SUMMER 2017-2018

The ANGLICAN PACIFIST
of Aotearoa/New Zealand

Newsletter of the New Zealand Branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

CHAIRMAN'S LETTER

Royal Births

There is another royal birth on the way and Princess Kate can expect it to be the safest and easiest of all her births. Not that any birth should be called easy. Her previous births have been at St. Mary's Hospital London in their private wing. A very far cry from the birth experience of St. Mary herself, and Kate and many others can be thankful for that.

God planned Mary's pregnancy and, as a thousand years are but one in His sight, one could well wonder why He didn't wait another 2,000 years until Mary's pregnancy and delivery could be as safe and comfortable as Kate's will be. Except for the planned part, Mary's circumstances tick all the boxes for a high risk pregnancy. Even by the standards of her time she and her baby were at greater risk than most of her contemporaries. As a former obstetrician if I had advised a pregnancy in a 13 year old in Mary's circumstances I would have been censured and ordered to re-train or retire.

So why did God send the angel Gabriel at that time to seek permission to use Mary's womb? Could Gabriel not have been sent to a wealthy married mother in her thirties having her third child? For me the answer lies in that air conditioned delivery suite at Mary's hospital.

Kate will have her husband and midwife and doctor with her in the delivery suite. Behind the scenes there will be a highly skilled surgeon, anaesthetist and epidural expert, a neo-natologist, midwives, nurses, cross-matched blood and other intravenous infusions, all at the ready, just in case the unexpected happens.

That was not the experience of Mary who was forced to labour in a tetanus-laden stable as there was no room in the living quarters upstairs. Away from home there was only Joseph, and maybe a kind stranger, to assist as Jesus emerged onto the well manured floor.

Each hour 15,000 babies are born into the world and many of those parents would have an experience nearer to that of Mary than that of Kate. Of those who may hear of Kate's experience when it happens, some would wish that for themselves, some would be just pleased for her, some might envy her, some may be downright angry that so much resource is spent on one safe low risk birth.

Many other babies still face a 5% perinatal mortality (NZ 0.3%) for the millennial goal of safe childbirth has not been achieved with so many armies and too many conflicts preventing its implementation. So I would doubt if many of Kate's birthing sisters can really relate to her experience. That is not William and Kate's fault, they live in a stable country and they are wealthy and able to afford luxury.

However even the most vulnerable and disadvantaged parents can relate to Joseph and Mary and their baby. That identification is important for God in Jesus has come to be with us. And if he is to include all of us and not just a privileged few then he must identify with the

vulnerable and disadvantaged as well as those more fortunate.

So I can see a reason for that high risk pregnancy and birth. With the royal birth of Jesus his subversive form of Kingship is already appearing. By the usual standards of kingship the birth should have been in a palace not a stable, he should have ridden into Jerusalem on a horse not a donkey, his crown should have been of gold not thorns and his throne an ornate chair not a shameful cross. So in the light of his later life he didn't have to wait 2,000 years for the efficient luxury of St. Mary's Hospital before turning the world upside down.

I don't find these birth stories comfortable or cozy. They are full of risk and pain and discomfort, and required every ounce of determination, obedience and courage from Joseph and Mary . They gave their all as they became God's plan to rescue His world. But despite the pain and difficulties what joy for them when they heard that first cry, what joy as they laid Jesus in the manger.

And much later what joy when another Mary met the risen Christ in a garden.

Thus, through suffering and hardship the Word is made flesh and dwells amongst us.

Shalom,
Jonathan

AUCKLAND STUDY DAY

October 13 and 14, 2017

FROM JUST WAR TO JUST PEACE

The Bishop Selwyn Chapel was comfortably full on the Friday Evening for the Dorothy Brown Memorial Lecture by Maire Leadbeater, and slightly less full for the Saturday Study Day.

The lectures were all informative and thought-provoking. Some of them are reported here, and there will be more in next year's newsletters.

The Pacifist State

RICHARD JACKSON,

THE NATIONAL CENTRE FOR PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES

Introduction

I am delighted to be speaking to you again at this important annual study day. My talk today comes out of a three year project I have been doing on pacifism and how it can be rehabilitated in academia and public political discourse. I am grateful to the Marsden Fund of New Zealand for their financial support of the project.

The recent decision of the Catholic Church to repudiate the theological justification for war deals a powerful blow to the idea of 'just war' – an idea entrenched in our society and culture, and considered by most people to be nothing more than commonsense. At the same time, it raises the important question: should nation states possess the weapons and means of war? Should they even have military forces? After all, if there are no circumstances in which war can be initiated and conducted justly, then why would we need militaries trained and equipped to fight war?

Interestingly, the idea of dismantling state militaries and replacing them with what is called "social defence", or "civilian-based defence" – leading to what we would call a Pacifist State, one which no longer possesses the means to wield military force – is not new. It was an idea studied and discussed widely up until the 1990s. Some of the books written about this topic include: Baradford Lyttle's 1958 book, National Defense Through Nonviolent Resistance; Adam Roberts' 1967 book, The Strategy of Civilian

Defence: Non-violent Resistance to Aggression; the 1974 book, War Without Weapons: Non-violence in National Defence by Anders Boserup and Andrew Mack; Gustaaf Geeraerts' 1977 book, Possibilities of Civilian Defence in Western Europe; Gene Sharp's 1985 book, Making Europe Unconquerable: The Potential of Civilian-based Deterrence and Defense, which was followed by his 1990 book with Bruce Jenkins called Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System. In 1993, Brian Martin wrote Social Defence, Social Change; the 1996 book, The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense: A Gandhian Approach by Robert Burrowes; and in 1996, Franklin Zahn published a book called, Alternative to the Pentagon: Nonviolent Methods of Defending a Nation. All these books, as well as many more articles, papers and conferences, were given over to the idea that nation states could dissolve their military forces and replace them with civilian-based forms of nonviolent defence.

However, since then, it is true to say that peace scholars and activists have made little progress in advancing this revolutionary idea. Certainly, apart from Lithuania to a limited extent, no governments have taken it seriously as a possibility, and it is virtually unknown in the world of international relations scholarship or public political discourse. In fact, the obvious lack of attention to the idea led Brian Martin to publish an article in 2014 entitled, "Whatever happened to social defence?" in the journal Social Alternatives. There are of course, many reasons for this widespread neglect: it would threaten the profits of the military-industrial complex, it challenges our cultural values and commonsense ideas about violence, it would empower ordinary people against the forces of social control, it would give the government one less tool to control the masses, it would challenge our war-based sense of national identity, and so on.

Nevertheless, I would like to suggest today, following the pacifist scholar Brian Martin who makes the same argument in a paper to be presented at the Rethinking Pacifism Conference in November of this year, that we are at an opportune moment for bringing back the proposition that states should completely disarm and dissolve their military forces and commit to a radically nonviolent kind of politics. In addition to the repudiation of just war by the Catholic Church, there are other good reasons for arguing that it is time to take the Pacifist State seriously, and to consider dissolving the military as an institution.

First of all, the last few years, as well as an honest appraisal of the last few centuries, have clearly demonstrated that war and military force is hugely destructive and largely incapable of achieving positive political goals such as creating peace, strengthening democracy, enforcing human rights, defeating fascism, and so on. Instead, it has the tendency to perpetually create the conditions for the following war, not least through the logic of the security dilemma – the fact that building up arms in one state produces anxiety in another, leading to a spiral of insecurity and tension. The war on terror is a perfect example of this broader failure, with millions killed, increased instability, and no reduction in the levels of terrorism and violence.

Second, the existence of nuclear weapons and the continual development of other forms of destructive weaponry makes it extremely risky for the whole world. The dangers of escalation and misperception, and the psychology of crises – such as the current crisis on the Korean Peninsula – make disarmament and demilitarisation a critical priority at the present time.

