

Learning to Wage Peace

by

Todd E. Buegler
Dept. of Religion Senior Thesis
Religion 99
Dr. Garrett E. Paul
Final Draft
May 6, 1987

Returning hate for hate multiplies hate,
adding deeper darkness to a night already
devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out
darkness; only love can do that.¹

- Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

One cannot turn on a television or read a newspaper without hearing or reading about another terrorist attack; mid-east war or street murder. Violent situations such as these do not occur on a daily basis to the average American citizen. Yet, wanton violence surrounds us. Americans, as people who participate in the world, need to consider violence. This is important because we need to decide how to react to violent situations, whether we ourselves are attacked, or whether we read about such an attack in a newspaper.

Every day, potentially violent situations arise, and they force people to choose a course of action. The options they have to choose from are infinite, yet may generally be categorized into several areas. A person may respond to a situation aggressively, defensively or passively. Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary defines the word "aggression" as "A forceful act or procedure (as in an unprovoked attack) esp. when intended to dominate or master."² The word "defense" is defined as "Protection from or resistance against assault."³

One problem which relates very specifically to the problem of violence is language. In particular, when peacemaking is discussed, the word "pacifism" has become one of the most

misunderstood and misused words in the discussion. It has come to mean so many different things to so many different people that it is impossible to reach a clear definition. It should be understood, though, that the comments quoted in this study which specifically refer to pacifism or Christian pacifism do so within the confines of peacemaking as it will be defined and used in this discussion.

The choice between violent or non-violent response is a specifically religious issue for several reasons. People placed in potentially violent situations make their choices about how to act on the basis of ethical and moral criteria. They must have a standard for action from which they can draw options. Church bodies are organizations that attempt to establish and evaluate standards of this type. Religious bodies tend to take stands on issues of violence and non-violence. The stands those groups take, the reasons they take them and the effectiveness of these positions are all worthy of study.

There are a few observations which should be made to clarify the method of this study. It will focus upon two of the traditional treatments of this very broad question: Just war and peacemaking. This paper will look at typical representatives of these two traditions. If certain other traditions, denominations or approaches to the problem of violence are not being examined, it is because they do not apply to the areas under scrutiny, or because they are merely repeating material already discussed.

First, this examination will look at the role that the

churches have chosen to take in the issue. The churches have generally followed what has come to be called the "just-war" tradition, which has been upheld by such mainline groups as the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference and the Lutheran Church in America. Most of the groups that choose to advocate the just war theory do so with the knowing that it "...needs to be understood not as justifying war per se but as giving criteria by which to evaluate the justice or injustice of a particular war."⁴ It is important to remember that the just war theory does not attempt to justify war. Instead, it attempts to bring war under the control of justice, so that if the theory were consistently adhered to, the very concept of war itself would be eliminated. Both the strength and the weakness of the just war tradition lies in the criteria used to determine the validity of a violent confrontation. Its strength is the ability to apply the criteria to a given situation and reach a decision. Its weakness is the inability to create a standard in interpreting the criteria and in the inability to enforce the decision once it has been made and in the high costs of violent action.

Then this study will examine the position of those who advocate a "peacemaking" approach. This view is held by many of the smaller Christian denominations such as the Mennonites and the Quakers, although many of the larger groups, such as the Lutheran World Federation, are beginning to take the position of the peacemaking churches. Those who advocate this position are generally noted for their refusal to take part in war, and for

their non-violent way of life. The problem with a discussion of this tradition is the diversity found within it. There is a broad spectrum of lifestyles encompassed under the term "peacemaker." The Mennonites have been the most willing to separate completely from society and to avoid participation in any kind of governmental activities, while the Quakers have been willing to go to the point of assuming political office. Specific themes that occur within the peacemaking tradition include obedience, discipleship, stewardship and the imitation of Christ. The non-violent way of life is regarded both as a strategy for change and as a witness to the way of Christ and the Kingdom of God. The biblical justification for the peacemaking approach comes most strongly from the Sermon on the Mount, which is interpreted as an ethical absolute describing the lifestyle closest to what God desires.

The peacemaking position can be broken down into two general areas. Those who claim to be fully pacifist renounce all coercion, even if non-violent. There are those, on the other hand, who live by what might be termed as active non-violence, or non-violent resistance. Martin Luther King and Mohandas K. Gandhi (though not a Christian) are best known historically for assuming this ideal. There are also those who will allow a physical resistance only to the point of the restraint of someone who might commit a violent act. Of these two areas, this study will examine almost exclusively those who pursue non-violent resistance. The other peacemaking positions are interesting

areas of study, but have not had the historical influence that the non-violent resistance movement has had.

The third section of the paper will be a case study of a current socio-political crisis. The situation in the nation of South Africa provides an excellent opportunity to compare both the just war and non-violent peacemaking positions to a current situation that is approaching crisis. There are many different forces within South Africa calling for action ranging from violence to non-resistance to end the system of apartheid. The fact that the people of South Africa are being forced to choose how to respond makes for an interesting look at the values of both the just war and peacemaking positions.

Finally, all of the data will be examined and analyzed in hope of answering the question "What is the best possible response to a violent situation?" Through a solid examination of the relevant information, an answer to this question will be defended.

There is a third major tradition historically found within the church that should be mentioned. The "Crusade" attitude, being the spread of Christianity through aggressive means, is not being studied because it does not play a role in contemporary mainline Christianity. Historically, it was quite important to the development and theology of the church, and there are still those who believe in its validity. These are primarily individuals and groups outside of the mainline tradition. One example would be Jerry Falwell and the Moral Majority, who

support active military opposition to communist nations, who they see as being an instrument of evil. However, with the exception of the missionary movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the crusade attitude towards war and peace within the traditional church does not fit into the scope of this discussion.

This examination will not attempt to draw absolutes as conclusions. How one responds to violence is a very subjective issue. It will, however, attempt to compare two traditions that deserves consideration. The question that must be answered is whether either tradition can provide a way of insuring peace in a future when the possibility of war and destruction remains so great.

