



The ANGLICAN PACIFIST of Aotearoa/New Zealand

Newsletter of the New Zealand Branch of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

Chairman's Letter

I was handed Mao Tse-Tung's Little Red Book of quotations as I was sailing up the Calabar River on an erratic wood-fired steamer. Maybe I was targeted by the smart young Nigerian because I was the only European on board. However on landing I was too busy resuscitating a wrecked hospital and nursing school to read most of the contents, but on Page 61 I was struck by a quotation from 1938. "Every communist must grasp the truth, Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". With a civil war in full spate it seemed grimly apt, although it was blockade and starvation rather than bullets that led to Biafra's extinction as a nation.

August 6th reminds us that since Mao wrote those words the stakes have risen, power now grows out of a nuclear silo.

Sadly violence is still the usual way that Kingdoms and Presidencies are established and preserved. Unfortunately violent power dictates its own truth and this inevitably distorts honesty, fairness and respect for others' point of view. Mao conforms to the conventional truths when he also says, "We are advocates of the abolition of war, ...but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."

So Pilate was probably wearily sincere when he asked that famous question. (John.18.38) Truth for him had to be his Emperor's latest tweet.

The challenge for us who continue to live in a world where many are addicted to violence and power is how to hold fast to that which is good (Romans 12.9) and follow Jesus who is the way and the truth and the life. (John 14.6). One suggestion from Him is that we are to be as salt (Matthew 5.13) which is to be rubbed into the world to preserve its freshness and goodness, and prevent its decay and putrefaction. A process that also enhances our tasting of God's good creation.

Jesus' Kingdom has come to us on earth and he says we live in the Kingdom of Heaven when we admit our vulnerability and need of God. Surprisingly, it is the meek who will inherit the earth. (Matthew



5.3&5). So the violent overthrowing of a gun barrel culture is not for us. Our way has to be by 'submitting' (which is not slavish obedience) (Romans 13.1) to the powers, and then living

Jesus, the constant truth, alongside the shifty truths of those hungry for power.

Pope Francis has disarmed the just war, and the UN treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons is to be signed by 122 nations in September. Both of these moves will make it easier for sanity to prevail in our turbulent world.

I find it reassuring that the moment of absolute truth, and the end of all violent power, will be signalled by the last Trump (1.Corinthians 15.52).

Shalom, Jonathan.
22.07.17.

Dorothy Brown Lecture & Study Day
Auckland October 14-15

SPRING 2017

See p. 16 for details

Explore Christian Pacifism
Dunedin November 24-25

IN MEMORIAM

MEG HARTFIELD JUNE 24, 1934-APRIL 23, 2017

Meg trained as a nurse at St George's Hospital, London where she met Jonathan, a medical student, and they married in 1958 after they had both qualified.

They were called to a newly independent Nigeria when their first child was 18 months old. Staff children were home schooled and Meg proved a creative teacher. She also taught the nursing students. Nigeria was turbulent and twice Meg and the children had to remain in the UK. During the Biafran war there was no communication possible for several months.

The family left Nigeria in 1971 and came to New Zealand. After two years in Te Kuiti, they were invited to Whanganui and Meg went down to look for a house. The first evening she phoned Jonathan to say there were no affordable houses but what about 5 acres of bare sandhill and marsh? The deal was done with room to build for the four children and Meg's parents. And so began the slow creation of a garden and the acquisition of four donkeys and much else.

Meg was in great demand as a speaker and also taught Bible in Schools, Sunday School and in adult study groups. She was a lay preacher and served on the C.M.S. national committee. Working with Jonathan as often as possible, she became his private practice nurse

and later joined him at Hospice Wanganui as a volunteer nurse.

In 1985 the then vicar of Christ Church suggested she make a banner for the church. This multiplied to nearly 50 banners over the next 25 years, including the gently inspiring one she made for the APF – seen at conferences, marches and in at least two cathedrals.



Meg's banner in action

The APF was but one of a number of peace organisations to which Meg belonged. She is fondly remembered at our conferences, especially for her skits and readings. She helped to edit the NZ branch newsletter and often contributed poems and sketches. Her Prayers for Peace booklet has been much appreciated.

She rarely seemed rushed and always had time for people. Diffident and humble about her abilities, she was nevertheless passionate about her beliefs. She rejoiced in her four children, nine grand-children and the beauties of creation. She was a great encourager of all that she thought was good. Her life was centred on gratitude and love.

Invaded by a melanoma, she continued to liaise with her publisher, continued to support and encourage others and gardened until she was too weak to lift a spade. Her book of poems was published and seen by her two days before she died.

Thanks to Jonathan Hartfield and the Wanganui Chronicle. Ed.



Jonathan and Meg at the 2010 APF conference

National Centre for Peace & Conflict Studies

NEW DIRECTOR FOR CENTRE

Professor Kevin Clements, the charismatic founding Director, has retired after building up the Centre to six permanent staff over the last ten years. Professor Richard Jackson, formerly Deputy Director, is the new Director. Dr Katerina Standish



Professor Kevin Clements

is now the Deputy-Director. Professor Kevin remains at the Centre but is now employed by the Toda Peace Institute in Japan for four-fifths of his time continuing his work in international peacemaking with special focus on relationships between China and Japan and South Korea. We thank Kevin for his splendid contribution and wish Richard and Katerina well in their new roles.



Professor Richard Jackson

“Ends, Means, and the Meaning of War Without End”



Dr Derek Woodard-Lehman

Lecturer in Theology and Public Issues, University of Otago

Good afternoon. On behalf of the University of Otago—which I’m delighted to see is well-represented on the program, and the Centre for Theology and Public Issues, which I represent—let me say thank you. Thank you to the organizers of this Study Day for affording me a moment to reflect on the history and character of just war. Thanks to you all for coming to reflect with me on the wars that characterise our historical moment.

As you’ve heard in my introduction, I am a public theologian. But what does that mean?

It means, most obviously, that I am a scholar whose research and teaching focus on Christianity. More importantly, it means that my research and teaching extend beyond the textual, historical, and doctrinal dimensions of Christianity.

I study the social, ethical, and political dimensions of Christian thought and practice.