Third, the costs of war and militarism are unsustainable in a time of climate change and austerity. Global military spending of over a trillion dollars per annum could, and should, be better spent on mitigating the effects of climate change, poverty reduction, healthcare, education, housing and the like. We should also note that militaries are one of the largest producers of greenhouse gases in the world; dissolving them would go a long way to towards reaching carbon reduction targets and perhaps pushing back the worst case scenarios of climate change. Militaries are also a poor form of economic investment: dollar-for-dollar, investing in green technology, for example, produces more jobs and more wealth than investing in the military.

Lastly, as I and many others have shown, today we know that everything that militaries claim to be able to do – such as national defence, humanitarian protection, security, and so on – can be done by other nonviolent means. In other words, we don't actually need the military anymore. We could do perfectly well without it, and without its risks and costs we could make a

much better society and a much better world.

Is Military Force Necessary?

Of course, the idea that nation states need military forces – for self defence, for peacekeeping, for a sense of identity – is so widely accepted these days that it is little more than common sense. Therefore, the first objection that someone will make to the notion of the Pacifist State will be: Does the idea of a demilitarised, unarmed nation state make any sense? Does the prospect of replacing military defence with forms of nonviolent social defence make sense? Related to this, does it make any sense to think that we could protect vulnerable civilians in situations of civil war or genocide without using military forces? I have already suggested some reasons – that militaries are horribly expensive, they haven't done a good job of creating peace, they contribute to climate change, and so on. But are there are other reasons why it would make sense to dissolve the military.

I would argue that it does make sense – it actually makes more sense than keeping the military in place – if you understand a few things about the nature of violence, and the nature of nonviolence. First of all, it makes sense when you recognise some of the prevalent myths that surround our collective understanding of violence and what it can purportedly do. Most people think that having military force and the ability to use violence means that we have power, and that we can force others to either stop doing something we don't like (deterrence) or do something we want them to do (compelance). The belief is that with violent capabilities we can deter others from attacking us, force others to stop committing abuses, or establish the conditions for peace and democracy. According to this belief, violence can be used as a predictable tool of politics: bomb ISIS and you will deter them from attacking the West; invade Gaza or Iraq and you will stop terrorist attacks; overthrow Gaddafi and you will bring democracy to Libya; arm the police and you will prevent attacks on tourists in Paris; and so on.

However, this is a belief that misunderstands and confuses the relationship between violence, force, and power, and particularly, the relationship between brute force and coercion. In fact, the effectiveness of violence to deter or compel depends entirely on how people respond to the violence, not the violence itself, and the capacity to kill and destroy actually bears little relation to the ability to coerce. Just because you can threaten me with violence does not guarantee that I will obey you or submit to your wishes. In reality, the application of violence can provoke either deterrence or retaliation, intimidation or rage, submission or resistance, and the desired response can never be assured. Even when force is used for purportedly good reasons – such as intervening to protect civilians from violent attack – the response by the actors involved and those who are witnessing it cannot be predicted. In a great many cases, including Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Libya, and elsewhere, so-called well-intentioned interventions have ended up killing large numbers of civilians and provoking more widespread violence and instability. Military force and violence, is therefore, an unreliable tool of politics because it produces a great many unpredictable outcomes – as the rise of ISIS and the defiance of North Korea indicates.

More broadly, a realistic understanding of the current global balance of forces (in which most states cannot realistically defend themselves from the large states), and a realistic understanding of the security dilemma demonstrates that the common faith in military force is misplaced. The truth is that New Zealand, or most other countries in the world, could not use their military forces to protect the nation from invasion, especially if it was from a powerful nation. Out of the world's 200 or so nation states, only a handful could successfully use military force to repel an invasion. More importantly, in a world of nuclear weapons, the military would be impotent to stop a nuclear attack.

Added to this, we know that the possession of military force actually makes other nations nervous and anxious, because they cannot be sure of the real reason why we possess military forces. We may claim it's solely for defence, but other states cannot be sure it's not for a preemptive attack. This is called the "security dilemma", and its internal logic dictates that states must keep up a sufficient level forces to deter other states from being tempted to attack them first. So, if we combine nuclear weapons with the security dilemma, the result is a world where the possession of military forces makes arms races inevitable and misperceptions, tensions and crises much more likely. In other words, military forces actually contribute more to international

insecurity than to security; they make us more likely to be attacked – and if we were attacked, they are unlikely to help us much, anyway.

So much for the myths of violence and what it can do. Nonviolence, on the other hand, can do all the things that violence purports to do, and it has a better record of successfully achieving its goals over the past one hundred years or so. For example, nonviolence can be used to exert power, to deter actions, and to coerce – through things like boycotts, mass demonstrations, the threat of sanctions, physical interposition, and the like. It can make even powerful states change their behaviour. Gandhi and King demonstrated this in their struggles in India and the United States. This means that if the purpose of the military is to exert power and deter opponents, then an alternative exists; we can use nonviolence to do the same things that are most often claimed to be the exclusive domain of violence.

Perhaps more importantly, well-known research by Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephen in their 2011 book, Why Civil Resistance Works, shows that over the past one hundred years or so, nonviolent movements have been twice as successful as violent movements in achieving their goals, even when the goal involves a major demand like regime change or secession, and even when it involves a very ruthless opponent. Apart from the well-known cases of Gandhi in India and Martin Luther King in the United States, other examples of successful nonviolent movements include: the solidarity movement in Poland; the people power movement in the Philippines; the Iranian revolution; the singing revolution in the Baltic states; the velvet revolution in Czechoslovakia; the peaceful revolution in East Germany; the bloodless revolution in Bulgaria; the colour revolutions in Ukraine, Serbia and Georgia; the wave of democratic transitions during the 1990s in Africa; the cedar revolution in Lebanon; the Arab Spring; and many more individual cases. There are even examples of successful nonviolent resistance to the Nazis during WWII.

Added to this, there is also a growing literature on how unarmed peacekeeping can be a highly successful means of protecting vulnerable civilians in the midst of civil war and widespread violence. Studies are now coming in from places like Syria, Colombia, South Sudan and elsewhere which show that in many cases, being unarmed actually assists peacekeepers and nonviolent peace volunteers in protecting civilians. In short, it is simply not the case that military forces are necessary for deterrence or for protecting vulnerable people. Nonviolence can do anything that violence can do (apart from kill and destroy, obviously), and it has a historical record of success that is better than that of military force.

It can also be argued that dissolving the military makes sense if the real purpose of the government is the protection and well-being of its people. That is, if we look over history, we can note that the military has most often been used not in self defence against other nations, but as a force for the suppression of groups and individual citizens within the state itself. This is certainly true for the post-colonial states, in which the military was deployed for decades in the suppression of indigenous peoples. Getting rid of the military, therefore, is a way of guaranteeing that it cannot be used against the people. Second, as mentioned, in modern war, civilians bear the brunt of the casualties: in wars since 1945, around 90 percent of casualties have been civilians. We know from the research that nonviolent resistance to invasion and armed attack results in fewer civilian casualties than when violent resistance is used. If states want to protect their civilians, in other words, they should not use the military but use nonviolent means to protect the lives of their citizens.

Dissolving the military also makes sense if you understand the nature and purpose of politics, how violence is actually the negation of politics, and how difference and deep-rooted conflict is part of the central human condition. That is, the purpose of politics is help people deal with their differences and conflicts through dialogue and compromise, which is the opposite of violence. Violence destroys the possibility of dialogue and compromise; it destroys the possibility of persuading your opponent, or of being persuaded by your opponent. Instead, it eradicates the Other; while politics is about treating people as equals and with dignity, violence is about eradicating people altogether.

In other words, the risk of maintaining a standing military is that, as we have seen in so many countries, when there is a deep political crisis or conflict, the military will be used to settle it, most often by violently eradicating those it views as the enemy. That is, one of the central problems with modern states, rooted as they are on the

monopoly of legitimate violence, is that in an intense political crisis, or a perceived threat, the governing party (or elite factions) can always resort to military violence as the final form of arbitration. Removing the military from politics, and replacing it with civilian defence, therefore would remove one of the permissive conditions of violent political conflict. In short, this implies, as Stanley Hauerwas puts it, that 'nonviolence is the necessary condition for a politics not based on death'.