I. The Just War Tradition

In the contemporary context, the just war tradition has sparked a large amount of controversy among both religious and political bodies. Simply defined, the just war tradition considers war as an evil that may at times be justified as being less evil than the execution of some threat which it wards off, or the continuation of some system it changes. The concept and term "just war" were first coined by Aristotle. He believed in justified violence to enslave those whom he thought were destined by nature to be enslaved. However, the just war tradition has changed much since its inception. The Christian version of the just war tradition is rooted primarily in the beliefs of Augustine, one of the early church leaders. Augustine's just war concept arose out of the idea that the church and the state both aim at peace, which places the two in agreement. War is merely a police measure against evildoers who themselves benefit by the punishment which the war inflicts. Augustine believed that the defense of the state could be equated with the defense of the church; Therefore Christians who obeyed the call of the emperor to fight in defense of the Christian empire against the barbarian invaders were obeying the command of God.⁵ For Augustine, the important thing was that a war or conflict must be waged within the spirit of love. Christian love as such is not incompatible with killing, when the killing is done with the best interests of the enemy in mind. In what Augustine envisioned as a partnership of the church and the empire, the role of the church was to

provide the leadership so that the military functions of the empire could be infused with Christian love. The ethical implications and justifications are explained by the pacifist philosopher, David Hoekema:

The just war tradition, rooted in the ethical theories of Plato and Cicero and formulated within the Christian tradition by Augustine, Aquinas and the protestant reformers, defends military force as a last resort against grave injustice. According to this view, when the innocent are threatened by an unjust aggressor and all other remedies have failed, Jesus' demand for sacrificial love may require us to use lethal force.⁶

Augustine's just war theory could be categorized then, into four areas: 1) War must be just in its object and intent, which should be to restore peace and vindicate justice; 2) War must be just in its disposition, which is Christian love; 3) War must be just in its conduct, i.e. "There should be no wanton violence, profanation of temples, looting, massacre or conflagration. Vengeance, atrocities and reprisals are excluded."⁷ 4) War may be waged only under the authority of the ruler.

The ordinary Christian, who could not hope to be separated from the world, could participate in just wars. Members of the clergy, monks and nuns were obligated, however, to strive for a condition as close to perfection and the ideals of Christ as possible, and were not allowed to participate in violence. The life of Jesus Christ represented the highest standard of what the people of the church could become. Because it was an unreachable standard for the typical person, action beneath that standard

became justified.

By the middle ages even these standards began to fall. With the influence of the nationalistic groups within the church and the conversion of Emperor Constantinople to Christianity, the era of aggressive religious action began. The church/state carried their message across the continent, violently destroying anything that would get in its way, hence bringing to an end anything just about war.

The just war tradition has again come into prominence in approximately the last two hundred years. During that time period, the concept of a justifiable defense has arisen in situations such as the American revolution, the civil war, the first and second world wars and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts. It is interesting to note that while the doctrine of just war is much the same today as it was during the time of Augustine, the teaching of that theory has assumed a slight change. While it was never stated before, now the goal of the just war is clearly seen as insuring peace. Hypothetically, if all of the nations were to abide by the just war tradition, war itself would be eliminated. If all nations were to fight only defensive wars, it would be unnecessary to fight, as there would be no aggressive action to defend against. But since it is not realistic to assume that there will never be military aggression, the just war theory continues to allow for a defensive response to aggression.

The American Catholic Bishops Conference in their pastoral letter The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise, Our Response, have

outlined seven criteria for what might be considered a just war:

- a. Just cause: War is permissible only to confront a real and certain danger. i.e., to protect innocent life, to preserve conditions necessary for decent human existence, and to secure basic human rights...
- b. Competent authority: ...war must be declared by those with responsibility for public order, not by private groups or individuals...
- c. Comparative justice: ...Do the rights and values involved justify killing? For whatever the means used, war, by definition, involves violence, destruction, suffering and death.
- d. Right intention: ...means pursuit of peace and reconciliation, including avoiding unnecessarily destructive acts...
- e. Last resort: For resort to war and to be justified, all peaceful alternatives must have been exhausted...
- f. Probability of success: This is a difficult criterion to apply, but its purpose is to prevent irrational resort to force or hopeless resistance when the outcome of either will clearly be disproportionate or futile...
- g. Proportionality: ...the damage to be inflicted and the costs incurred by war must be proportionate to the good expected by taking up arms.⁸

There have been many prominent theologians throughout history who have argued for the legitimacy of just war. Martin Luther and Reinhold Niebuhr have had a significant effect upon how the just war tradition is used by the contemporary churches. Luther, who instigated many of the actions taken in the reformation agreed for the most part with Augustine. He believed in the legitimacy of war as a police action taken by the state. While

Augustine had developed four codes of behavior, Luther acknowledged three of these. Augustine took into account the roles of the magistrate, the minister, the monk and the citizen. Luther deleted the monk from this list.

There is a certain correspondence here to the two aspects of God's character. For God operates in history with his left hand which is the coercive state and a right hand which is the persuasive church...the magistrate is the instrument of (God's) wrath...the role of the minister is strictly spiritual...he may employ no weapons other than the Word...the soldier (has) a legitimate calling ordained of God.⁹

The categories break down as the magistrate meeting the physical needs of the body of believers, the minister meeting all that concerns mind and spirit and the soldier representing the government, whether in time of peace or war.¹⁰

Luther presented a unique version of the just war tradition because he still allowed for individual choice. He stated: "If a prince desired us to go to war, and his cause was clearly unrighteous; we should neither follow nor help such a prince..."¹¹ So then, while a war could be just, if an individual soldier feels that the war is unjust, or against God's will, that soldier would not be obligated to fight.

Reinhold Niebuhr revived some of Luther's major themes in his 1933 book Moral Man and Immoral Society, with one important exception. Where Luther drew the Augustinian distinction between true Christians being able to live purely and without violence and normal Christians participating in violence, Niebuhr drew a

separate distinction. He saw the difference as being between the way Christians act as individuals, and as members of large groups.¹² In both cases conflict could never be overcome. Thus, some restraint or defensive conflict would always be necessary. The issue becomes "how much conflict?" Niebuhr drew an important distinction between non-resistance and non-cooperation, which he held to be the same as non-violent resistance.

...that even violence is justified if it proceeds from perfect moral goodwill. But he is equally insistent that non-violence is usually the better method of expressing goodwill. He is probably right on both counts. The advantage of non-violence as a method of expressing moral goodwill lies in the fact, that it protects the agent against the resentment and ill-will to the contending party in the resentments which violent conflict always creates.¹³

Niebuhr asserts that violence can be made morally justifiable. This would follow from his assumption that there will always be conflict, so there will always be a need for restraint. Still, Niebuhr asks the question, "If power is needed to destroy power, how is the new power made ethical?"¹⁴

The churches within the mainline American tradition have taken strong stands on the issue of just war. These churches include the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopal, United Methodist, American Baptist and United Presbyterian. The strongest statements come from the American Catholic Bishop's Conference and the Lutheran Church in America. It is important to note that all of these churches distinguish strongly between nuclear and non-nuclear conflict. The LCA goes so far as to

state that "We declare without equivocation that nuclear war, with its catastrophic devastation of the earth, is contrary to the good and gracious will of God for the creation."¹⁵ The pastoral letter of the American Catholic Bishops is equally condemning of nuclear conflict, but does justify the use of violence when the violence meets the seven criteria of a just conflict. The Bishops also recognize the important role that the just war concept can play in the prevention of war. "...just war teaching has evolved, however, as an effort to prevent war; only if war cannot be rationally avoided does the teaching then seek to reduce and restrict its horrors."¹⁶ This statement, written in 1983, set a precedent in that it publicly acknowledged and justified a policy for the first time in a mainline American church that had been in functional operation for years. One year later, the Lutheran Church in America, being much more concise than its Catholic counterpart, said that

While the weak must still be defended with power backed by might, and while nations may unhappily be forced to respond to aggression by limited military means, yet the normal use of force must be its political use through military non-use.¹⁷

The just war tradition has had a long history within the church and in essence has changed very little since the time of Augustine. The challenge lies in discovering whether the tradition can still operate successfully today given the nature of modern warfare.

