvation as a result of an
 11-year U.S.
 embargo against the country.

Before I begin this poem,
 Two months of silence for the Blacks under
 Apartheid in South Africa,
 Where homeland security made them aliens in
 their own country.
 Nine months of silence for the dead in
 Hiroshima and Nagasaki,
 Where death rained down and peeled back
 every layer of
 concrete, steel, earth and skin
 And the survivors went on as if alive.
 A year of silence for the millions of dead in
 Vietnam - a people,
 not a war - for those who
 know a thing or two about the scent of
 burning fuel, their
 relatives' bones buried in it, their babies born
 of it.
 A year of silence for the dead in Cambodia and
 Laos, victims of
 a secret war ... sssshhhhh....
 Say nothing ... we don't want them to learn
 that they are dead.
 Two months of silence for the decades of dead
 in Colombia,
 Whose names, like the corpses they once
 represented, have
 piled up and slipped off our tongues.
 Before I begin this poem.
 An hour of silence for El Salvador ...
 An afternoon of silence for Nicaragua ...
 Two days of silence for the Guatemaltecos ...
 None of whom ever knew a moment of peace
 in their living years.
 45 seconds of silence for the 45 dead at Acteal,
 Chiapas
 25 years of silence for the hundred million
 Africans who found
 their graves far deeper in the ocean than any
 building could
 poke into the sky.

There will be no DNA testing or dental records
 to identify their remains.
 And for those who were strung and swung
 from the heights of
 sycamore trees in the south, the north, the
 east, and the west...

100 years of silence...
 For the hundreds of millions of indigenous
 peoples from this half
 of right here,
 Whose land and lives were stolen,
 In postcard-perfect plots like Pine Ridge,
 Wounded Knee, Sand
 Creek,
 Fallen Timbers, or the Trail of Tears.
 Names now reduced to innocuous magnetic
 poetry on the
 refrigerator of our consciousness ...

So you want a moment of silence?
 And we are all left speechless
 Our tongues snatched from our mouths
 Our eyes stapled shut
 A moment of silence
 And the poets have all been laid to rest
 The drums disintegrating into dust.

Before I begin this poem,
 You want a moment of silence
 You mourn now as if the world will never be
 the same
 And the rest of us hope to hell it won't be. Not
 like it always has
 been.

Because this is not a 9/11 poem.
 This is a 9/10 poem,
 It is a 9/9 poem,
 A 9/8 poem,
 A 9/7 poem
 This is a 1492 poem.

This is a poem about what causes poems like
 this to be written.
 And if this is a 9/11 poem, then:
 This is a September 11th poem for Chile, 1971.
 This is a September 12th poem for Steven Biko
 in South Africa,
 1977.
 This is a September 13th poem for the
 brothers at Attica Prison,
 New York, 1971.
 This is a September 14th poem for Somalia,
 1992.

This is a poem for every date that falls to the
 ground in ashes
 This is a poem for the 110 stories that were
 never told
 The 110 stories that history chose not to write
 in textbooks
 The 110 stories that CNN, BBC, The New York
 Times, and
 Newsweek ignored.
 This is a poem for interrupting this program.
 And still you want a moment of silence for
 your dead?
 We could give you lifetimes of empty:
 The unmarked graves
 The lost languages
 The uprooted trees and histories
 The dead stares on the faces of nameless
 children
 Before I start this poem we could be silent
 forever
 Or just long enough to hunger,
 For the dust to bury us
 And you would still ask us
 For more of our silence.
 If you want a moment of silence
 Then stop the oil pumps
 Turn off the engines and the televisions
 Sink the cruise ships
 Crash the stock markets
 Unplug the marquee lights,
 Delete the instant messages,
 Derail the trains, the light rail transit.
 If you want a moment of silence, put a brick
 through the window
 of Taco Bell,
 And pay the workers for wages lost.
 Tear down the liquor stores,
 The townhouses, the White Houses, the
 jailhouses, the
 Penthouses and the Playboys.
 If you want a moment of silence,
 Then take it
 On Super Bowl Sunday,
 The Fourth of July
 During Dayton's 13 hour sale
 Or the next time your white guilt fills the room
 where my beautiful
 people have gathered.
 You want a moment of silence
 Then take it NOW,
 Before this poem begins.