Finally, dissolving the military also makes sense if you understand the inseparability of means and ends. It is common to think of the military as a tool – an instrument which can be picked up, used for a purpose, and then put back in the toolbox. But this is a false understanding of reality. In reality, the way we act, and the things we do, define us and shape us; they create or constitute us. In terms of the military, using military force is rooted in a specific kind of logic, and once you actually use this kind of logic, it is almost impossible to break free of the logic. Instead, military logic becomes a normal part of political thinking. More broadly, in order to use military force, you first have to construct a war system and a war society to support it. You have to have scientists and engineers who design weapons, strategists who design military strategy, suppliers who make the weapons, medical professionals who look after the troops when they're ill or injured, laws and doctrines governing the use of violence and killing, cultural beliefs that support killing and dying for the nation (as seen in popular entertainment and children's toys, for example), categories of friend and enemy, and worthy and unworthy victims, memorialisation for the war dead, and so on. All these practices, processes and institutions have to become embedded in society. They thus shape and impact society; they create and reaffirm a society based on violence. In the end, they make society into a war system.

From this perspective, it is not possible to make society more peaceful through using military means, just as it is not possible to make society more truthful by telling lots of lies. Gandhi argued this point by suggesting that the belief that we can separate means and ends would be the same as thinking "that we can get a rose through planting a noxious weed." He goes on to say, "The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connexion between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree… We reap exactly what we sow". This is not to say that the military cannot do good in the short-term, but rather, as Gandhi again, puts it: "I object to violence because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary; the evil it does is permanent." The philosopher Hannha Arendt makes a similar point; she says "[t]he practice of violence, like all action, changes the world, but the most probable change is to a more violent world."

Is a Pacifist State Realistic

A second and final objection to the idea of dissolving the military will be this: Is the Pacifist State a realistic proposition? How might it work in practice? Are there any real-world practical examples? On the basis of the research I mentioned at the beginning of my talk, and a great deal more recent research, I would argue that dissolving the military and creating a pacifist state is not only practical and realistic, but it is also essential for the survival and flourishing of the planet and its people. Although not as well researched or well known as all the wars and military campaigns, there are some important areas of nonviolent research which strongly indicated that it is indeed realistic to think about how a pacifist state would work in practice.

Interestingly, anthropologists have found that peaceful, non-warring societies exist today and have existed for thousands of years; they have documented at least 74 of them. They have also found that there were many non-warring regions of the world, where political communities lived in mutual peace with other nations for long periods of history. In other words, there are historical precedents for peaceful nations living together without the practice of institution of war.

More recently, there is a rapidly growing literature on what are known as "local peace practices" and "peace formations" in which groups and communities have mobilised and established forms of peaceful life rooted in nonviolence, social justice, equality, and so on. This is referred to as the "nonwarring communities" literature, and it details how villages, towns and even cities have constructed nonviolent communities, often in the midst of very violent civil wars and widespread violence. They have done so through a variety of strategies, including disarmament, dialogue and negotiation with armed groups,

nonviolent resistance, self-rule, boycotts and a great many other strategies relevant to their situation. The existence of these communities in the real world suggests that it is practical and realistic to consider forms of security and protection based on nonviolence.

Related to this, I have already mentioned that there is an important and growing literature on unarmed peacekeeping and civilian protection. This literature shows that even in extremely repressive and violent contexts, unarmed peace activists can succeed in deterring violence against civilians and protecting vulnerable people from harm – through strategies such as negotiating with armed actors, accompaniment, interposition, information gathering, humanising potential victims, relationship building, and so on. Such cases indicate once again that armed actors are not essential for protection; it is possible to protect people from violent actors without using counter-violence.

Another important phenomenon we ought to consider is those nation states without national militaries. Although most of them are small states and/or island states, such as Samoa, Panama, Iceland, Haiti, and others, this does not necessarily detract from the argument that it would be possible to have a nation state without a military. Costa Rica, for example, abolished its standing army in 1949 following a civil war, and has remained free of large-scale violent internal conflict since. Its military budget was subsequently re-allocated to security, welfare and culture, with extraordinary results. A recent article in the Guardian newspaper reported the following:

Every few years the New Economics Foundation publishes the Happy Planet Index – a measure of progress that looks at life expectancy, wellbeing and equality rather than the narrow metric of GDP, and plots these measures against ecological impact. Costa Rica tops the list of countries every time. With a life expectancy of 79.1 years and levels of wellbeing in the top 7% of the world, Costa Rica matches many Scandinavian nations in these areas and neatly outperforms the United States. And it manages all of this with a GDP per capita of only $10,000 (£7,640), less than one fifth that of the US.

In this sense, Costa Rica is the most efficient economy on earth: it produces high standards of living with low GDP and minimal pressure on the environment.

The article went on to suggest that the reason for this extraordinary success was all down to Costa Rica's commitment to universalism: the principle that everyone – regardless of income – should have equal access to generous, high-quality social services as a basic right. A series of progressive governments started rolling out healthcare, education and social security in the 1940s and expanded these to the whole population from the 1950s onward, after abolishing the military and freeing up more resources for social spending.

The point is not that Costa Rica is some kind of utopia, but simply that such real world examples lend further weight to the argument that dissolving the military is a viable and realistic goal that could result in tangible gains. As the peace scholar Kenneth Boulding put it, "Anything that exists is possible". Clearly, Pacifist states like Costa Rica exist; therefore, a Pacifist State is realistically possible.

Following this, and as I alluded to at the start of my talk, there is a growing literature on civilian national defence models – or what is often called "social defence" – which demonstrate realistic possibilities for thinking beyond military forces as the primary tool for national defence, in particular. This literature details literally hundreds of strategies and tactics for deterring and defending against foreign invasion, from symbolic actions like rallies, fasts and the use of symbols, to practical, coordinated mass actions like establishing alternative communication systems and leadership structures, the sabotage of vital equipment and transportation, noncooperation, boycotts, strikes, obstruction, sit-ins, counter-propaganda, and many more. Importantly, social defence requires planning, investment, training, and the development of appropriate technology, and it is designed to ensure that the population can function and act independently of any occupying government. In other words, it is a strategy to empower the population so that they can resist domination by an invading or occupying

force and can take actions in support of their own well-being. You can see that this is one reason why governments prefer to stick with military forces which they can control. Few governments, even enlightened ones, want their own people to be so empowered that they can resist efforts to control them.

Along with the reduced costs and risks which come from dissolving the military, there are a number of other benefits which would come from a pacifist state that relies on social defence and unarmed peacekeeping, rather than on its military forces. Most notably, engaging the public in social defence would expand democratic participation and provide civic education and inclusion in politics; it would help to break down hostile group identities and forge a new national identity based on peace rather than war; it would help to build local capacity and strengthen local peace; and it would reassure other states as to our peaceful intentions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, for all the reasons I have suggested in this talk, I am calling for the dissolution of the New Zealand military forces and the reinvestment of the huge savings this would entail developing a social defence system, unarmed peacekeeping, peace education, social justice, environmental protection, and the promotion of New Zealand as an international peace-maker. Last year, the government announced that "up to $20 billion will be spent on New Zealand's Defence Force over the next 15 years". This sum would go a long way towards making the country more secure and working towards greater peace, development and environmental protection. It would allow us to make New Zealand a Pacifist State which was a real force for peace in the world.

Moreover, with the recent change in position of the Catholic Church towards war, the threat posed by nuclear weapons, and the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the anti-nuclear group, ICAN, and the growing evidential base for nonviolence, now is an ideal time to reinvigorate this important idea and re-start the efforts of the broader peace movement to disarm and dissolve the military and create New Zealand as a Pacifist State. We need to start lobbying government and convincing our fellow citizens that this is the best way forward. However, we should also acknowledge that as Brian Martin and others remind us, at the heart of social defence is the idea of local defence of the community and grassroots empowerment. If this is the case, then we don't have to wait for governments to lead the way; we can start building resilience and peace in our own communities right now.