II. The Peacemaking Tradition

Peacemaking or peacebuilding, is most clearly defined, ironically enough, by the Lutheran Church in America.

Peacemaking "Aims at the establishment of the conditions of justice among people which, in turn, minimize hostility and the likelihood of violent conflict...for the Christian, peacemaking is the love of enemies and the reconciliation of the estranged."¹⁸

One of the key elements of peacemaking is non-violence. There are two main forms of non-violence: Non-resistance and non-violent resistance. Of the two, it is the latter that more fully represents the virtues of peacemaking. Non-resistance cannot, by this definition, count as peacemaking because pure non-resistance becomes the passive acceptance of a violent fate. Peacemaking, on the other hand, calls for people to take an active role in the resolution of violence. This reinforces the validity of non-violent resistance. The American Friends Service Committee of the Quakers state that "Non-violent action refers to methods of protest, resistance and intervention without physical violence in which members of the non-violent group do or refuse to do certain things."¹⁹

There is little doubt that the position of the peacemakers has been heavily influenced by the New Testament. They usually see Jesus as the long-awaited messiah, who brings the promised age of peace, the Kingdom of God into the world. Jesus rejected the role of violence and war as a means of resolving conflict.

The Gospels portray him as repeatedly calling upon those who hear him to forgive one another, not just once, but as often as wronged. (Matt. 6:14-15 and 18:21-22; Mark 11:25; Luke 6:37 and 17:3-4) The clearest call of Jesus Christ for those who follow him is found in the words of the Sermon on the Mount:

You have heard that it was said "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." But I say to you, do not resist one who is evil. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if anyone would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to him who begs from you, and do not refuse him who would borrow from you.

You have heard it said, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy." But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be the sons of your Father who is in heaven; For he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect. (Matt. 5:38-48, RSV)

Peacemakers see this section of the gospels as both a call and a mandate. They feel that all Christians are called to be peacemakers, and are given a moral guide of how to act by both the words and the actions of Jesus. David Hoekema argues that "Followers of Jesus, Christian pacifists say, must follow both his example and his teachings: They must show love for all in their actions and seek healing and reconciliation in every situation."²⁰ The message, life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, then brought to all creation the restoration of

unity and harmony that the prophets had longed for, and made possible once again the reconciliation of God and the world.

The origins of the non-violent position from a Christian perspective can be traced back to the origins of the church itself. The conflict was strong even then, and arose from comparisons of Old Testament writings, showing God as a mighty warrior to the teachings of Christ, portraying a loving and merciful God. There is an interesting difference in the way violence is portrayed in the two testaments. While battle in the Old Testament is shown to be nation against nation or person against person, The New Testament portrays violence as occurring almost exclusively against evil. The fight was not between people, but against the broader concept of evil as it was in humans. The Old Testament passages were difficult for the early church leaders to reconcile with Christ's radically different commands. They used two methods of resolving these problems.²¹ The first was chronological. Wars belonged to an earlier history, and with the advent of the Christ came a new era of peace. The other means of dismissing the problem was to consider the Old Testament stories of war as allegorical examples of God working in the world.

The pacifist position reached its peak in the time period prior to the early 4th century. Historian Roland Bainton noted that until that time, there was not a single Christian writing supporting participation in warfare.²² In addition, Paul Ramsey, a contemporary just war ethicist admits that "For almost two

centuries of the history of the early church, Christians were universally pacifist."²³

The strong pacifist influence in the church began to diminish until Constantine declared Christianity the official religion of the empire in 313. As the church and the state became less distinct from each other, Christians began serving in the army. By the early 5th century, non-Christians were forbidden from military service. Starting during this time period, two important events occurred: pacifism redeveloped as a reactionary movement to the destruction of the crusades, and Augustine developed his just war theory. Since that time, both concepts have coexisted, though the just war tradition has been dominant.

Within the peacemaking movement of the last two hundred years, the Quakers have been very prominent. As mentioned above, Quakers are not separationists and prefer to effect change by working within the existing system of government. Their strong stand against the use of violence is representative of what has come to be called the "peace churches." The Quakers advocate not just a change in personal philosophy at an individual level, but a change in strategy at a national level. They believe that it is possible to replace a military system of government with a system of civil defense based on non-violence. They make the strong affirmation that "We propose that the United States recast its entire defense effort and rely upon civilian defense based on non-violent action and thereby do its part in the creation of a world community in which war will no longer have a place."²⁴ In

this system, the churches would serve as a moral and spiritual resource. They state that:

...civilian defense would find in religion resources for realizing love and justice through non-violence. There are indeed tremendous spiritual resources which the churches can release if they preach, teach and practice non-violence as a source of power for the nations, following the example of Jeremiah, of Isaiah, of St. Francis, and of Gandhi.²⁵

In the last century, the person most closely associated with non-violent resistance has been Martin Luther King Jr. King, during his civil rights struggle, used the principles of non-violence to affect legislative change and to establish civil rights for blacks primarily in the South. At the same time, King came to believe in the value of non-violence on a global scale. His statements and speeches show clearly his belief that non-violence was paramount to the pursuit of peace. "Non-violence is the answer to the crucial political and moral question of our time - the need for man to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression..."²⁶ King was a peacemaker. The objective he strove for was not merely the abstinence of violence, but the achievement of peace through the abstention from violence.