More specifically, I am a moral theologian. More plainly, I am a Christian ethicist. What that means, boils down to this. I describe and evaluate human action. In other words, I am a student of human behavior and language. I explain what you and I do. I examine what we say about what we’re doing and what we’ve done. I ask if what we’re doing is right. I question whether or not what we say about what we’ve done is true.

As my title puts it, I investigate the ends and means of our doing: the nature of our ideals and the methods employed to realize them. I interrogate the meaning of our saying. I do so, because what we do is inseparable from what we say.

The American theologian, Stanley Hauerwas, puts this point about seeing and saying like this: “Morally speaking,” says Hauerwas, “the first issue is never what we are to do, but what we should see.” This is because, “You can only act in a world you can see, and you can only see a world you can say.” Let me say that again. “You can only act in a world you can see. And you can only see a world you can say.”

When we look at our world, when we look at our wars, what do we see? What should we say?

That’s what I would like to reflect on with you this afternoon. I say with you—because, the way I see it—my job is not to dispense a verdict to you. Sticking with the metaphor of a courtroom, I play the part of an attorney. My task is to introduce evidence, to present the relevant law, and to elicit testimony.

You play the part of the jury. The verdict is yours.

Before we turn to the matter at hand, let’s begin with a very basic example to illustrate this point about seeing, saying, and doing. What do we see?*

If our eyes focus on what artists call “positive space”—that is, the white part of the illustration that is right side up, then we see a skyline with an Islamic minaret. If we instead focus on the “negative space”—that is, the blue part of the illustration that is upside down, then we see the Twin Towers. We see this.

One image viewed from two perspectives. Two worldviews of one world. The difference between the two is what is in the foreground, and what is in the background, as well as which way is up. Is it a white foreground against a blue background? Or is it a blue foreground against a white background?

Now, as I’ve just said, my job is not necessarily to tell you which perspective or worldview is right. However, my job is also not to pretend that there are no relevant differences between the two. To simply tell you what to think would be pretentious. To simplistically tell you that it makes no difference what you think would be pretence.

My job, then, is to bring the image into focus, so to speak. My task is to orient you to the foreground and background, to which way is up. Does that make sense? Does this sound fair? Okay. Let’s get to work.

Things, of course, become rather more

*The speaker showed several images which are not available, but the reader will easily envisage them from his words. Ed

complicated when we look at this image of the Twin Towers. An optical illusion is a matter of visual focus. An explosion is a matter of moral, political, and even theological focus. Nevertheless, as Hauerwas reminds us, these are all intimately related. Vision bears heavily on virtue and vice. Narratives are normative.

Complicated though all this may be, this is what we've come together study today. Our task is to consider the question of just war.

With this in mind, let me suggest that just war theology—and its secular counterpart, just war theory—is a framing device meant to focus our description and evaluation of certain human actions that involve killing.

The theological, moral, and political criteria of just war thinking tell us where to look and what to look for. These criteria orient us to the foreground and background of these actions. They show us which way is up.

As I understand it, our reconsideration of just war takes its point of departure from recent proposals that the Roman Catholic Church renounce its longstanding commitment to just war theology and announce a new commitment to a pacifist theology of just peacemaking. This commitment emerges in the theologies of Augustine and Aquinas, and is expressed in the Catechism. Pope Francis entertained these proposals at a Vatican consultation co-sponsored by Pax Christi and the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.

To these proposals, I'd like to add those of Adriana Cavarero and Talal Asad concerning the ends, means, and meaning of war. Cavarero, an Italian political philosopher, worries that "linguistic chaos," "incoherence," and "masking" beset Western and Christian discourses of war. Asad, a Saudi anthropologist, similarly wonders if these same discourses of war—our discourses—have lost their grip on the moral fact of the matter and the facts that matter morally.

Cavarero and Asad suggest that the language of just war sees and says the wrong things. It misses the meaning of the ends and means of contemporary political violence. We see and say the wrong things, because we focus too much on the *jus ad bellum* criteria that govern why we resort to war—what we might call "the right to fight." As a result, we focus too little on the *jus in bello* criteria that govern how we prosecute war—

what we might call "fighting right."

Insofar as I've said that description and evaluation of war is a matter of seeing and saying, I'd like to show you what Cavarero and Asad mean, and not just say what they mean. Some of the images I will show you are not easy to look at. Indeed, they are almost impossible to bear. I chose these images carefully. I don't show them to you lightly. Even so, I leave it to you; you may close your eyes, or leave the room.

Nevertheless, I think we must see these things and say something about them.

For many, the difference between "war" and "terrorism" turns out to be difference between the legitimate authority of duly elected officials and uniformed military on one side, and its absence for insurgent leaders and irregular combatants on the other side.

Saying "war" or "terrorism" is simply a matter of seeing who the agent of political violence is. The meaning of these descriptions and evaluations is a simple matter of visual identification and verbal definition. If we say the words "war" or "terrorism" like this, we inhabit a moral universe and take up a political worldview. We decide what is foreground and background, placing the agent in the foreground and their action in the background. We decide which way is up, putting the flag, the uniform, and the state on top.

Doing so, our descriptions are already evaluations, and necessarily so. Terrorism is, by definition, unjust political violence. War is, by definition, just.

Technically speaking, there is no such thing as an unjust war, just as there is no such thing as just murder. Technically speaking, if political violence is unjust, then it is not war. It is something else: terrorism, imperialism, crime, or just plain murder.

What do we see? On the left, we see the dismembered remains of the victim of an Iraqi suicide bombing. On the right, we see the dismembered and buried remains of civilian victims of a US American airstrike. We see the visual—and, indeed, visceral—consequences of political violence. We see two scenes that Cavarero calls "scenes of massacre."

What should we say?

If we take what Cavarero calls the "perspective of the warrior"—the perspective of just war—then

we see two different things. On the left, with the suicide bombing, we see the reprehensible killing of a noncombatant that is, first, illegal in virtue of the identity of the agent as an irregular combatant, and, second immoral due to the vice of the putative intentionality of their targeting a civilian. On the right, with the airstrike, we see the regrettable killing of noncombatants that, while not permissible, nevertheless is not punishable, again, due to the identity of the agent as a soldier, as well as the purported un-intentionality of their targeting civilians.