THE ROOTS OF CHRISTIAN PACIFISM AND PEACE TRADITIONS IN NEW ZEALAND

GEOFF TROUGHTON

RELIGIOUS STUDIES, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Introduction

This paper examines the roots of Christian pacifism and peace traditions in New Zealand. It is based upon work I have been engaged with over the past couple of years.

One of my main recent areas of research has concerned the peace dimension in early missionary Christianity in New Zealand. When I began examining this topic, I imagined follow-on projects that might explore later legacies, and consider the story of Christian engagements with peace and peacemaking in New Zealand more generally. As it happens, for a variety of reasons, I've found myself drawn into these larger projects rather earlier than anticipated.

Most of that work has revolved around two edited volumes: these are the first broad-ranging book-length examinations of the role of peacemaking in New Zealand Christianity. The first, Saints and Stirrers: Christianity, Conflict and Peacemaking in New Zealand, 1814-1945, has just been published, and contains a series

of outstanding essays on peace and war in the period up to the end of the Second World War (see http://vup.victoria.ac.nz/saints-and- stirrers-christianity-conflict-and-peacemaking-in-new-zealand-1814-1945/).

The second volume, Pursuing Peace in Godzone, will be published by Victoria University Press in March 2018. This volume contains shorter, narrative-driven accounts, focusing on more recent dynamics and a more expansive conception of peace. Many of the chapters are first- person accounts, narrated by participants in the diverse communities and activities they describe. For example, there are accounts of the Peace Squadron and of the ploughshares action at Waihopai; there are reflections on working among disenfranchised Māori youth, and on ecological activism; and narratives drawn from within Anglican, Catholic, Quaker and Pentecostal traditions, among others. In addition to the book itself, my colleague Philip Fountain and I have been working creatively with some outstanding partners to help make this material available to teachers and high school students – and usable in the context of NCEA unit standards – through a series of associated resources.

I'll resist elaborating at length about the aims, origins and contents of both of these books. But it's worth stating here that taken together they establish a number of points that are salient for our present discussion: first, the books demonstrate that we have many remarkable, compelling, complex and distinctively Kiwi stories of peacemaking in our history; second, that many of these have been grossly overshadowed in the literature, and in the public imagination, but deserve to be better known; and third, that Christianity has played a much more interesting and pivotal role in the nation's peace history – and in the framing of peace traditions – than our existing accounts suggest.

Crucially, in relation to the theme for this study day, I want to argue that a sustained and dynamic peace tradition has been evident within New Zealand Christianity – or at least within particular sections of it; and that this tradition has been highly committed, challenging and disruptive – though it has waxed and waned somewhat and has more often been grounded in a rigorous Just War orientation than in outright opposition to war.

Missionary peacemaking

As I mentioned above, much of my own research has focused on the peace dimension within early missionary Christianity in New Zealand. It's this aspect that I will focus on today. One of my key claims is that "peace" loomed large in the way that early Protestant missionaries conceptualised and narrated the mission among Māori. This emphasis stood at the base of a mission-influenced peace tradition that conforms in many respects to the broad characterisation just offered.

I expect that many of us will be aware that early Christian missionaries to New Zealand frequently cast themselves as bearers of a "gospel of peace", and emphasised their role as peacemakers – and that this reputation became entrenched in many of the earliest accounts of the missions. That way of thinking about the missions largely disappeared in the post- colonial era as attitudes towards the missionary project soured.

Insofar as it has been remembered, Church Missionary Society (CMS) campaigning against war has sometimes been treated as a development of the late 1820s and 30s. It is certainly true that opportunities to inhabit the traditional "peacemaker" role in Māori society strengthened from the late-1820s. This occurred especially after the death of Hongi Hika, and led to some notable instances of mediation – for example, when with the mission boat Herald accompanied taua heading south from the Bay of Islands with the avowed intention of acting as peacemakers; and occasions such as the so-called Girls' War in 1830, where Samuel Marsden and others put themselves in harm's way, running between opposing parties in the midst of hostilities that had broken out at Kororareka.

Rather than seeing this kind of activity as a novel later development, my contention is that such actions elaborated a peace emphasis that was evident from the outset of the CMS mission – symbolically, and for strategic reasons, but also as a principled priority.

To begin with the symbolic dimension, it is notable and quite remarkable that the earliest symbol of Christianity in New Zealand actually pre-dated the launch of the mission and was in fact a peace symbol. It arrived courtesy of Ruatara – the Ngāpuhi rangatira who became the CMS's first sponsor and protector. Samuel Marsden tended to Ruatara when he discovered him sick

and distressed on board the Ann as they both returned from England in 1809, and subsequently hosted him in New South Wales.

During his stay with Marsden, Ruatara apparently became convinced about the benefits of European agriculture and technology. He also came, in Marsden's view, to revere the Christian religion and pay "the greatest Respect to the Sabbath Day". On leaving Parramatta, Ruatara declared his intent to institute a Sabbath in New Zealand upon his return. To promote this, he requested "a Colour" that could be hoisted to advertise the Sabbath and ensure that his people desisted from their labour. Marsden's response was to offer some white muslin, for as he explained to Ruatara, the "white flag was the Signal for Peace".

Sabbath-keeping was rigorously promoted within evangelical Christianity, and became part of the rhythm of weekly life once the mission was established. Significantly, white flags continued to act as a signal for Sunday observance throughout the following decades. As a key emblem of Christianity, the flag was intended to symbolise the peace of the gospel: this connoted spiritual peace, but also temporal peace, enacted through the cessation of labour and worship – and also the ending of strife.

Peace was not merely a prominent element symbolically. We also have early examples of attempts to broker peace, both as a matter of intrinsic concern and out of strategic necessity.

Before the famous Christmas Day sermon which launched the mission at Rangihoua Bay in 1814, Marsden and his charges put in further north at Matauri Bay with the express intention of brokering peace between Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Uru. The aim was to end conflicts that had escalated in the years following the Boyd incident in 1809, and which had put paid to the initial plan to establish the mission.

At one level Marsden's remonstrations on this occasion simply reflected that it was important to ensure (and be assured) of stability in the region if the mission was to survive and flourish. This had been one of the lessons drawn from the London Missionary Society mission in Tahiti – which initially faltered in the face of local conflicts – and it became salient at other times in New Zealand, too. No-one really wanted to establish a mission in the middle of a war-zone.

This consideration probably also influenced the CMS Committee's instructions forbidding Hall and King from becoming involved in any local wars. There was a similarly pragmatic element in Marsden's opposition to the trade in muskets (notwithstanding the famous controversies that erupted over this trade, especially in connection with Thomas Kendall's dealings with Hongi Hika).

In the face of these considerations, it would be possible to regard missionary peace rhetoric as simply that: rhetoric. Essentially symbolic, spiritualised language; or admonitions focused largely on self-preservation.

On the other hand, it is important to recognise that missionary teaching also emphasised peace because it was intrinsically good, and that the methods the CMS mission employed were often cast as ones that would reduce the incidence of violence and war.

Thus, schooling – in the Bay of Islands but also at Marsden's seminary at Parramatta – was explicitly described as a means to promote amity between young rangitira, thereby reducing the prospects for conflict between them, and more generally for "counteracting ... ferocity".

Marsden's advocacy of trade and agriculture was justified in similar terms. He promoted these as the "peaceful arts", contrasting them with the evils of idleness and warfare. The logic of this contrast formed the basis of Marsden's message at the Matauri Bay reconciliation, where he sought to persuade local chiefs "how much more it would be for their interest and happiness to turn their attention to agriculture and the improvement of their country than continue to fight and murder one another"; "if they would only attend to the cultivation of their lands and lay aside all wars and murder, they would soon become a great and happy people".

Similar comments were made on many further occasions. In 1823, Marsden lamented that warfare flourished because Māori presently lacked alternatives to "exercise their active minds", adding: "Should the arts of peace in time open to them the field of commerce to find them employment, they will then have less inclination for war." Soon after, he reflected: "If they would turn their attention to agriculture and commerce, these would furnish a field sufficient to occupy their minds.... Until something of this kind is adopted, I cannot conceive how their wars are to be prevented".