The theology of peacemaking has been described by John Howard Yoder. Yoder, a pacifist theologian from the Mennonite church believes that the way to peace is not an easy path, but yet one that Christians are obligated to take. He writes that Jesus

...asks them (Christians) to be different, to be visibly different...like a light, ...like a city on a hill. Their differentness, he says, is to be in the way their righteousness fulfills the law and goes beyond the law... beyond not killing to not hating...beyond limiting vengeance to renouncing vengeance... beyond loving the neighbor to loving the enemy. He does not ask first, "can you run a government that way?" He asks first, "What is God like?" and calls his disciples to be like that. The God who loves his enemies is the original peacemaker.²⁷

Yoder represents on a general level the perspective of the peace churches. Their perspective of Christ is that of both teacher and example. Christ taught with words such as the Sermon on the Mount, but he also lived as an example. Through his sacrifice of self, Christ became a peacemaker. He made possible the reconciliation between God and humans. Even as Christ was a peacemaker, his disciples are also called to teach and live the way of peace. As Yoder describes it, it is a dangerous call, for those who chose to follow Jesus in that way "Should not follow him unless they were ready to suffer, as he was going to suffer."²⁸ Yet following the path of peace is in itself a form of power as demonstrated by both Gandhi and King. Yoder goes on to describe that both of these two leaders

...demonstrated the power of truth made effective through active non-cooperation with evil. It is costly, though hardly more costly than war. to recognize the sacredness of the adversary's life and dignity, to refuse to meet him on his own terms, is at once a moral victory and the beginning of a tactical advantage.²⁹

Both the peacemaking and just war traditions begin with the

presumption that peace is the standard. The just war tradition outlines the criteria that if met, would allow people to perform limited acts of violence. Yoder speaks for the peacemakers who believe that even if the criteria are valid, which they may not be, there is no situation that can satisfy the criteria to justify violence. Peacemakers feel that the problem with the just war tradition is that those who believe in it have consciously or unconsciously shifted the burden of proof to the side of peace. Violence has become the norm, and those espousing non-violence are left having to prove the validity of their position. This is contrary to the teachings of Christ.

III. The Case of South Africa

South Africa is a nation approaching a crisis. With a government many consider oppressive, and a resistance movement many consider militant, violence is always a possibility. This is why the South African situation can provide a good case study for the just war and peacemaking traditions.

The South African government faces strong resistance from both external and internal forces. Externally, they have had to live under the condemnation of other nations for their continuation of the doctrine of apartheid, which literally translates from the language of Afrikaans as "separateness." The nation was forced out of the British Commonwealth in 1961, and has been under a U.N. Security Council arms embargo since 1963. It has been excluded from participating in the plenary sessions of the United Nations since 1974 and has four times faced trade sanctions from both the Commonwealth conferences and the U.N., causing South African currency to lose its value by more than half of its foreign exchange rate in 1985.³⁰ The government of Prime Minister Botha has been severely criticized both for its policies of racist separation and for its political and military occupation of Namibia.

Internally, the South African government faces a military threat on two fronts. The Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO) and their military wing, the People's

Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), are working from bases within Namibia to end the South African governmental rule both in Namibia and South Africa. The main effort of SWAPO is to end an illegal and unjust rule by a foreign government. They state in The Combatant, their news and information publication, that

...many more people, away from newspapers and public eyes, are still suffering appalling violence from the racist South African Defence Force. People are being killed, abused, raped and assaulted everyday. Overt and covert terror and political repression are rife, eating away at the society and destroying its fabric.³¹

SWAPO goes on to pledge that

As long as the racist regime of Botha continues with its illegal occupation of Namibia, the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) vow to intensify the armed liberation struggle to compel the racist regime to withdraw its colonial forces from Namibia and surrender power to the Namibian people.³²

The other major front of opposition is found in the form of the African National Congress, headquartered in Zambia. The ANC's military organization, "Spear of the Nation," has been steadily increasing its operations within South Africa itself in the last two years. They are responsible for the mining of major roads within South Africa, the assassination of governmental leaders and rioting in Black townships outside of white cities. The ANC is the more active of the two groups in terms of actual military response within the South African borders.

John Keegan, a journalist serving in Pretoria, writes that "South Africa thus exists in a state of near war, external and internal. But it is a war that South Africa is not losing. Nor is it likely to lose in the foreseeable future. Afrikaanders are determined to resist, and they carry most of the country's white English speaking people with them."³³ South Africa is an almost completely self sufficient nation. Their only major import is oil, which if cut off, could be partially replaced with their abundant supply of coal. After the 1963 weapons embargo, South Africa set up the Armaments Development and Production Corporation. (ARMSCOR) This company has reached a level of production which now allows it to meet all of the needs of the South African Defence Force. (SADF) Consequently, South Africa is capable of surviving regardless of the external economic or political pressures which are placed upon it.

David Duncan describes and compares the Afrikaanders attitudes to the idea of the "Laager." The Laager was the defense method of the early Dutch settlers. They would circle their ox wagons in order to protect themselves when confronted by hostile natives.

This formation has long defined the attitudes of the Afrikaander people toward adversaries. They have always been few in numbers and have had to fight against incredible odds to preserve their way of life. They have learned to be tough and resourceful...I shudder to think what would happen if Afrikaanders reacted to full sanctions by forming a late 20th century equivalent of the laager.³⁴

The church structure within both South Africa and Namibia provide the perfect setting for the development and support of a resistance movement. There is a distinction which needs to be drawn regarding what can be called "the church" within South Africa. There are two churches in South Africa; The Black and the White. The White church is, for all practical purposes, identical with the state. It serves as an extension of the government for the enacting and enforcement of the policies of apartheid. This examination will deal only briefly with the White church, concentrating upon the resistance churches and their response to the violence within their nations.

A group of 150 leading theologians not associated with the state church gathered together to write a statement entitled Challenge to the Church: The Kairos Document. The Kairos theologians outline the position of the Black, or resistance churches within South Africa and Namibia. Their statement, published by the British Council of Churches, outlines the position of the resistance movement from a religious perspective. The theologians delineate between three theological positions within the conflict: State Theology, Church Theology and Prophetic Theology.

State Theology is identified as the theology of the White Church and the Afrikaners government. This theology attempts to make legitimate a complete and blind obedience to the state. To justify this approach, the state church draws heavily from Romans 13:1-7:

Every subject must obey the government authorities, for no authority exists apart from God; The existing authorities have been constituted by God. Hence anyone who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition will bring judgement on themselves. Magistrates are no terror to an honest man, though they are to a bad man. If you would avoid being alarmed at the government authorities, lead an honest life and you will be commended for it; The magistrate is God's servant for the infliction of divine vengeance upon evildoers. You must be obedient, therefore, not only to avoid the divine vengeance but as a matter of conscience, for the same reason as you pay taxes - since Magistrates are God's officers, bout upon the maintenance of order and authority. Pay them all their respective dues, tributes to one, taxes to another, respect to this man, honor to that..." (RSV)

The Kairos document observes that "The South African state recognizes no authority beyond itself and therefore it will not allow anyone to question what it has chosen."³⁵ If a parallel were to be drawn, State Theology would be closest to the historical attitude of the Crusade in terms of its position on justifiable violence. The state has a certain theological perspective and is determined that Black and White South Africans will live according to the beliefs of the government. Much like the crusades of old, the government is willing to enforce its views upon its people, using violence if necessary.