In other words—in the words of just war—we see the “murder” of terrorists on the left and the “collateral damage” of warriors on the right.

Cavarero thinks this distinction between killing that is morally reprehensible and killing that is merely regrettable is far too simplistic. She thinks we must see something more. She thinks we should say something different. She thinks we ought to see and say this. “If we observe the scene of massacre from the point of view of the helpless victims rather than that of the warriors, the picture changes: the end melts away, and the means becomes the substance.”

Comparing the two scenes of massacre from the point of view of their victims, Cavarero says that what stands out is not “war” or “terror,” but what she calls “horror.” “Horror” is her redescription of the mutilation of mass casualties inflicted by the massive explosions of contemporary political violence. It is her reevaluation of violence so excessive, that it rends bodies asunder and renders unable to speak.

Horrific violence is not simply destruction of a life or the loss of an individual. Horrific violence is the desecration of life itself and the demolition of individuality. Horrific violence is not just an attack on human beings, but an assault on human being itself. Horrific violence is not just physical violence against human body, but political violence against the body politic.

Cavarero’s intuition is that, if this is what contemporary political violence does, then it doesn’t matter who does it, or even why they do it. Her suspicion is that, if these are the means of contemporary political conflict, then it doesn’t matter what state of affairs or affairs of state are sought as ends. In other words—again, in the words of just war—Cavarero is saying that the *jus in bello* criteria of proportionality and noncombatant immunity ought to bear more

heavily on our description and evaluation of the ends, means, an meaning of war.

In fact, she is saying that there is just one criterion for describing and evaluating the justice or injustice of political violence: the single criterion of the victim, not the several criteria of the warrior. Cavarero says as much herself, despite the fact that she explicitly disavows just war thinking: “The unarmed person is correctly designated as the illegitimate victim *par excellence*, but their remains a significant reluctance to take him or her as the exclusive criterion for separating illegitimate from legitimate violence.”

For Cavarero, just cause and legitimate authority are entirely beside the point. The justice of political violence is not a matter of visual identification and verbal definition. The office and uniform of the combatants has no bearing on the legitimacy of their violence. These, and the other *ad bellum* considerations about the ends of war are the criteria of the warrior that she rejects.

If she is right, if we should instead see and say from the criterion of the victim, how can we distinguish between Bush and Bin Laden, between Barack Hussein Obama and Saddam Abad Hussein? Can we distinguish between intentional and unintentional killing of civilians? Is there any distinction at all between “war” and “terrorism”?

I think we can, and I think there is. But only if our talk of “intention” is truthful. Talal Asad, however, warns us that far too much of our talk about intention is far from truthful.

This is because the discourse of the warrior tends to treat “intention” as a matter of psychological mentality rather than a matter of physical materiality. It substitutes subjective motivation for objective action. He explains, “The sincerity of the terrorist’s conscience, of the excuses he makes, is of no significance in the categorisation of his action; the military commander’s sincere conscience, on the other hand, may be crucial to the difference between an unfortunate necessity and a war crime.”

When treated as a matter of mentality rather than materiality, the warrior’s profession of reluctance to act in ways that risk the possibility of noncombatant casualties and protestation of regret about their actuality serve to explain and excuse his killing of the innocent. Likewise, the absence of reluctance and regret condemns the terrorist’s killing of the innocent.

Now, set aside the terrorist's intentionally indiscriminate killing of the innocent, which Asad himself rightly insists is never justified.

What, then, of the warrior and his killing of noncombatants? Is the killing of noncombatants, again by identification and definition, always murder?

It depends on the nature of the case. Naturally, we can't consider every case. So let's consider the most prevalent case in the ongoing war.

Although the US has drawn down its ground forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, at the very same time it has dramatically increased its use of Unarmed Aerial Vehicles — UAV's or drones. The principle advantages of these remote means, it is said, are these. Our combatants are out of harm's way. This, in turn, means that they can go out of their way not to harm noncombatants. Since no one is shooting at them, they can take more time and care not to shoot at civilians.

The advantage of drones, is, in a word, precision.

As we see here, a drone can pick out single individuals or small groups.

As drone operators put it, with their characteristic bravado, drones allow us "to put warheads on foreheads."

However, what we see here in this drone's-eye-view, and what we say about the "precision" of drones misleads. These weapons are not foolproof. And we dare not let ourselves be fooled by their technical capabilities.

The word "precision" says too much and too little. It says too much, because it implies that drones hit only what they aim at. It says too little, because it denies that drones hit anything other than what they aim at.

However, the Hellfire missile launched by Predator drones has a kill radius of 15 meters and a wound radius of 20 meters. That means that, if at this very moment, a drone put a warhead on my forehead, most of you would be killed or maimed.

But we must say more than this. There are two kinds of strikes. "Targeted Strikes," as the name

suggests, strike targets whose identity is known by name and whose combatancy is established in detail. Targeted strikes are the best case scenario. The most common case scenario, however, are "Signature Strikes," the identity of whose targets are unknown and whose combatancy is established only by conformity to a "pattern of life analysis" conducted by computer algorithm.

A pattern of life analysis is a mathematical calculation that, if "looks like a duck, quacks like a duck, walks like a duck, we can shoot it like a duck." When such a pattern is recognized, operators are allowed to open a "kill box" in which they may fire at will." In the most disturbing case, it has been determined that any "military-aged male" in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan (FATA) is a combatant. And "military-aged male" means any male aged 15 to 50.

The results of signature strikes? They are all too predictable. We see their tell-tale sign here: dead children.



By modest estimates, there have been over 1,000 strikes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia alone. These strikes have killed some 7,900 people. Of those, approximately 1,200 have been civilians; over 200 of those have been children. Fewer than 100 have been high-value terrorist or

insurgent leaders.

One civilian for every seven combatants killed. Two children for every high-value leader killed. In the case of Baitullah Mehsud, leader of the Taliban in Pakistan, it took sixteen strikes over twelve months killing 260 people in order to finally kill him.

This is what we call "precision." This is what we say is "collateral damage." But saying this is duplicitous. It is double-speak about what theologians and philosophers call "double-effect."

Double-effect is a principle that, first, recognizes that human actions often have multiple effects, and, second, analyzes which effects are "intentional" and which are "accidental."