Conversion and the ethics of war

My suggestion, therefore, is that a peace ethic was advocated within the CMS mission, and that this ethic was promoted from very early in the piece – effectively from the outset.

More prominent and effective missionary mediation in the late-1820s took on particular significance because it coincided with a period of rapidly growing Māori interest in Christianity. This in turn coincided with a period of declining support for the Musket Wars. Missionaries saw a causal link, and claimed peace as one of the gifts of Christianity to Māori, though this explanation is now commonly discounted.

The role of Christianity in the declining warfare of the late-1830s has been much debated, as have the meanings, causes and processes involved in Māori conversion to Christianity. There is clearly more to explore about these issues. But whatever else it meant, turning to Christianity and to peace were connected. The CMS demanded peace as a precondition for establishing its new mission stations; it also required renunciation of violence and retribution as a necessity for would-be converts. And Māori clearly understood the connection between embrace of Christianity and a serious restructuring of the ethics of violence and war.

Missionaries like A.N. Brown sometimes attributed Māori resistance to Christianity as being based in their desire to continue fighting, and a number of incidents seemingly confirmed this. One of my favourite stories of this nature relates to Te Heuheu of Tūwharetoa, who reputedly told Thomas Chapman that "he would have one more fight with the tribe at Whanganui to settle old grievances, then make a durable peace, and settle down and 'believe'."

Converts evidently understood the Christian ethic to involve two key principles. The first was the principle of non-retaliation: this entailed repudiating violent expressions of utu (the cultural principle of reciprocity or payback), which was held to foster revenge and hence perpetuate conflict and war. A second principle was that of active reconciliation between previously hostile parties. These two principles were not unrelated.

Perhaps the most famous example of non-retaliation is connected with arguably New Zealand Christianity's most famous story: that of Tārore. Malcolm Falloon has rightly noted that this could be more accurately described as the Ngākuku story, for the most compelling aspect was not Tārore's piety but the refusal of her father (Ngākuku) to exact utu for her death – as was his right under customary law. This instance of non-retaliation was considered by missionary observers to be unimpeachable evidence of true conversion.

What is striking here is not only that Ngākuku's actions conformed with missionary expectations of converts, but also the basis on which he rationalised them. For Ngākuku explained his actions in terms that drew upon biblical teaching (for example, from Romans 12, which we know was widely used in missionary teaching and in the construction of Māori Christian ethics); he also drew upon distinctively Christian eschatology – notably invoking a final judgment of God:

"There lies my child", Ngākuku said at Tārore's funeral: "she has been murdered, as a payment for your bad conduct, but do not you rise to seek a payment for her. God will do that. Let this be the finishing of the war with Rotorua. Now, let peace be made."

The principle of active reconciliation with enemies was also evident in Ngākuku's story. In this case, it was Tārore's murderer, Uita, who sought forgiveness from Ngākuku as part of his own embrace of Christianity. Tāmihana Te Rauparaha's travels to Kai Tahu may also be seen in this light, as part of the fuller Tārore narrative.

Another example of these dynamics can be found in interactions between Ngāti Ruanui and Tūwharetoa in the 1840s, in which recently Christianised Ngāti Ruanui committed themselves to non-retaliation, and subsequently to preaching and peacemaking tours among Tūwharetoa that ultimately led to the deaths of Mānihera and Kereopa – often referred to as the first Māori Christian martyrs. Their story is told in Saints and Stirrers.

A Christian peace tradition?

What then shall we say about the origins of a Christian peace tradition in New Zealand? Quite a lot, potentially, but I'll attempt to state a few things briefly.

My first point is that if we want to find the origins a New Zealand Christian peace tradition, we need to look seriously at the very earliest period of Christian presence in New Zealand. This is important for a number of reasons – not the

least being that this tradition is often strangely overlooked, which is regrettable since failure to recognise it denies us a richer understanding of our peace tradition and some of its resources.

Another point is that this early Christian peace tradition arguably became most thoroughly embedded within Māori Christianity. I have alluded to a number cases where Māori Christians exhibited extraordinary commitment to non-violence, non-retaliation, and opposition to war. This remained a significant and enduring thread within Māori Christianity, though it was by no means uniform or comprehensive. There were often sharp disjunctions between the ethics of war and violence that were acceptable within Māori Christianity (and mission-influenced spiritual traditions) and the assumptions of the settler State and settler Christianity.

Wiremu Parata is particularly well known to many in association with the Wi Parata v Bishop of Wellington case which led to the famous Prendergast ruling in 1877 that the Treaty of Waitangi was a "legal nullity". That case arose on account of dispute over land in Porirua that had been gifted to the Church of England to establish a collegiate-style institution that never materialised. At a 1905 Royal Commission into the land dispute, Parata objected to the idea of Ngāti Toa children being required to participate in military drill as part of state education, testifying that their lands had been given for a school "with the object of teaching the new religion, with a view to cause intertribal wars and the killing of men to cease". Lands were not given "for teaching children how to fight and how to kill each other", he said. "It was religion that civilised us, and I think the teaching of religion is a good thing."

Thorough-going pacificist communities like Parihaka were perhaps exceptional in their absolutism and tenacity. I think it is a mistake to see these communities simply as exemplars of "political resistance" (as often happens). Historians have tended to downplay the religious dimensions of Te Whiti's ministry, and also the significance of missionary influences on him, partly from a sense that these seem inimical to Māori agency. Yet this was a distinctly religious community, and it is hard to imagine it taking the shape it did without Te Whiti's biblical knowledge and the input of Wesleyan and Lutheran teachers who emphasised peace. A similar point could be made with respect to Te Maiharoa, the Waitaha prophet who identified as Anglican before embracing Kaingarara teachings.

Christian peace traditions and just war

It is notable that peace ideologies were prominent in many of the new movements of the nineteenth century that were forged in interaction with Christianity – Pai Marire and the King movement being among these. Both of these movements struggled to maintain opposition to the use of force in the face of settler encroachments on their lands, and with the outbreak of war prosecuted by the colonial government.

Wiremu Tāmihana provides an example of the difficulty of maintaining strict opposition to war. A notable advocate of the peace gospel he also became a key protagonist in the King Movement – a movement which actually elaborated aspects of missionary political theology, though it also worried the missionaries. Yet he was also drawn into conflict with the Crown in response to aggressive wars of conquest in Taranaki and the Waikato; he ultimately chose to lay down his weapons again – though this was controversial, and came at some personal cost.

In his responses, Tāmihana was not entirely repudiating the principles of earlier missionary teaching, as propounded by Marsden, Henry Williams and others. The peace gospel that they had promoted was pacificist rather than pacifist in the strict modern sense. It fitted broadly within a Just War framework, since it accepted a protective role for the armed forces, the permissibility of lethal force by the State in the form of capital punishment, and the legitimacy of warfare prosecuted by civilised nations where just causes could be attributed.

It is telling, for example, that humanitarian opponents of the war in Taranaki, such as Octavius Hadfield, couched their strident opposition in precisely these terms. They complained bitterly that the Taranaki War was a failure of justice, civilisation and the rule of law, but not that war was on principle wrong.

In conclusion, then, the missionary peace gospel may reasonably be understood to represent the beginnings of a Christian peace tradition in New Zealand, and more broadly of a peace tradition in New Zealand. It was not uncomplicated or beyond critique (some of these complications and criticisms have already been well explored). In

many respects, it was a rigorously-applied Just War peace tradition rather than a strictly pacifist one, but it was nevertheless significant and remarkably influential.

References

Falloon, Malcolm. "The Tārore Story: Sorting Fact from Fiction." In Sacred Histories in Secular New Zealand, eds. Geoffrey Troughton and Stuart Lange, 40-53. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2016.

Head, Lyndsay. "Wiremu Tamihana and the Mana of Christianity." In Christianity, Modernity and Culture: New Perspectives on New Zealand History, eds. John Stenhouse and G. A. Wood, 58–86. Adelaide: ATF Press, 2005.