The authors of The Kairos Document attempt to show how the state has made communism their concrete symbol of evil and the SADF a representation of God's army in the defeat of the evil. The God of the state is seen as historically on the side of the White settlers. It is not uncommon for the Whites to identify

themselves as the chosen people of God while the Blacks, on the other hand, are merely the dispossessed of the land. Perhaps The Kairos Document's strongest indictment of State Theology is found when it states that "From a theological point of view the opposite of the God of the Bible is the devil, Satan. The god of the South African State is not merely an idol or false God, it is the devil disguised as Almighty God - the AntiChrist."³⁶

The authors of the Kairos document also offer a strong critique of the Peacemaking tradition. Their belief is that the biggest problem with this theology is its emphasis on reconciliation. Reconciliation has been emphasized too much as an absolute principle that is applicable in all cases of conflict. Reconciliation does not take into account the individual aspects of a particular conflict. It assumes that in conflict, both sides must always make concessions until they reach a common ground. This is unjust as long as there are conflicts that are purely and simply issues of good against evil. It is unjust to assume that good should be willing to concede even a small amount to evil. The Kairos theologians state that "No reconciliation is possible in South Africa without justice."³⁷ This is not to say that Peacemaking is unconcerned with justice, but the justice it seeks is the justice of reform. A justice of reform is the same as reconciliation and is hollow.

The Kairos Document attacks the concept of non-violence with as much vehemence as it does reconciliation. The problem with non-violence, though, is primarily one of language. The term

"violence" is used to describe both what is done by the state and what is done by the resistance on an equal level. The problem, they believe, is that these really are two types of violence. The violence of the state is aggressive and unjust, while the violence of the resistance is defensive and just.

Is it legitimate, especially in our circumstances, to use the same word "violence" in a blanket condemnation to cover the ruthless and repressive activities of the state and the desperate attempts of the people to defend themselves?..Would it be legitimate to describe both the physical force used by a rapist and a physical force used by a woman trying to resist the rapist as violence?³⁸

The South African theologians have embraced the third option, that of the prophetic theology. Prophetic theology is actually a variation on the just war concept. The main difference is that the Kairos theologians deny the validity of two of the seven criteria for just war, those being "right intention" and "probability of success" as they were reinterpreted by the American Catholic Bishops Conference. Prophetic theology need not meet all seven criteria to justify violence, as adherence to those criteria can prevent the necessary violent action and perpetuate the injustices. This theory sees the South African conflict as much more than merely a racial war. "The conflict is between two irreconcilable causes or interests in which type one is just and the other unjust."³⁹ Prophetic Theology draws some of its justification from a rather questionable translation of the book of Psalms, which states that "God, who does right, is

always on the side of the oppressed." (Ps. 103:6) A government based upon tyranny is unjust and as time progresses, will only become more brutal and tyrannical, until finally it becomes a reign of terror. The Kairos Document states that "A regime that has made itself the enemy of the people has thereby also made itself the enemy of God. People are made in the image and likeness of God, and whatever we do to the least of them we do to God."⁴⁰

The Kairos leaders view the South African regime as having reached the state of being totally unjust and as warranting direct action to be removed. Their justification is simple:

We must also remember that the most loving thing we can do for both the oppressed and for our enemies who are oppressors is to eliminate the oppression. Remove the tyrants from power and establish a just government for the common good of all the people.⁴¹

This statement clearly is a call for resistance to the South African government that does not exclude violent action. The entire Prophetic Theology is filled with the rhetoric of the just war tradition. It can only be assumed from this statement, signed by over 150 South African religious leaders, that the church in the embattled nation of South Africa has rejected both the state (crusade) and the church (peacemaking) theologies and is prepared to participate in a just war against the Afrikaners.

In light of the fact that the Black churches have embraced the concept of prophetic theology and just war, the question then becomes: "Can the action taken by the military resistance within

South Africa really be called a just response?" There are several possible methods with which this comparison may be made. The most widely accepted of these would be the reinterpretation made by the American Catholic Bishops Conference.

Within the context of the South African crisis, there can be little doubt that five of the seven criteria of a just war are met. Certainly the actions and attitudes of the Botha regime can constitute a just cause (criteria A) for radical action. While it is not a government that is declaring the need for violent action within the resistance, the struggle has been declared through a legitimate form of authority. (Criteria B) Over the years the struggle has proceeded, it has become institutionalized. The prominent role of the church and organizations such as the ANC and SWAPO, which represent over 85% of the black population, has given these organizations the authority to declare the resistance as a "just liberation struggle." The issue of comparative justice (Criteria C) is a difficult one to apply. Do the rights and values involved justify killing? From the perspective of the black South Africans, they do. As the churches have made clear, it is justifiable to perform violence when that violence will do good for both the Blacks and the Whites. The struggle will involve destruction and death, but given the nature of the situation, this is seen as reasonable if done in proportion to the horrors of the oppression.

It is also reasonable to assume that all of the possible means of finding a peaceful alternative (Criteria E) have been

exhausted, both in and outside of the country.⁴² Lastly, as already mentioned, members of the resistance movement have argued that their struggle will be proportionally just. (criteria G) The resistance is not seeking a form of revenge, but merely an end to the terror of apartheid. The fight is not to be a holocaust, but a war of attrition designed to make the government see the cost of apartheid.

There are serious doubts as to whether or not the violent struggle in South Africa can meet the last two criteria set by the American Catholic Bishops. The first of these is the criterion of right intention. (Criteria D) This entails the active pursuit of peace and reconciliation, including avoiding unnecessarily violent acts. This criterion is not only impossible to meet, but is flatly condemned by the church leaders in South Africa in The Kairos Document. Here, they deny the validity of the concept of reconciliation. Yet the American Catholic Bishops have stated that without a commitment to reconciliation, there can be no just war. This is not a problem of language, both church bodies are using the same general definition for the word "reconciliation." The problem comes from a difference in values. To put it simply, the South African Black Church does not accept the validity of the concept of reconciliation. This problem is not unique to the criteria presented by the Catholic Church. It is true that other organizations have established different criteria, but all of them in some way or another acknowledge the need for

reconciliation to achieve peace. Herein lies one of the philosophical differences between just war and prophetic theology. It must be remembered that though the Kairos theologians choose to reject reconciliation, the validity of reconciliation is not necessarily in jeopardy, as will be argued later.