According to this principle, we are culpable only for those effects that we intend. If our action has immoral effects we do not intend, they are excusable...even if they are foreseeable.

The trick, of course, is telling which is which. And, as Asad cautions, telling the truth about which is which.

Elizabeth Anscombe—the great Catholic moral philosopher of the last century, and, perhaps, the greatest philosopher of action since Aristotle—adds this warning:

The distinction between the intended, and the merely foreseen, effects of voluntary action is indeed absolutely essential to Christian ethics.... Now if intention is all important — as it is — in determining the goodness or badness of an action, then, on this theory of what intention is, a marvellous way offers itself of making any action lawful. You only had to “direct your intention” in a suitable Way. In practice, this means making a little speech to yourself, “What I mean to be doing is....”

What does Anscombe mean? Among other things, she means my two sons — Josiah and Eli, who are nine and five.

Although they don't know anything about the principle of double-effect, they know everything about the double-speak of these little speeches. They know that if they say they did something “on accident,” they don't get in trouble. They know if they say they did something “on purpose,” they do. As they see it and say it, there are lots of accidents in our house: accidental arm slams into each other's jaws, accidental jumping on the furniture, accidental utterances of insults. Accidents, accidents everywhere and not a drop of intention to blame.

The fact that you're laughing means you understand the principle of double-effect and Anscombe's warning. “Intention” cannot be a little speech we make to ourselves or a story we tell each other. The point of the story about my sons is that their saying so doesn't make it so. Anscombe's point is that neither does ours.

Anscombe recommends two guidelines for applying the principle of double-effect truthfully. First, if the negative, unjust, immoral effect of

an action is “an intrinsic certainty,” then it is not double-effect. We intend these effects. We are both responsible and culpable for them. Second, if the negative, unjust, and immoral effect of an action is “a very great likelihood given the nature of the case,” then it is not double-effect. We intend these effects. We are both responsible and culpable for it.

So, in the case of drones—the primary means of the ongoing war on terror—even when we hit who we're aiming at, as in the case of targeted strikes, we hit more than we're aiming at. When we don't bother to confirm who we're aiming at, as with signature strikes, we most certainly hit those we're not permitted to aim at.

When we do, we willingly violate the legal restraints of international treaty. We knowingly violate the moral restraints of just war theology. No speech the drone operator makes to themselves can change this. No story we tell each other can either. Our saying that it is not so cannot make it so.

Now, I've spent most of my time reflecting on the means of the war on terror and their meaning. Allow me to conclude with a brief word about the ends of this war.

We see here George W. Bush giving his famous — or infamous, depending on how you see it — “Mission Accomplished” speech on the USS Abraham Lincoln, which celebrated the end of “major combat operations” in Iraq. That was 2003 ... it's now 2016. Afghanistan and Iraq have been liberated. Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden have been terminated. But the drone campaign has only accelerated.

But what now? Have we won? Is it over? Are we done? How can we know?

It seems that we cannot, in fact, know. It seems also that we cannot, in principle, answer.

Our present war is not simply unending. It also is, at least in significant respects, a war without determinate ends. Indeed, because a war comes to an end only when its ends are achieved, the absence of determinate ends determines us to war without end.

I leave it to you — to us, together — to say what this means, and see what we should do.

The Terrifying Consequences of High-Tech War

Keith Locke

The message of this talk is that war, as it becomes a more technological enterprise, is becoming even more barbaric with even less recognition that those being attacked are fellow human beings.



Perhaps we should start this discussion by going back a pre-industrial form of warfare, such as the tribal war between Maori before Europeans with their guns arrived on the scene.

On one level such tribal war was brutal, with one human destroying another human in hand-to-hand combat, and there were sometimes massacres.

But the combat was on a fairly level playing field, although one side might get the advantage through having superior numbers, an element of surprise, or better fortifications. Both sides would commonly suffer significant casualties, which was one of the things pushing them to solve differences peacefully.

Some tribes, such as the Moriori on Rekohu, became pacifist and rejected war altogether.

The biggest slaughter in Maori intertribal wars came when the technology went up a notch. Those who could get a large stock of muskets, like Nga Puhī, tended to prevail.

From that time on, through the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries the technology of war has advanced hugely, particularly in the Western nations. The killers were able to kill from an ever greater distance, without ever having to set sight on their victims.

The guns or artillery got longer and longer in its range, and then aircraft arrived with an ability to murder people en masse with their bombs and missiles.

The extreme of this was reached on August 6 1945, when a US plane, the Enola Gay, dropped an atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima killing 140,000 and condemning many others to early deaths through radiation effects.

On one side 140,000 civilians were killed; on the other, American side, zero people were killed. All twelve crew members of the Enola Gay returned safely.

Read most of the reports of the Hiroshima

bombing and you won't see the crew of the described as psychopathic monsters for killing 140,000 innocent people, nor will you find much criticism of the man who ordered the mass killing, President Truman.

To this day you won't find an American president admitting the obvious truth, that the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was wrong, although to his credit President Obama did go to Hiroshima last year to participate in a remembrance ceremony.

There are great ethical problems with the inconsistent way in which Western nations have treated the wartime killing of civilians.

It is easier to say "our side is right" and "the killing is justified" when you can't see the victims, and into the bargain they are being demonized, or belittled as less civilized. And many in the Third World are so belittled by those in rich Western nations.

Or to put the converse, it is easier to say the other side (say ISIS) is wrong and brutal if you can see their killing close up, in all its horror, as in the videos of ISIS people beheading their victims.

Without in any way justifying the brutality of ISIS, it may be, when we look at UN figures, that in the areas ISIS controls more civilians have been killed by US bombing than by ISIS soldiers. But such statistics don't register in Western nations because the blood spattered bodies resulting from US bombing are hidden away in "enemy-controlled" territory, whereas we see the results of ISIS killings on our TV screens. The unseen Iraqi civilians that might have died from American bombing are merely statistics, quickly dismissed as "collateral damage".

It has suited the purposes of the United States, in the wars against Saddam's Iraq and Gaddafi's Libya, to simply not keep a tally of civilian casualties. It has been left to others to quantify it.

That raises another critical question. Is the killing of civilians from a distance, from the air, somehow less repulsive than a killing by a knife or bayonet?