Thompson, Daniel. "The Decline of Christian Humanitarian Discourse: The Waitara Dispute and the 'Pamphlet War.'" BA Hons research exercise in History, Victoria University of Wellington, 2015.

Troughton, Geoffrey. "Missionaries, Historians and the Peace Tradition in New Zealand." In , 2014.

Troughton, Geoffrey, ed. Saints and Stirrers: Christianity, Conflict and Peacemaking in New Zealand, 1814–1945. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2017.

Troughton, Geoffrey, and Philip Fountain, eds. Pursuing Peace in Godzone: Christianity and the Peace Tradition in New Zealand. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2018.

Te Rongopai 1814, 'Takoto te pai!': Bicentenary Reflections on Christian Beginnings and

Developments in Aotearoa New Zealand, eds. Allan K. Davidson, Stuart Lange, Peter

Lineham and Adrienne Puckey, 228–245. Auckland: General Synod of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia http://www.allsaintsdn.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/welcome-church-door.jpg

The Pursuit of Justice: Through War or Peace

Dr. Heather Devere

National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin.

Introduction

Just war theory was proposed by St. Augustine to enable the Roman Empire, recently Christianised, to pursue war against its enemies, rather than to adhere to the doctrine of pacifism as originally espoused by the Christian church. Over time the concept of just war has evolved to be used as the moral justification for all sorts of wars, some of them very unjust, and many occurring in our present era. There are very real questions about whether war can ever be just.

However, it is not enough in the pursuit of justice just to stop war, because the absence of war does not mean that justice exists. The concept of just peace is part of the debate within the discipline of peace and conflict studies that considers what might be necessary both to keep a society peaceful and to ensure that conflicted societies return to peace. Practitioner and academic, John Paul Lederach, argues that in order to bring about conflict transformation and reconciliation to achieve a condition of positive peace, we need to consider how justice interacts with other values such as forgiveness and truth.

In this address, I will provide a brief definition of justice, then look at the evolution of the doctrine or ethical theory of Just War. I will then consider the concept of just peace and how peace and justice inter-relate with forgiveness and truth.

What is Justice?

Originally, the word 'justice', from Latin and Old French, was related to administration of the law. A narrow understanding of justice is administrative justice which concerns how individuals relate to government and its representatives, and implies impartiality, neutrality, equity and objectivity. However, more broadly justice is equated with fairness, with moral rightness with respect and outcomes that enhance well-being for all. Justice is usually divided into two types – distributive and procedural, with distributive justice focused on outcomes, aiming for 'fair' allocation of resources, and procedural justice focused on the way the processes are conducted.

Relationships that reflect justice are concerned with fairness and equity. The term 'social justice' has evolved to emphasise human rights and equality based on the belief that each person has value and possesses an innate human dignity. Just relationships are non-discriminatory, treating others as equal, without being patronizing. Just relationships incorporate respect for others' rights and concerns. They are fair, unbiased, and

do not use favoritism or preferential treatment. So just war theory seems to be related to the administrative law, and procedural justice. It has not been about distributive justice, but does use arguments about moral rightness.

Just War Theory

Just war theory is usually divided into *jus ad bellum* or justice in going to war, and *jus in bello* or just conduct in war. Conditions for going to war include a just cause and the right intention. Conduct during war concerns discrimination, or who should be targeted, proportionality or how much force should be used,

Greek and Roman accounts

While most accounts of just war theory in the Western tradition start with St. Augustine and the application of the theory in the Christian world, the philosophical concept of just war goes back much further. Thucydides's account of the Peloponnesian War in the 5th century BC where Athens and Sparta were fighting for supremacy in the Greek world, justified their position in terms of who harmed the other first. The first time the term 'just war' appears in Greek sources was by Aristotle to 'describe wars by Greeks against barbarians, where only moral principles and not law prevailed' (Delahunty and Yoo 2012, p.5). For the Roman writer, Marcus Tullius Cicero, the natural state of mankind was peace. War therefore needed declaration and justification. He wrote 'No war can be undertaken by a just and wise state, unless for faith or self-defense' (Delahunty and Yoo p.7). In fact, Cicero promoted discussion over force saying that 'the former is appropriate for human beings, the latter for beasts' (Delahunty and Yoo, p.8).

Medieval Christianity

Just war theory was developed significantly during the Medieval period. When Christianity was established as Rome's state religion by Emperor Constantine, Christianity's injunction to 'love thy neighbour' 'created deep tensions with the secular demands to defend the Empire from barbarian invasions' (Delahunty and Yoo, p.10). The intellectual work of resolving the conflict between Christianity and war was begun by St. Augustine who resurrected just war theory. St. Augustine (AD 354- 430) argued that 'A Christian could wage war when he did so not out of malice or hatred, but out of love of his enemy'. War was permitted as long as it was conducted in order to punish the wrong and prevent them from sinning again, and it was not to serve any desire for glory or revenge. Augustine borrowed from Cicero but added a divine purpose 'of waging war to advance the will of God and biblical principles' (p.11).

Thirteenth Century

From the thirteenth century a number of different strands emerged in Christian approaches to war. A group of canon lawyers known as the 'Decretalists' sought to provide a more legal form of just war, developing a number of criteria for a just war:

1. War had to be fought by laymen, not members of the priesthood.
2. War must be to recover stolen property or defend the country or the church.
3. There needed to be 'just' cause.
4. War should not be waged to punish, but to make whole.
5. A prince, king, emperor of proper authority had to declare the war.

St. Thomas Aquinas, in his Summa Theologiae, codified the different strands, trying to harmonise canonical teachings with the views of Aristotle and natural law, and incorporating St. Augustine's teachings. Aquinas is seen as significant because 'his work provided a comprehensive moral restatement of the Christian approach to war that provided the jumping off point for later scholars' (p.14). The concept of punishment as one of the justifications for war, was re-introduced by Aquinas.

The 'Modern' World.

Two Spanish monks, Francisco de Vitoria and Francisco Suarez, addressed the concept of just war as 'the West left the medieval world and emerged into the modern world' in the 16th century. In justifying Spain's colonization of the Americas, Vitoria rejected the claims that the Holy Roman Emperor or the Pope possessed the whole world and could grant the Americas to Spain, that the right of discovery applied to lands already peopled by the Indians, that the Spanish had a right to conquer non-Christians and stop their violations of natural law, or that the Indians were already Spanish subjects. Instead he used a human rights type of argument, advocating that 'Spain could resort to armed force because the Indians sought to exclude her citizens from travel, trade, settlement, and propagation of the faith in the Americas.' He also recognized that the Indians might use reasonable force to

defend themselves, and raised the possibility that both sides of the conflict might have a just cause. Suarez rejected this notion and proposed that war was the outcome of a judicial process between contending nations and was a judgement against a wrongdoing nation.

'The Protestant Reformation and the related rise of the modern state led to fundamental changes in the ways in which European statesmen and thinkers viewed the relationship between justice and war' (p.16). One of these changes was the rise of modern public international law. Hugo Grotius in the 16th Century has been credited with incorporating just war theory into international law while at the same time the emphasis switched from concern about *jus ad bellum* to *jus in bello*. New rules were developed to govern the conduct of hostilities.

However, from the sixteenth century to the twentieth century, Delahunty claims that 'European states went to war against each other regularly … with little to no heed to the requirements of just war teaching… wars were fought for the purposes of dynastic glory, the acquisition of territory and populations or the maintenance or restoration of the balance of power.' In the 19th century, so called 'preventative wars ' which did not adhere to just war sentiments were an accepted and legitimate method of statecraft.

Change began with the First World War, which was followed by the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and eventually the UN Charter. For many this signaled a return to just war theory. However, the UN Charter's overriding commitment is not about only just wars being waged, but to preserving the existing international order, and to preserve state sovereignty. And certainly, R2P or the Responsibility to Protect, extends the justifications for war to allow states to intervene militarily in other states.

Nevertheless, despite just war theory having been expanded substantially, the unilateral attack on Iraq by the US under George W. Bush breached even these understandings. Former President Jimmy Carter argued that this war violated all of the criteria for defining a just war:

1. The war can only be waged as a last resort
2. The war's weapons must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants.
3. Its violence must be proportional to the injury suffered.
4. The peace it establishes must be a clear improvement over what exists. (Carter 2003, p.91-92).