The second major problem with this criterion is the way it defines "unnecessarily destructive acts." The Catholic's definition implies the protection of the innocent, an idea important to any just war. The violent response to an unjust situation can itself only be just if it is limited to action against the oppressor. If a violent response cannot be entered into without risking the lives of the uninvolved, then that response cannot meet the criteria set by the Catholic Bishops. The problem with the South African situation is that the type of warfare engaged in by the resistance, including bombings, riots and guerilla action is not the type that is easily targeted against the enemy, but is the type that causes terror among the people and is designed to weaken their morale. Frequently in South Africa, the innocent, be they White or Black, are slaughtered in this strategy.

The last criterion is that of the probability of success. (Criterion F) It is also the easiest to label as unreachable in South Africa. As David Duncan reported, the government is well prepared for a long term struggle. In a nation capable of providing for all of its own needs, including weapons, the

prospect of a quick military victory for the resistance is bleak. As US News and World Report stated, "[The government of] South Africa is not losing, nor is it likely to lose in the foreseeable future."⁴³ Yet in the face of insurmountable odds, the South African Black church is sanctioning the use of violence to bring an end to oppression.

It is obvious that the prophetic theology does not meet the qualifications of a just war, indeed it makes no pretense to. The next question that must be asked, though, is whether the prophetic theology can stand on its own as a justification for violent response to government oppression. There are two specific problems that disqualify prophetic theology as a legitimate option. The first problem is that the prophetic theologians discount the validity of reconciliation too quickly on the basis that reconciliation itself is unjust. This is true only if it is understood as always meaning a matter of compromise. This is a fallacy. Reconciliation as understood by peacemakers is the making just of the unjust. This might mean an equal division of responsibility in conflict resolution, or it might mean that one side is totally unjust and needs to be eliminated. While the Black church has interpreted reconciliation as being unjust, peacemakers interpret it as a search for justice. This is an important distinction.

The second major area of conflict is the issue of method. The Kairos Document defines non-violence as being an acceptance of the oppressor's violence, and violence as having one of two

aspects: Good or bad. There are problems with both of these ideas. First, non-violence, as the Prophetic Theologians define it, is really total pacifism. That is not what the peacemaking approach and Church Theology call for. Instead, peacemaking sees the use of non-violence as being necessarily active. Gandhi and King both established precedents where active non-resistance served as effective tools in the pursuit of peace. It would be foolish to assume that the same techniques would necessarily work in South Africa, but there are ways as yet untried to combat apartheid peacefully.

An example of a possible strategy would be using the economic power of the Blacks, who provide the major labor force for an industrial nation. If they could become organized, they could bring the industrial and economic gains of the government to a swift halt. It is likely that there would be governmental reprisals and perhaps violence, but as John Yoder described it, the way to peace is often a way of suffering. As Christ suffered, sometimes people must.

Secondly, the Kairos theologians would draw a distinction between good and bad violence. This is a misconception. It would be more appropriate to identify violence, which is bad according to New Testament teachings, and active resistance, which is good, if done in the spirit of non-violence.

The Black South African church has attempted to justify a violent response to violent repression. If peace through non-violence is truly to be the standard, as the just war tradition

claims, then the South African resistance needs to examine the standard criteria for justified violence. If those criteria cannot be met, as is the case, they need to maintain their standard of peace.

IV. Analysis

There are many similarities and differences between the just war and peacemaking traditions. Unfortunately, it is not within the scope of this examination to explore them all. To adequately understand the commonalities behind the two theories, it must be realized that both traditions share a common goal: To achieve justice. Nonetheless, strong conflict between the two concepts continues. Ultimately, the tension between the two is not one of goals and objects, but of method. The problem lies in the deciding of how that justice is attainable. Indeed, David Hoekema states that

Pacifism and just war theory reach different conclusions only in a narrow range of cases: Both positions insist that Christians must strive always for healing and reconciliation and must act out of love for all, and both traditions unequivocally condemn the reasons whether nationalism, territorial or economic gain, revenge or glory for which all wars have been fought. Yet the differences that exist are both theologically and politically significant. Just war defenders argue that if all means short of violence have failed and organized violence promises to be a limited and effective means of reestablishing justice, Christians may participate in war. Pacifists insist that to resort to warfare, even for a moral end, is to adopt a means inconsistent with a Christian's calling.⁴⁴

Here then lies the crux of the conflict: That those who believe in the just war are willing to take the final step into the realm of violent action, while the peacemakers see that step as being as unjust as the original violent action which demanded response.

This is, as Hoekema pointed out, no insignificant difference, and not one that is will be easily resolved. Still, it can be shown that if both traditions are evaluated on the basis of their functional and moral aspects, peacemaking will provide the least amount of danger, while attaining the highest moral good possible.

There is another area which both concepts share. If an individual or group must choose between justified violence or peacemaking when facing a violent situation, it is a decision that will almost certainly bring down upon them a high cost. Both just war and peacemaking are dangerous and can result in serious physical injury or death to the person or people making the choice. Yet, the choice must often be made. It is important then, to choose the course of action which will provide for the greatest moral good, while hopefully having the lowest total cost in lives and property.

It is also important to distinguish between the long and the short term results of such a decision. The just war advocate claims an advantage in both the long and the short term. This may be true in the short term, where violent action is guaranteed to elicit at least a result and a response. The non-violent techniques of the peacemaking strategy, on the other hand, are much more likely to bring violence down on those who resist. This was shown clearly in the actions taken against the Black non-violent civil rights demonstrators in the early 1960's. Thus the short term advantage may be seen as favoring the just war

tradition. In the long term, however, the results are different; Peacemaking provides the better method of reaching the goal of justice.

It is a given that if one makes use of justified violence against another, that other must have expressed at least a willingness to make use of violence. (If not, there can be no justification.) Since both parties have expressed a willingness to use violence, the odds are strong that the violence will continue until there has been some resolution to the problem. Given the nature of contemporary warfare, a long term violent situation will almost assuredly escalate into either a long and drawn out "guerilla" war of attrition, or a nuclear confrontation. Both of these options are not only dangerous, but in themselves violate the criteria for a just war. A long term guerilla war does not have a significant chance for success, and a nuclear conflict not only violates under any circumstances the criterion of proportionality, but as the American Catholic Bishops stated, "We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear war, on however restricted a scale, can be morally justified."⁴⁵

This argument is made clear in recent history. Since 1945, there has not been a conflict which has not turned to the use of guerilla tactics in the carrying out of its strategy. The Korean, Vietnamese, Afghan, Middle East, Lebanese and terrorist wars are just a few of the examples that can be shown. Our nuclear history is equally indicting. On several occasions, the

world has stood on the brink of a nuclear disaster while military strategists have debated over the effectiveness of using these weapons. In both the short and the long term, the just war tradition is a dangerous one and one which would most assuredly have a high cost.