8 Is the person in the cockpit, or the person putting

in the coordinates for a missile, more civilized than the person armed with a bayonet on the front line? Those in control of the planes or missiles usually cause more death and injury, but somehow they are not seen as having blood on their hands.

Remote war becomes a computer game, and almost as sanitised.

Let's now look at how the advance of technology is worsening this problem.

Firstly, let's consider nuclear weapons. There is a certain public resignation to the continuing existence of nuclear weapons, and a certain complacency that they are unlikely to be used.

It's partially true that since the end of the Cold War there is less danger of a nuclear war breaking out between major nuclear powers. But there are still several ways in which a nuclear war could begin.

Firstly, the US has not ruled out using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear power, as we saw happen in 1945. Nor has Israel ruled out bombing a Middle Eastern nation, if it perceives its vital interests are threatened.

And we can't trust the North Korean dictatorship not to conduct a first nuclear strike.

Secondly, when relations India and Pakistan reach crisis point, as they have in the past, there is no guarantee that one side, perhaps the weaker side, Pakistan, won't resort to nuclear weapons.

Pakistan, also, is not the most stable of countries.

Thirdly, technological improvements have in some ways increased the danger of accidental nuclear war during a crisis between nuclear armed powers, such as Russia and America. The US has recently tested hypersonic ballistic missiles that travel at 5 times the speed of sound, which means, if my maths is correct, that they travel 100 kilometres in about one minute.

If Russia detected one of these missiles coming at them there would be little time for them to rationally decide whether it was a real missile or a false alarm and whether or not to respond. A nuclear exchange could begin, perhaps destroying much of the world.

We always have to remember that the whole nature of so-called nuclear deterrence rests on willingness of the leaders of nuclear states to

launch a retaliatory strike. Just recently, the British Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn got into terrible trouble with the Conservatives, the UK media pundits, and most of his fellow Labour MPs, when he said he would not push the nuclear button.

Also, the continuing development of missile defence systems by the United States increases rather than decreases the nuclear danger by making it more likely that in a crisis an adversary will strike earlier and with more missiles to get through the US missile defence shield.

Conversely, the US could be more tempted to conduct a first strike if it thought its missile defence shield made it safe from retaliation.

Meanwhile, the technology of killing from afar continues to advance in non-nuclear warfare.

Higher precision killing using GPS is the most notable advance in recent years. The result has been a hugely one-sided form of warfare, whether done by aerial drones, or land and sea-based missiles.

Usually the missile or drone operators are so far away that their lives are not at risk. Whereas, for the targets, their lives are always in danger. Under the mantle of a "global war on terror", the US gives itself the right to conduct drone missile attack in any country, with or without the permission of the government of that country. For example, drone strikes have occurred in Pakistan and Libya despite protests from the Pakistani and Libyan authorities.

This is all going against the restraints on war contained in the Geneva Conventions which envisage combat between armed combatants on a battlefield. To the US all the world is now a battlefield, and it reserves the right to kill any adversary, even when that adversary is not a soldier but rather an ideologue or a political leader.

When all the world is considered a battlefield, the dangers of killing civilians other than those being targeted is also substantial, as we have seen.

Many, many civilians have been killed as collateral damage in American drone missile strikes, in a way that contravenes much of the international humanitarian law designed to protect non-combatants.

This problem of civilian deaths is enhanced when the strikes are against targets about which the

Americans have limited intelligence - mainly because they have no intelligence from the ground itself.

American intelligence is pretty much all based on observation from the air, combined with information from intercepted telephone conversations.

Even worse are those drone strikes call “signature strikes” where the identity of the target is not known, but they appear to be acting like an adversary, or a “militant” in the West language of demonization.

It is death by algorithm. If you present with certain characteristics you are killed.

A UN special rapporteur has rightly called the use of fatal drone strikes away from a war zone as illegal extra-judicial killing.

Just because the US government has endorsed such killing doesn't make it legal. How can it be legal for a US president to be given the power to construct a secret kill list and order the killing of anyone, anywhere in the world, with not even the pretence of legal constraints? Now that power to kill anyone by drone, anywhere in the world, at any time, is to be entrusted to Donald J Trump.

Let us look at another aspect of high-tech aerial war.

It is usually very one-sided. Take the current war against ISIS in Mosul, Iraq. One side controls the air and conducts detailed aerial surveillance around the clock as well as monitoring all electronic communications. US planes can strike with precision missiles at short notice. It can prevent the ISIS fighting in the open, and stop it making effective use of heavy weaponry or tanks.

This huge technological imbalance between the two sides - or what could be called the asymmetric nature of the war - has driven ISIS to desperate measures, such as suicide soldiers driving truck bombs into the lines of the forces attacking them.

This technological imbalance and the desperation it causes also gives impetus to terroristic suicide actions against civilians – as we have seen in Baghdad and Paris.

Without justifying such terrorist actions in any way, we have to understand the mindset which produces them.

To some extent they are motivated by a perceived

sense of injustice against the people these jihadists claim to represent. The Palestinian suicide bombers of earlier times thought they were justified in blowing up Israeli civilians because perceived the Israeli people as a whole to be against Palestinians.

Occasionally, these days, Islamic Jihad in Gaza will send a rocket into Israel with the same rationale, or as retaliation for an Israeli drone strike on one of their people. Sending rockets into civilian areas is clearly a desperate terror act, which we cannot excuse. But that desperation among Islamic Jihad's civilian supporters is only enhanced when they see a constant presence of Israeli drones in the sky overhead, never knowing when a missile might suddenly come their way.

In general terms, the advance of military technology helps the already rich and powerful states – who can afford such technology – to pursue their own agendas, and it weakens the ability of people in the poorer nations to resist.

Wars “won” by the massive use of Western air power and highly targeted bombing end up not only destroying so much of a country, but are also hugely destabilising. We've seen that in Iraq and Libya, and the same process is underway consequent to the massive bombing of Syria (by Russia and other nations) and in the Yemen (as a result of the Saudi bombing).

Bombing can weaken or destroy a regime, as we saw in the fall of Gaddafi's Libya or Saddam's Iraq, but the foreign victor's interference in the moulding of a new body politic tends to exacerbate tensions between internal factions, widen sectarian differences, and generate new conflicts, often of a military nature.