Some wars can obviously be more damaging than others, and leaving people who are suffering without any intervention cannot be right. However, the question of whether war can ever be just remains. Delahunty and Yoo argue that in fact just wars would only lead to false peace.

Justice in Peace

Another philosophical debate is emerging about the concept of just peace. There are attempts to introduce this into international relations theory, arguing that just peace begins with peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace-building (Valerie Elverton Dixon). The 10 just peacemaking practices are: support nonviolent direct action; take independent initiatives to reduce threat; use cooperative conflict resolution; acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice, and seek repentance and forgiveness; advance democracy, human rights, and interdependence; foster just and sustainable economic development; work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system; strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights; reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade; encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary association. (Just Peacemaking: the new paradigm for the ethics of peace and war Glen H. Stassen editor)

Just as the Catholic Church was instrumental in introducing and promoting the concept of just war, now there are moves to advocate just peace instead. Several other churches are also promoting this move. The United Church of Christ claims that the "Just peace church vision' has been a hallmark of its theological identity for 30 years. (United Church of Christ). The World Council of Churches for example, claims that 'Christians and churches are entrusted with the ministry of peace and reconciliation.' And their 2012 Just Peace Companion discusses in depth which might need to be considered as part of this philosophical and doctrinal debate.

But what about justice in peace? What is the relationship between peace and justice? John Paul Lederach whose work on building peace, conflict transformation and the search for reconciliation is a staple in peace and conflict studies, suggests

that we need to consider several values that can be conflicting in order to bring about genuine reconciliation after conflict. He puts forward four values or virtues that are needed for reconciliation: these include peace and justice, but also mercy and truth. He does not see either justice or peace as the over-riding or over-arching value.

Lederach's conceptual framework for peace building emphasizes relationships which he suggests are built through reconciliation which balances the four concepts of truth, mercy, justice and peace. Reconciliation has been described as 'the apex of a long process of conflict termination and being tantamount to a stable, warm peace'. Another description is 'a long and deep process which aims at radical changes in the hearts and minds of the communities involved' (Auerbach, p. 291-292).

In order to illustrate reconciliation between the four concepts, Lederach wrote a small play or liturgy called 'The Meeting Place' where truth, mercy, justice and peace were personified. I'll give some extracts from this play to give you a sense of some of the competing values.

Sister Truth begins:

> I am Truth … I am like light cast so that all may see. At times of conflict I am concerned with bringing forward, out into the open, what really happened. Not with the watered down version. Not with a partial recounting. My handmaidens are transparency, honesty and clarity. I am set apart from the three colleagues here … because they need me first and foremost. Without me they cannot go forward. When I am found, I set people free.

She goes on to acknowledge that truth resides within each person, but can only be revealed when the search for truth is genuine and authentic, and where people respect each other. Where I am strutted before others, like a hand puppet on a child's stage, I am abused, shattered and disappear …

Truth reveals that Mercy is the one she fears the most because in the haste to forgive, the light of truth can be covered and clouded over.

Brother Mercy responds:

> I am Mercy, and I am the new beginning. I am concerned with people and their relationships. Acceptance, compassion and support stand with me. I know the frailty of the human condition. Who among them is perfect? [Truth] knows that her light can bring clarity, but too often it blinds and burns. What freedom is there without life and relationships, … if people are arrogantly clubbed to humiliation and agony with their imperfections and weaknesses. Forgiveness is a child birthed to provide for healing …

Mercy claims that he is built of 'steadfast love' and not to cover the light of truth. However, the one he fears most is Justice, who forgets that 'his roots lie in real people and relationships'.

Brother Justice then states:

> I am Justice, and Mercy is correct. I am concerned about making things right. I consider myself a person who looks beyond the surface and the issues about which people seem to fight. What lies at the root of most conflicts are inequality, greed and wrongdoing. I stand with Truth who sheds her light on the paths of wrongdoing. My task is to make sure that something is done to restore the damage that has been wreaked, particularly on the victims and the downtrodden. We must restore the relationship, but never at the expense of acknowledging and rectifying what broke the relationships in the first place.

Justice is concerned about accountability, and claims that love without accountability is nothing but words. The two he fears most are Mercy and Peace because they claim too much when they are only possible with justice.

Sister Peace agrees with all three:

> I am Peace … I hold the community together, with the encouragement of security, respect and well-being… I am more fully expressed through and after both Brother Justice and Sister Truth… But it is also true that without me there is no space for Truth to be heard, and without me there is no respite from the vicious cycle of accusation, bitterness, and bloodshed. Justice cannot be fully embodied without my presence. I am the way.

Peace fears no one but fears manipulation – of people who use Truth for their own purposes; when for the sake of Mercy, Justice is sacrificed; for blind manipulation of the ideal of justice.

Reconciliation – requires Truth to slow down and take care not blind and burn; that Peace and Mercy give space for accountability and action;

and for Justice to recognize that Mercy, Truth and Peace are also important.

For Lederach, then, reconciliation, just peace or positive peace is the desired outcome of the transitional process that includes balancing truth, mercy, justice with peace.

Bibliography

Auerbach, Yehudith (2009) The Reconciliation Pyramid – a Narrative-Based Framework for Analyzing Identity Conflicts. Political Psychology. 32:2, pp. 291-381.

Carter, Jimmy (2003) Just war – or a just war? Peace Research, Winnipeg 35:1, May, pp.91-92.

Delahunty, Robert J. and John Yoo (2012) From Just War to False Peace Chicago Journal of International Law. 13, pp. 1-45.

Dixon, Valerie Elverton, 'Just Peace Theory and Foreign Policy (2012) Sourjourners, https://sojo.net/articles/just-peace-theory-and-foreign-policy (accessed 05 October 2017).

Lederach, John-Paul (1997) Building Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

United Church of Christ http://www.ucc.org/justice_just-peace (accessed 05 October 2017).

World Council of Churches https://www.oikoumene.org/en/what-we-do/promoting-just-peace (accessed 05 October 2017); http://www.overcomingviolence.org/fileadmin/dov/files/iepc/resources/JustPeaceCompanion_2ndEd.pdf

Note: Thanks to Peace Movement Aotearoa for Speakers' photos with foliage in the background..

Christian Pacifism Conference Dunedin

The Legacy of Peace and Being People of Peace Today

HOSTED BY THE APF, NOVEMBER 24-25, 2017

Twenty people participated in parts of the Friday night and Saturday event which was held at All Saints church hall in North Dunedin.

The Friday evening began with dinner, followed by "peace-fuelled socialising" to which people brought poems, stories and a peace quiz to share.

All Saints hall and church

On Saturday David Tombs, Director of the Centre for Theology and Public Issues at Otago University, led a session about the pacifist witness of Achibald Baxter, specifically exploring the place of Christianity in Arhie's life. At lunchtime historian Dr Bill Dacker gave a guided tour of two key sites associated with pacifist Parihaka prisoners transported in the 1800s from Taranaki to Dunedin. The tour ended by identifying the site where an Archibald Baxter and other conscientious objectors memorial is to be developed in George Street.

Two sessions were led by Christchurch Anglican Diocese Social Justice Advocate Jolyon White. A thought-provoking Bible Study about Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and his turning of the tables in the temple, and a session in which he challenged people about how to live out pacifism in a way that matters, and is meaningful for the church and community.

On the Sunday following the conference, the APF chairperson and secretary were invited to preach at All Saints North Dunedin, and St Martins North East Valley, where a number of people expressed interest in belonging to the APF.

INDREA'S SERMON

for the Feast of Christ the King

St Martins North East Valley — Nov 26, 2017

Ezekiel 34:11-16, 20-24 — Ephesians 1:15-23 — Matthew 25:31-46

Today is Christ the King Sunday and all around the world people are praying "Your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven".