Here, in the echo of my voice,
 In the pause between gosesteps of the
 second hand,
 In the space between bodies in embrace,
 Here is your silence.
 Take it.
 But take it all...Don't cut in line.
 Let your silence begin at the beginning of
 crime. But we,
 Tonight we will keep right on singing...For our
 dead.
 EMMANUEL ORTIZ, 11 Sep 2002.

This is why I was early on inspired not
 to address any aspect of traditional just
 war theory or it's by now well named
 insufficiencies or shortcomings.

Instead it seemed far more important and
 urgent to expose what I believe to be an
 exceptional and completely unrecognised
 complicity on the part of traditional just war
 theorists, advocates and critics in actually
 wittingly or not, perpetuating deafening public
 silence and thus unforgivable indifference
 to the ongoing 'wars' of devastation inflicted
 not only upon indigenous peoples, but upon
 women (and thus children), upon gay people,
 transgender people, upon poor people, indeed
 upon too many of those equally precious
 human beings 'traditionally' cast as less
 worthy 'others', since time immemorial.

Let me here then freely confess that right
 from my utterly naïve but no less rabid
 participation as a 15 year old, virtually
 solitary indigenous devotee of the Progressive
 Youth Movement, I have now long perceived
 the tradition of just war theory, just war
 public discourse, just war official statements,
 just war political analysis, just war social
 commentary, just war sermonizing, as
 disturbingly insufficient – there are simply too
 many absences.

As I grew in age and in educational
 qualifications, I began to articulate a more
 informed understanding of the tradition of
 just war theory as being deployed as Audre
 Lorde irreverently describes, as a tool of the
 master.

In other words selective appropriation on
 every front has been used cynically and
 expediently by countless political and military

leaders to maintain the utterly dishonest hegemony of just war.

Virtually all of the public narrative pertaining has until recent times been (and is still being) used variously to justify, magnify, sanctify, valorize, romanticize, glorify, historic traditional war in the militarized mode in all manner of geopolitical formulations. This of course is not to deny the valiant and relentless efforts of those who have quite without the same literary fanfare been admirably bold in their intellectual critique and activist condemnation of these same often sanitized accounts.

All of this is why I so welcome the current debates provoked by Pope Francis in his impassioned urging a rethink of the tradition of just war theory. His blessed intervention has meant that there are now any number of scholars, theologians, political leaders, even former military 'hawks' and so on who are now also stepping up with the most impressive often conscience stricken refutations of both historic and contemporary 'just' war discourse.

One recent example, I found especially poignant as I watched very young drone operators testifying before the Senate Committee and at the UN. In spite of the immeasurable and likely lifelong psychological and doubtless spiritual damage their unwavering professional loyalty has wrought upon them, they stood with tremendous courage and unwavering dignity before their military commanders and the world's political leaders to speak with profound, heartrending regret of the evil they admitted to knowingly, heartlessly, viciously inflicting upon innocent civilians. One in particular I noticed because he said, 'how can what I did ever be forgiven, how can what I did ever be seen as just and then he added barely audible, just for whom'?

It is indeed heartening that there are now abroad many incredibly poignant and thoroughly critical reviews of all the big deal, media and blood saturated global wars of the past centuries. Each one replete with irrefutable evidence of the countless moral, ethical, physical and spiritual obscenities whether fiscal, environmental and human, inherent in military war.

With the advent now of multiple modern technologies, and given an increasingly voracious public demand (thank you again blessed Pope Francis!), the entire odious panoply of officially sanctioned wars is now readily open to public scrutiny.

As I have mentioned I do not see how I can add anything substantive to that mercifully welcome global trend toward debunking populist previously 'justified' war narratives.

Certainly I acknowledge that trend with gratitude, indeed I affirm it unreservedly. However, I am also conscious of the very real risk of us all simply melting into a tropical pool of all round self-congratulatory torpor if we simply concede the insufficiencies of traditional apprehensions of just war theory. For surely we must also concede our collective failure to bear equal activist witness against all 'wars' being enacted especially against those least able to resist.