ISIS may be militarily defeated but the political fault lines in Iraq – between Sunni, Shia and Kurdish factions – may be widened in the process.

Let's go on to another aspect of our main topic, that is how big advances in weapons technology are affecting naval and ground warfare.

Coming on stream are science fiction weapons like railguns, where explosive projectiles are rapidly accelerated via electro-magnetic rails. According to the US Deputy Defence Secretary Robert Work railguns will be inexpensive and be of enormous use against airplanes, missiles, tanks - almost anything.

Another powerful new weapon, to be introduced by the US Navy, is a “directed energy” laser

weapon which can hit anything in a line of sight.

And then there is the replacing of soldier roles with robots, often called “killer robots”, which can be fully automated aerial drones used close to the ground or they can be land vehicles like tanks.

It took me a while to get my head around this, but then I thought that anything is possible when we now have self-driving cars, that can somehow respond to multiple factors in the changing environment around them.

The United States is testing small one metre tall tanks, called a MAARS (a Modular Advanced Armed Robotic System). The remote controller can sit kilometres away and use the MAARS tank to conduct camera surveillance of a battlefield and to fire shells and grenades.

Russia has a full-size Armata T-14 tank with an unmanned remote-controlled firing turret. The tank still has 3 crew members to drive it, but this is being reduced to zero soon. Imagine a swarm of these fully robotized tanks coming at you, assisted in targeting by a swarm of small drones over the battlefield.

The tanks and drones can be programmed to act in concert, choosing targets and firing with little or no intervention from operators away from the battlefield.

The idea that tanks, drones or other robots could autonomously make decisions to kill people is a horrendous idea. But that is where things are heading, given advances in pre-programming, artificial intelligence, sensor and collision avoidance technology, combined with a sophisticated networking of communications.

But what happens when the “unintended” happens and hundreds of civilians are killed by these autonomous weapons? The army’s defence would be, “we didn’t mean to kill them, we just made a computer coding error and it all went wrong from there.” You can see that there are big problems in applying the law to the use of killer robots, which is one reason why they should be banned.

There is now an active Campaign to Stop Killer Robots, whose global coordinator is a New Zealander, Mary Wareham. And some progress is being made.

At a UN meeting in Geneva last April 94 countries agreed to begin formal discussions about the problems with “lethal automated weapons system” or LAWS.

For me, any killing is inhuman, but I am even more repulsed by the remote character of much of today’s high-tech killing. Some of the killing is even more emotionless than a computer game, where at least the player’s hand is on the joystick.

There is absolutely no human connection between a computer programmer writing code to guide a killer robot and an Afghan whose family home might be blown up by that fully autonomous robotic device when it is put into operation.

And because high-tech weaponry is expensive and largely the preserve of the already rich and powerful nations, its use by those nations tends to preserve their dominance, and their wealth and power.

In our fight against militarism and war we should be conscious danger these new high-tech weapons pose and campaign strongly against their use.

A Note from our Treasurer

Thank you to the following members, from whom I have received their annual Sub/Donation.

Anthony Blaschke	Patricia Harvey
Pip Colgan	R Jackson
Allen Coyle	Graeme
Mary Davies	MacCormick
David Day	Catherine
VT and P Dyer	Mackereth
M J Fairbrass	Susan Minchin
Janet Franks	Geoffrey Neilson
C and M Hartfield	S Owen.

A kind reminder to those who have

yet to pay the suggested annual Sub/Donation of \$20. This can be posted to me at: Apt 205/1 Squadron Drive

Hobsonville
Auckland 0616

or paid directly into our APF Bank Account 12-3014-0854633-00. Please give your name as Reference. This income is used to pay the cost of printing and posting our Newsletters to those members not on email. We also use it to cover the costs of the Speakers at our popular Study Days and to make an annual donation to Peace Movement Aotearoa who post news of the APF on their website, and other Peace initiatives.

Mary Davies (Treasurer)

What Can St Francis Teach Us Today?

Professor Margaret Bedggood and Chris Barfoot

Anglican Franciscan Third Order

Margaret: Our final session for today has a somewhat different emphasis – but it does recall the presentation with which we started the day and brings a similar message of hope and possibility, not this time from a 21st century Pope but from a 13th century saint.



Pope Francis' (note the name) encyclical last year on care for our common

home was entitled *Laudato Si* (Praise be to you), the first line of the *Canticle of the Sun* of St. Francis of Assisi, in praise of God in God's creation. While you might think from the media and most of the groups which have taken up the Pope's document/message that document is mainly about the environment, it is in fact, like St. Francis' *Canticle*, about three sets of human relationships: with creation, with others, and with God. These were the three themes which occupied St. Francis too.

Despite the appalling damage which is done to all these relationships by war, humans continue to indulge in it, often, as we have seen, with the backing of the church. War is seen as just and noble – or at least as inevitable as a way of solving disputes. As it still is today – in Syria as a prime example. Like our forebears in so many wars, many of the people, factions and states involved seriously believe that they are acting justly and nobly. The young Syrian pilots who drop bombs on their own cities are taught that they are heroes because they are eliminating terrorists. The rebel groups believe that they are fighting for freedom. The countries that are intervening believe they are helping their fellow religionists or have a responsibility to protect those threatened by an evil tyrant.

But there has long been another, often hidden, strand of thinking in Christianity which is reflected, as we have again been hearing, in the Pope's next step in questioning the just war, a strand which favours reconciliation and non-violence.

In this session Chris and I are going to look at the place in that tradition of that earlier Francis,

through some stories about him, and ask whether those stories tell us anything which might help us now, in the topic we have been engaged with today.

First, a bit of background: Francis as a rich young merchant aspired to be a knight, in shining armour, to ride to war for the honour and glory of it. In 1205 he set out to join in one of the skirmishes which occurred regularly between city states. He had already survived one such skirmish and a year as a prisoner of war.

The first night when they were encamped at Spoleto, about 30 miles from Assisi, Francis had the first of those many 'experiences' or visions which were to challenge and sustain him throughout his life. During the night, while he was half-asleep, he became aware of a voice asking him where he was going. When Francis had explained the purpose of his journey the voice said: "Which can do better for you, the lord or the servant?" Francis had no hesitation in saying, "The lord". "Why then", said the other, "do you leave the lord for the servant, and a rich lord for a poor?" Francis, mystified by this and groping for guidance, cried, "Lord, what would you have me do?" and the voice replied: "Go back to your own country and you will be told what to do."