As already stated, peacemaking may indeed have a higher cost on the short term. History shows though, that it can be very successful over a longer period of time. The two strongest examples are, of course, those of Gandhi and King. By adopting a stance of peacemaking, they effected a strong change both socially and legislatively while under strong oppression. These are two examples of situations where peacemaking has proven effective in the long term. Any comparable victory from the just war position pales next to a victory of peacemaking in the number of lives lost to accomplish their goals.

There is another comparison that is made even more important than the functional aspects of the two traditions: Which of the two most closely coincides with the vision of morality from a Christian perspective. While this is a highly subjective concern, there is one general observation which may be made in comparing the two. The issue at hand is not one of moral "rights" and "wrongs." Rather it is a matter of deciding which of the two traditions provides a solution that can be more effective and more in accordance with Christian teachings. Reinhold Niebuhr described it when he said:

The technique of non-violence will not eliminate all these perils, but it will reduce them. It will, if persisted in with the same patience and discipline attained by Mr. Gandhi and his followers, achieve a degree of justice which neither pure moral suasion nor violence could gain.⁴⁶

This is an important consideration since justice is the claimed goal of both traditions. If, as shown historically, peacemaking can provide victory, then peacemaking can reach a higher level of justice. Whether just war can ever reach that level is questionable. There may be a functional advantage to the just war doctrine in the short term. In the long term however, there is no question that the peacemaking tradition provides the least physical damage with the greater moral justice.

From a religious perspective, it can be shown that peacemaking provides a justice that just war cannot. The first and most obvious consideration is the very nature of God:

Concern for peace, whether Jewish or Christian, is part of the purpose of God for all eternity. God is by nature a reconciler, a maker of shalom. For us to participate in the peacemaking purposes of that kind of God is not just morality. It is not just politics. It is worship, doxology, praise.⁴⁷

There are certainly Biblical writings which would seem to justify the use of violence against the enemy. However, the meaning and purpose of these entries is clouded, or radically changed by the teachings of Christ. An example would be the well known verse: "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." This seems to be very straightforward until Jesus adds "But I say to you..." and

admonishes those who would seek revenge.

While many of these teachings of violence are called into question, there seems little that can be challenged about the command to "Love your enemies, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who persecute you..." (Matt. 5:44) In the beatitudes, Jesus has set forth not just a set of rules to be followed, but a new way of life for his disciples and an eschatological promise for the coming of the Kingdom. If the claim that Jesus teaches through word and deed, and that Christians must show love in all actions and seek healing and reconciliation is to be taken seriously, then Christians should be prepared to act upon that claim.

John Howard Yoder notes that the peacemaking work of the believer, whether it be in conflict or in suffering is a continuation of the work of Christ. The willingness to love the enemy to the point of giving up one's own life is paramount to the very concept of peacemaking.⁴⁸ The justification Yoder uses is from the book of 1 John 3:12-16 which states that Christians "...ought not be like Cain who cut his brother's throat...He has taught us to love in that he gave up his life for us. We, too, ought to give up our lives for our brothers."

Yoder goes on to write of the sense of responsibility to insure peace through love, which is a part of being a Christian:

If I am a child of a Father who loves both good and evil children, if I am a witness for a God who loves his enemies, then when I love my enemy I am proclaiming that love. I am not just obeying it; I am

communicating it. And I cannot communicate it in any other way.

The enemy whom I love, the person coercing me with whom I go a second mile, experiences through me the call to accept grace, because my action makes God's forgiveness real. No other way could do that.

If I lovingly go the second mile, or turn the other cheek to someone who struck me, I am speaking God's forgiving love in the form of the situation by standing before him defenseless.⁴⁹

Summarily, the concept of peacemaking and the non-violent approach to situations that goes with it, is very much in line with the teachings of Christ. Time and time again, the Biblical writings that form much of the basis for the doctrine of the church bring across the message that the Christian is called to bring peace to others. It is not a peace that is achieved through violence, but a peace that is achieved through love and sacrifice exclusively. There is no way in which a doctrine that justifies violence can meet that moral dictum. As David Hoekema stated, the just war tradition "...gives insufficient weight to the central Christian calling to be agents of healing and reconciliation."⁵⁰

Both the just war and the peacemaking traditions share a goal: To achieve justice. Realistically, however, justice as it is seen through the loving vision of Christ cannot entail a standard which will allow violence. Even Reinhold Niebuhr, who eventually embraced the doctrine of just war, wrote that "Violence may tend to perpetuate injustice, even when its aim is justice."⁵¹

By looking again at the situation in South Africa, it is possible to see how by both the standards of functionality and morality, peacemaking is the way to achieve the justice that is so desperately sought.

As far as functionality, justified violence even under the guise of prophetic theology cannot work in South Africa. As John Keegan stated so succinctly in the US News and World Report,⁵² the South African government is not likely to bow under either the pressures of internal military action or external political and economic sanctions. Much more likely, they would assume the position of the laager. The Afrikaners are easily in a position to sit and wait out any attempts to force social change in the nation from within or without. Since any military force from within would be ineffective against the SADF, and military force from the outside unjust,⁵³ and since economic pressures from foreign nations would be without results, there must be another form of action which can be taken. That option should be the combination of economic, political and direct non-violent action that is encompassed under the term "peacemaking."

White South Africa is totally dependent upon Black labor as the basis for their entire economy. If the Blacks could unite and face the government with a single internal non-violent threat to the nation's well being, Prime Minister Botha might be more inclined to seek reconciliation, opening the doors to justice. The mechanism for this pressure is already developing. Labor unions are growing and gaining popular support. A recent issue

of the Weekly Mail, a resistance newspaper, reported that "Strikes at three Black township supermarkets this week herald a new era in labour relations."⁵⁴ This is actually quite significant, considering that just a few years ago, any unionizing of Blacks would have been put down by force.

The mechanism for social action in South Africa may be in place, but the mechanism for organization and communication is lacking. Under a peacemaking strategy the Black church, being the only structural institution that embraces the entire nation geographically, yet which is not under the direct control of the government would fit ideally into this role in the pursuit of justice. This is not possible though, until they give up their justification of violence against the government.

Whatever option the church chooses to follow, it is clear that a new strategy is in order. The violent struggle has been in place for a long time and shows no significant gains. The Black church must realize that it is up to themselves to issue a new call for action, a call for peace.