Actually, people have been praying that every day for about 2000 years. So are we expecting it? Is it happening yet? Is the Kingdom of God coming? Have you seen it? Anywhere? Where shall we look? In the news? In our communities? In our family? In ourselves? Do we know what to look for?

Today's readings give us a clue what to look for – Ezekiel offers these signs that God is around: the lost are found and embraced, the injured are cared for, the weak are given strength. Matthew 25 speaks of God's will being done with the hungry being fed, the stranger welcomed, the naked clothed, the sick taken care of. And when John the Baptist sent messengers to Jesus to ask if he was the promised one, Jesus said something similar: "Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead raised and the poor have good news brought to them."

Jesus pointed to these signs of the kingdom of God and I think I've seen some of them - not everywhere, not all the time, but I've seen compassion and healing love—nurses, physios, grandmas, children. I've seen people praying with others, the tears of people being heard and cared about—over a coffee, on skype, with a counsellor or with a friend. I've seen charities bring sight to the blind, crutches for the lame, lepers embraced, the poor employed, and literacy and numeracy offered in prison.

Rather wonderfully, we are all invited to be part of the in-breaking of the Kingdom of Heaven. To follow in the footsteps of Christ our King. Unfortunately, the ways of the world are often seductive, pervasive and in conflict with the ways of God. For example, in the Beatitudes Jesus declares: Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God. But rather than making peace, building peace, and committing to peace built on justice, we often retaliate when hurt, accept it when people want vengeance when they are wronged, and unquestioningly allow our government to build military capacity on our behalf.

I have had the encouraging opportunity this week to attend a conference hosted by the Otago University Peace and Conflict Studies Centre. Three days surround by people of peace from around the world. Then yesterday a conference at All Saints Dunedin focused on Christian pacifism.

Hearing people's stories, being offered their study and reflection, and sensing their commitment and hope was inspiring. I've come away with plenty to mull on.

One of the interesting terms I heard this week was "warism" - describing an underlying, unquestioning belief that war is normal, natural and can rightfully and successfully be used to resolve conflict. It was suggested "warism" runs deep (like racism and sexism have in the past) and that most people don't even know they have internally accepted "warism"… but because it's there, it silently prevents exploration of other ways to resolve conflict.

I wonder what would happen if NZ spent say $70 million exploring peaceful alternatives for resolving conflict? $70 million. $70 million is rather a lot of money. Have you ever had $70 million? Won it? Inherited it? $70 million is a bit less than NZ spends on the military every week - $71 million a week. We're spending an additional $20 billion over the next 15 years to increase NZ's combat capability… I wonder what God thinks about that.

A few years ago it was very popular to consider WWJD—What Would Jesus Do. A book I read recently (Shane Claibourne: Irresistible Revolution) asked WWJB—Who Would Jesus Bomb? That's a very good question. Who would Jesus bomb or shoot or starve or orphan or maim with landmines? And if Christ our King wouldn't, should we?

Different people reject violence for different reasons. One speaker this week (Duane Cady, USA) offered what he called a spectrum of pacifism including these five.

There are Pragmatic Pacifists. They believe violence is not likely to work, so don't use it. Their argument isn't based on moral or religious grounds. They are simply pragmatic pacifists.

There are Nuclear Pacifists. Because the effect of nuclear weapons cannot be restricted to military targets, their use cannot be justified. Therefore they are nuclear pacifists.

Then there are Ecological Pacifists. They argue that war devastates our planet, and even the military's huge carbon footprint is an ecological threat, so for the sake of the environment they are ecological pacifists.

Another group are Collectivist Pacifists. They

claim violence may be acceptable on a small scale, eg in individual self-defence or capital punishment, but violence should not be used collectively by "us" against "them". So they are collectivist Pacifists.

And then there are Absolute Pacifists who assert violence to another person is wrong. Some believe this on religious grounds, some on humanist or political grounds. They refuse to fight, and they commit themselves to justice and reconciliation. Absolute pacifists.

You may see yourself in one of those descriptions, or you may see yourself fitting somewhere in the gaps in between.

The speaker who proposed these categories suggested most people "back into pacifism" as they "step back" from what is unacceptable. The killing of civilians may be unacceptable to them, so they step back from accepting weapons with collateral damage to civilians such as land mines and nuclear weapons. They don't accept devastation of the planet, so they step back into ecological pacifism. They don't accept the military's demand for unquestioning obedience in the conflict between us and them, so they step back into collectivist pacifism and so on. Stepping back from what is unacceptable.

However, some Christians step forward into Christian peace-making, seeing in front of them the wounded footprints of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, who came in sacrificial love for all people. Christ, who through the sacrament of his own body and blood, makes us one with all believers, regardless of their politics, gender, class or race. Christ, in whom we share an identity stronger than any nationalism or patriotism. Christ, who invites us to pray and work for God's kingdom that is coming on earth as it is in heaven

National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

from Newsletter December 2017

FROM THE DIRECTOR

As the Centre moves towards the end of 2017, the staff and students will look back on a year that has seen the achievement of some important milestones.

Most significantly, from July, Professor Kevin Clements stepped down from his role as Founding Director of the Centre to take up a position as Director of the Toda Peace Institute. Fortunately for the Centre, Kevin maintains his university links in a part time capacity and undertakes his role with Toda from his university base. We are grateful that we still have access to his wisdom, institutional memory and passion for the work of the Centre.

I took up the position of Director from July and Dr Katerina Standish was appointed Deputy Director. It has been a steep learning curve for us as a new leadership team and we are lucky to have capable and supportive colleagues who have willingly taken on responsibilities within the Centre.

It has also been a year of milestones for many of our doctoral students, with the largest number of students graduating in a single year. For a small Centre with 25-30 doctoral students enrolled at any one time, having 8 graduations and completions in a year is significant. This follows the strong growth in the Centre during 2013 and 2014, including the beginning of the Rei Foundation doctoral scholarship programme. Three of the Rei scholars have now completed, two of whom will graduate in December this year. We were delighted to be able to employ two of the Centre's graduates earlier in the year, and will keenly follow the careers of others.

The Centre hosted its first international conference this year in association with the Marsden project led by Dr Jeremy Moses (University of Canterbury) and myself. Rethinking Pacifism for Revolution, Security and Politics brought together academics and practitioners from around the world as well as many from New Zealand to discuss the marginal position of pacifism and how a new engagement with pacifism might help us face global challenges. This conference was a great success. Thanks to a group of students, many of the presentations will soon be available on You Tube. In 2018, a number of publications will be produced from the papers presented at the Conference.

The conference was preceded by a lively and stimulating hui on nonviolent activism at Karitane, organised by doctoral students Joe Llewellyn and Grffin Leonard.

As a Centre, we have made a commitment to actively advance our relationship with Tangata Whenua and to develop a Treaty-based partnership. A range of initiatives is underway and I thank Tuari Potiki, Mark Brunton and Anaru Eketone in particular for their support and advice. To symbolise this commitment, our students presented the Centre with a stained glass window depicting the Treaty of Waitangi, which will be a potent reminder of the importance of relationships as we move into 2018.

Thank you to the staff and students of the Centre for another busy and rewarding year, and we look forward to all that 2018 will bring.

Me Rongo
Richard Jackson

LORD GOD, TOO MIGHTY TO GRASP

Lord God, creator of all –
immensity of space
stars, galaxies beyond number
my mind reels, grapples, fails
all too mighty to grasp.

immensity of ocean
fish, silvery, shoaled, beyond number
unplumbed depths – great sea-monsters?
my mind reels, grapples, fails –
all too mighty to grasp.

wonder of plants
multi-hued flowers, seeds beyond number
each true to its kind
my mind reels, grapples, fails –
all too mighty to grasp.

birds beyond belief
winging, gliding, darting,
feathers beyond number
my mind reels, grapples, fails
all too mighty to grasp.

And then a baby
Lord God a BABY
Creator of the universe, you sent a Baby
my finite mind can grasp a baby
and wonder
and thank
and adore.

Meg Hartfield

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 <apfnzsecretary@gmail.com>

Treasurer: Revd Mary Davies, email <marydavies1934@gmail.com>

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.