I pray none of us ever again suffer from not seeing such injustice in plain sight.

For my fear is if we were to continue our practice of irrational selectivity, or that which enables us to so deftly avert our gaze from the deep and comprehensive evil of humanly violating injustice anywhere and everywhere then we can surely never even begin to imagine, much less to establish that peace filled utopia we so rightly, so decently, so humanely, continue to hunger for.

Peacemaking with justice for all is a universal civic duty that must value the lived experiences of all for it is only when all are present at the tables of truth telling, of peace with justice making that can we truly claim a more comprehensive and egalitarian approach that, will far more readily lead to a peaceful world.

Having said all of this I am cautiously hopeful – the signs locally and globally of far more expansive and engaged solidarity with formerly and currently silenced/ignored/unjustly dominated/disrespected 'others' are beginning to emerge – Standing Rock is a wonderful recent example, Black Lives Matter, the Occupy Movement, the Umbrella Movement –

Here in Aotearoa, I acknowledge the incredible example of the senior students of Otorohanga College; the staunch and determined witness of Andrew Judd; Vincent O'Malley, Jamie Belich truth teller historians; Jane Kelsey and Susan St John, compassionate activist economists; the peoples of Parihaka and Rekohu and their exemplary and enduring indigenous models for peacemaking . . . in all of these examples and many, many more personally involving so many of you here present, the pursuit of justice, the promises of peace and the prospect of flourishing for all and not just for some, is writ large and this I most definitely salute.

What is so especially hopeful about all of these examples is that the common good kaupapa is at last transcending identity politics. Is it just possible that we are indeed becoming those whom Walter Bruggemann describes

as, 'mature people' - people who at our best are committed to the common good, able to reach before private interest, willing to transcend sectarian commitments, open to giving freely and receiving with gratitude the immeasurable blessings of human solidarity.

In these increasingly perplexing times we need each other more than ever before – let us therefore be as vigilant as we are activist, let our gaze and our reach be far more expansive, let no one go unnoticed, let our future silences with and for one another be easy on the soul . . . let us pray for the day when justice will indeed roll down like a river and righteousness will be like a never ending stream . . .

Thank you for listening . . .

Dr Jenny Te Paa Daniel
18 November, 2016
jenzat1@gmail.com

APF SUBS

The Annual subscription for APF members and associates is \$20. If you haven't paid yours in the last twelve months, please send a cheque, made out to "Anglican Pacifist Fellowship" to our Honorary Treasurer, The Revd Mary Davies, 38 Merlot Heights, Huapai, Kumeu 0810. Or pay your subscription directly into the APF account 12 3014 0854633 00, inserting your initial(s) and surname in the Particulars box.



Donations to provide subsidies for members who find it difficult to come to meetings and conferences may be paid at the same time.

A CHRISTMAS POEM FROM MEG

Bethlehem –
small town
undistinguished
grown larger as her sons return
awaiting prophetic fulfilment.

Mary –
small girl
unimportant
growing larger as the life of God
grows beneath her heart.

Jesus –
small baby
vulnerable
yet heralded by heaven
worshipped by Magi.

And we –
undistinguished
unimportant
vulnerable
Believe
but can in no way understand
how the source of life
Creator, sustainer of the universe
with tiny arms swaddled
yet lifted and spread those arms
for our salvation.



ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP NEW ZEALAND BRANCH

www.converge.org.nz/pma/apf or www.anglicanpeacemaker.org.uk

Protector: The Most Revd Philip Richardson

Chairman: Revd Dr Jonathan Hartfield, email <ilesha@xtra.co.nz>

Secretary: Revd Indrea Alexander, email <indrea@xtra.co.nz>

Treasurer: Revd Mary Davies, email <maryad@paradise.net.nz>

Newsletter Editor: Pat Barfoot, email <barfoots@xtra.co.nz>

Members are invited to submit copy for publication in our newsletter. Please email it to the editor.