So Francis' chroniclers. But whatever happened that night it was something significant – and compelling. For by the morning Francis had left and returned to Assisi.

There followed a period of uncertainty.

Francis was now, as we would say, a conscientious objector, serving another master, looking for another way. But, as so often it seems, for a period nothing happened. No more messages. Or at least not clear ones. But during this period of uncertainty and change, there were incidents of significance: Francis, out riding one day, encountered a leper. Like most people, Francis was afraid of lepers and kept his distance. He might toss a few coins. But this time for some reason – or not a reason but an intuition– he got

down from his horse, approached the leper, gave him all the money he had on him and kissed him. He had seen that the leper, like himself, was, no more and no less, a human being beloved by God. He had, he says, seen Christ in him. Nor was this a one-off. He went often to stay with and care for the lepers in their hovels and later persuaded his brothers to do the same.

Much of our antipathy to 'others' is caused by our fear of that other person and of how they are different from us, in all sorts of ways. And we respond with violence. Up to and including war.

Chris: Look for example at the way we arm ourselves against one another. The world expenditure on arms last year was nearly 1700 billion dollars. In our city at the moment we are playing host to the navies of the world and at the same time consulting with arms manufacturers how to join this arms race and possess ever more lethal and hugely expensive weapons when we cannot even name a country who is our enemy. And what benefits to the world flow from this vast annual expenditure? Just 3% of this amount would fulfil the chief Millennium Development Goals to eliminate poverty, allow full free health care and primary education the world over. This is the kind of action which caring for the world, our common home, involves.

Why are we so blind?

Because fear manipulates us. It is a power which we cannot resist, a power which causes us to act irrationally? Outside our real nature.

Such is the power of fear.

I'd like to tell you another story. A huge ferocious and ravenous wolf was terrorising the town of Gubbio in Italy. He had started off raiding the farms and killing the sheep and the goats. When the people took up pitchforks and swords to go after him, he attacked them and killed them. The villagers were too frightened that they huddled in their houses, afraid to venture outside the city walls.

When Francis heard about it, he felt very deeply for the people of Gubbio but he felt for the wolf as well. He said to them. "I will go and meet this wolf." They looked to him as if he was crazy. "But he will kill you just as he killed the others." "Don't worry" he said, "God will look after me." One of the friars went with him and some of the villagers. But soon after they left the city gates

the villagers were terrified and turned back. But Francis and his companion walked on. Suddenly a huge wolf leapt out of the forest and charged towards them, its jaws wide open.

Francis did not move but made the sign of the cross towards the wolf. The wolf slowed down and closed its mouth. The Francis called to the wolf: "Come to me, Brother Wolf. I don't want to hurt you." At that moment the wolf lowered its head, and lay down at Francis' feet, meek as a lamb.

"Why have you been terrorising the people, killing their animals and anyone who came to stop you," he said. The wolf explained that he had been left behind by the pack because he was injured and couldn't keep up. So he had taken to catching prey that could not run, like sheep and goats. All he wanted was to eat when he was hungry.

"Brother Wolf," said Francis. "I want to make peace between you and the town of Gubbio. The won't harm you if you don't harm them. Everything that has gone wrong in the past will be forgiven.

The wolf showed that he agreed by moving his body and nodding his head. Then Francis walked back to the town, the wolf following meekly.

When the people gathered in the town square, they were amazed to see Francis with the great wolf sitting at his feet. He spoke to them "From now on will you feed this wolf?". "We will," they shouted. Then he asked the wolf. "Will you live here on these terms and do your part?" The wolf bowed his head to show that he agreed.

From that day on the people kept the pact they had made. The wolf lived for two years among the townspeople, going from door to door for food. It hurt no one and no one hurt it. Even the dogs did not bark at it. When the wolf finally died of old age, the people of Gubbio were sad. The wolf's peaceful ways had been a living reminder to them of the way God overcame their terror through his servant Francis.

Do we have enemies today like the wolf of Gubbio? Are we so possessed by fear that we spend 1700 billion a year in arming ourselves to the teeth against those whom we think are our enemies? Have we made any effort to meet them, talk to them and find out their needs?

But you will say it's religious fanaticism which is at the bottom of it all the problems today. Look at the jihadists, the suicide bombers, the abominable cruelties of Isis, the crimes committed on innocent people. Surely we need this huge expense to

combat terrorism, to deter them, to bomb them into oblivion because we say they are evil?

Religious violence is not new. Have we forgotten about the Crusaders who when they captured Jerusalem in 1099 rode through the Temple of Solomon awash with the blood of the infidels? And these same Crusaders were given indulgences, ie, they were let off their sins, for participating in a Crusade.

But is this the true nature of religion?

You will be surprised to hear that Francis went on a crusade, but even more surprised about the way he behaved.

Margaret: During the fifth crusade in 1219 when the Christians were besieging Damietta, it is reported that Francis with one companion, Brother Illuminatus, walked through both the Christian and the enemy lines and, though threatened and treated roughly, succeeded in gaining an audience with the Saracen Sultan, Malik al Kamil.

What actually took place in that tent is difficult to say. There seems little doubt that some such encounter took place – the general failure to explain or understand it weighs against this being a tale invented by his biographers, who along with many since, have offered a variety of explanations and embellishments, some of which seem more reminiscent of the Old Testament tales of Daniel or the young men in the fiery furnace.

The Sultan received Francis kindly and respectfully and there they remained for several days, apparently in religious discussion with the Sultan and his advisers. Then the Sultan gave them safe passage back to their own lines. Some questions: what was Francis intention? Was he trying to convert the Sultan? Even allowing for the bias of his chroniclers, the answer is probably yes. Was there a suggestion of an ordeal by fire made by Francis? and refused? Was Francis seeking martyrdom? Were gifts offered and refused?

We might get a better handle on this story if we take a quick look at what happened after. We know little of what Francis did in the months which followed – he may have gone to Jerusalem with a safe conduct from the Sultan. Certainly the Franciscans seem to have travelled safely thereafter. Francis noticeably toned down his attitude to missionary activity – the references to martyrdom disappear. He seems to have been particularly impressed by the Muslim constant

recognition of God's presence, the five-fold daily call to prayer, which he recommended in a letter to the authorities on his return. And at least one story may be true, that Francis accepted one gift from the Sultan – a muezzin horn, which he used to call the Brothers to prayer.

But probably most important is the fact of the encounter at all, so mystifying to his contemporaries, “a remarkable lived parable” as one writer describes it, in a time of hatred and conflict. Francis' encounter with the Sultan is a light that shines out in the dehumanising darkness of religious conflict through the ages.

So, a meeting of mutual respect and learning – with consequences. Francis, who had already been willing to acknowledge the presence of Christ in the “other” in the person of the leper, was now able to recognise him in the unbeliever and the enemy – an astonishing insight in that place and time. And one which we seem to have lost sight of.

Chris: But fighting and quarrelling with each other in the home, in the community and in the world is the norm today just as it was in Francis' time. Look at the newspapers or the TV. It's just human nature. Yeah, right!

You mean there's actually another way?

May I tell you one more of the stories of St Francis.

The Mayor and the Bishop of Assisi were in a terrible feud. They would not speak to each other and traded insults. The Bishop had excommunicated the Mayor and the Mayor had forbidden all citizens to have anything to do with the Bishop. St Francis when he heard it was very sad because they were both his friends. “It is a great shame,” he said “that no one helps these guys to get together.” You might know that Francis wrote a song called the ‘Canticle of the Sun’ which begins “All creatures of our God and King.” This song at the time would have been the top of the pops in Assisi. So he sat down and wrote a new verse. Then he sent messengers to the Bishop and the Mayor to meet him in the town's square. When both were there, he asked two of the brothers to sing the song which now included this new verse:

“...and all you men of tender heart,
forgiving others, take your part.
O praise Him! Halleluia!”*

*The audience spontaneously joined in the singing. .

When the song had ended the Mayor took a step forward, threw himself at the feet of the Bishop and said “Because I love our Lord Jesus Christ and his servant Francis I forgive you from my heart and am ready to do what you want, whatever it is.”

But the Bishop leaned over, and helped his enemy up, embraced him and kissed him and said: “Because I am a bishop I should be humble and peaceful. But by nature I am tempted to anger. So therefore please bear with me in my weakness.”

What might have been avoided in Syria if this approach had been tried?

Idealistic? No, realistic. Who is the more naïve?

A Note from our Secretary

It is a pleasure to be serving the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship as New Zealand secretary, after being a member for 37 years – from the age of 16.

My parents, the late Dudley and Margaret Mander, introduced me to Christian pacifism and gave me treasured opportunities to meet APF and Christian Pacifist Society members in my childhood and teens, many of whom had been conscientious objectors.

My impression is that in the 20th century Christian pacifists and conscientious objectors encountered significant opposition and ostracism within the church and community. Perhaps as a consequence, I remember meeting people who had nicknamed themselves “militant pacifists” – pacifists who had encountered, and expected, opposition at every turn and had gained a formidable reputation for “taking no prisoners” in debates about pacifism. Times have changed. Many young people inside and outside the church hold a firm commitment to justice, peace and sustainability. They welcome, and at times offer, a clear pacifist voice as they seek to live with integrity.

I am glad to be part of the APF as we support this rising generation by continuing to challenge all church members to renounce war, look to Christ and work for peace.

Rev Indrea Alexander
apfnzsecretary@gmail.com



He who puts his trust in the weapons of war to maintain his position or he who trusts in the way God has shown us?

May we believe that God through His Son, Jesus Christ, will provide another way to resolve conflicts so that we may better care for the earth which is our common home. May Pope Francis, in the spirit of St Francis, see fit to write a new encyclical addressed to all people and nations of the world – “Just War , and indeed, all war – no more! Laudato Si! Praise God, all creatures of our God and King!”

TIM'S CASTLE

I watched
protectingly
as our small grandson, at kindergarten
with utmost care
filled his bucket,
patting down the sand
tongue-tip helping,
up-ended
and with immense pride
up-lifted –
a perfect castle
then hastened to find the exact
leaf-flag –
his masterpiece crowned.

A moment,
then a war-whooping bigger boy
with flying leap
kicked
flattened
scattered, destroyed
Tim's castle.

Three reactions –
little boy's lip-quivering desolation
bigger boy's jubilation
my fierce anger
desire for retaliation.

A microcosm of the world?
But retaliation leads to retaliation
retaliation...retaliation
the hardest response –
understand
communicate
forgive
and build another sand-castle
together.

Meg Hartfield, from *A Celebration of Life*,
Collected Poems

AUCKLAND STUDY DAY

Selwyn Library, Holy Trinity Cathedral Precinct, Parnell, October 13 and 14, 2017

FROM JUST WAR TO JUST PEACE

Friday Evening: Dorothy Brown Memorial Lecture:

Maire Leadbeater: New Zealand, a leader in peacemaking

Saturday: Study Day

Professor Richard Jackson: The Pacifist State

Dr Katerina Standish: War Education

Dr Geoffrey Troughton: The Roots of Christian Pacifism in New Zealand

Aarif Rasheed: A Moslem Approach to Pacifism

Other speakers and details to be advised.

Enquiries: Chris Barfoot barfoots@xtra.co.nz or ph 09 575 6142.



EXPLORE CHRISTIAN PACIFISM IN DUNEDIN

Friday Nov 24 (evening) and Saturday November 25, 2017

Christian pacifists and people interested in learning more about Christian pacifism are invited to a South Island gathering in Dunedin.



These days dovetail onto the end of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies “Rethinking Pacifism for Revolution, Security and Politics” conference, November 22-24 at Otago University.

The Friday night and Saturday are intended to include Bible study, presentations, workshops, socialising and a visit to sites connected to pacifist prisoners transported from Parihaka, in the 1880s.

Non-binding expressions of interest in the two day event are sought now so information can be shared effectively as it becomes available. Please email APF secretary Indrea Alexander on apfnzsecretary@gmail.com or phone 03 689 6561 with your name and contact

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 <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.