The religious and moral issues surrounding the South African crisis do not differ greatly from those general arguments which surround the just war/peacemaking conflict already discussed. Even if the effectiveness of the peacemaking ethic is questionable compared to justified violence, peacemaking is not made any less workable on a moral level. These arguments certainly do not invalidate Christ's call to peace and reconciliation in the New Testament. That call forms a prime

facie presumption that non-violence is to be the standard. The Black church has not been able to show specifically why that standard of non-violent peace, shown clearly in both the gospel and apostolic writings, can be violated. In a recent interview, Toivo Ya Toivo, one of the leaders of SWAPO was asked to compare the doctrine of non-violence developed by Martin Luther King Jr., to the South African and Namibian situation. Ya Toivo responded that he admired King and appreciated the ethic of non-violence. "King" however, "Never tried it in South Africa."⁵⁵ To negate peacemaking on the grounds that it simply would not work is a premature assumption. This especially in light of the fact that the just war theory currently being followed has a marginal chance of success at best. Ya Toivo assumes, as do the Kairos theologians, that peacemaking refers only to passive non-violence. They do not consider the political, social and economic ramifications of peacemaking.

At this point, the question becomes "can the standard of peace ever be violated?" For many years, it was possible to judge situations of violence by the criteria of just war. Currently, the problem is that while the nature of warfare has changed, the criteria remain the same. In a post-nuclear era, the seven criteria used to judge whether conflict can be just do not apply. Given the possibility of long-term guerilla conflict or nuclear war as a result of violent conflict, the risks are simply too high. Hoekema has written that

...when the possible consequences of war include the destruction of humankind and the permanent defacement of the entire natural and human world, we do not know how to balance benefits against such costs. The just war tradition cannot guide us in thinking about such a prospect.⁵⁶

There can be no rational justification for violence if it were to result in this type of destruction. The current nature of war makes that destruction a frightening possibility.

Perhaps yet another system separate from the crusades, just war or peacemaking needs to be developed that would be able to effectively answer all of the criticisms of its predecessors. Until that time, however, it is necessary to evaluate both the just war and peacemaking positions and decide which of the two is less costly and serves justice more.

Jewish tradition identifies the coming of the Messiah, and the advent of God's Kingdom with the ushering in of a final age of peace, the new age of Shalom. Shalom incorporates the ideas of harmony, wholeness, security, well-being, abundance, national prosperity and good relationships between people and nations. The Jewish prophets were looking for a messianic period when shalom would be the rule not just for Israel, but for all nations. The vision of this time is shown in Isaiah:

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.
(Isaiah 2:4)

For Christians, the Messiah has come. Yet they still await

the coming of the age of shalom. The churches need to realize that the responsibility for peace throughout the world lies with the inhabitants. Justice is not an eschatological concept that lies beyond reach, but a distinct possibility if people only take seriously the quest for peace. Christian teachings specifically teach against the use of violence, yet in places such as South Africa, the church continues to sanction violence as justified. Over the course of the last two thousand years, justified violence has worked for many of those who use it. Within the last forty years, however, the stakes have changed. Now those who advocate violence find themselves taking, though not necessarily accepting, responsibility for the entire globe. Admittedly, peacemaking is a dangerous concept. Even more dangerous though is justified violence, with all of the potential costs involved. Both just war and peacemaking seek justice. According to the teachings of Christ, though, it is peacemaking which will more closely allow followers to "...Do justice, love kindness and to walk humbly with your God." (Micah 6:8b RSV)

ENDNOTES

1. Ronald J. Sider and Richard K. Taylor, Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope, p. 142.
2. Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary, p. 64.
3. ibid., p. 158.
4. Office of Church in Society, the American Lutheran Church, War, Peace, and Freedom, resolution and statement adopted by the Third General Convention of the ALC, October 19-25, 1966, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966), p.4.
5. Roland Bainton, Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace, p. 39.
6. Dr. David Hoekema, "A Practical Christian Pacifism," P. 918.
7. ibid., p. 97.
8. U.S. Catholic Bishop's Conference, The Challenge of Peace, God's Promise, Our Response, pp. 9a-10a.
9. Roland Bainton, Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace, pp. 138-139.
10. ibid., p. 139.
11. Martin Luther, Luther's Works, Vol. 44, p. 100.
12. Roland Bainton, p. 216.
13. Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society, p. 247.
14. ibid., p. 231.
15. LCA Social Statement, Peace and Politics, p. 5.
16. American Catholic Bishops Conference, The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise, Our Response, p. 9a.
17. LCA statement, Peace and Politics, p. 5.
18. ibid., pp. 8-9.
19. American Friends Service Committee, In Place of War, p. 3.
20. Dr. David Hoekema, p. 917.
21. Roland Bainton, p. 82.

22. ibid., p. 53.
23. Paul Ramsey, The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility, p. 282.
24. American Friends Service Committee, In Place of War, p. 36.
25. ibid., p. 91.
26. Martin Luther King, quoted in In Place of War, p. 96.
27. John H. Yoder, He Came Preaching Peace, p. 104.
28. ibid., pp. 42-43.
29. John H. Yoder, When War is Unjust, p. 52.
30. John Keegan, US News and World Report, p. 30.
31. The Combatant, p. 7.
32. ibid., p. 24.
33. John Keegan, US News and World Report, p. 30.
34. David Duncan, The Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1986, p. 15.
35. The Kairos Document, p. 10.
36. ibid., p. 10.
37. The Kairos Document, p. 10.
38. ibid., p. 15.
39. The Kairos Document, p. 18.
40. ibid., p. 22.
41. The Kairos Document, p. 23.
42. This does, of course, exclude peacemaking. This will be argued as still being an alternative later in the paper. However, from the perspective of the South African churches and resistance organizations, this alternative is unacceptable.
43. John Keegan, US News and World Report, p. 30.
44. David Hoekema, p. 918.
45. American Catholic Bishops Conference, p. 3a.

- 46.Reinhold Niebuhr, p. 254.
- 47.John Howard Yoder, He Came Preaching Peace, p. 34.
- 48.ibid., p. 35.
- 49.John Howard Yoder, He Came Preaching Peace, p. 52.
- 50.David Hoekema, p. 919.
- 51.Reinhold Niebuhr, p. 235.
- 52.John Keegan, US News and World Report, p. 30.
- 53.This would be true in that those taking military action would themselves be acting not defensively, but aggressively. These actions actually fall in line more with the "crusade" attitude than anything else, and are unacceptable.
- 54.Sefako Nyaka, "Union Battles Move Into the Township," Weekly Mail, ESCA Bulletin, p. 10.
- 55.Toivo Ya Toivo, at the National Conference on Namibia, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, MN, March 21, 1987.
- 56.David Hoekema, p. 919.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Africa Report, New York: The African-American Institute, Vol. 31, No. 2, March-April, 1986.

Apartheid, "Statements and Actions of the American Lutheran Church dealing with the apartheid system," Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1981.

Bainton, Roland, Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace, New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Carey, George L., "Biblical-Theological Perspectives on War and Peace," The Evangelical Quarterly, Vol. 57, pp. 163-178, 1985.

Challenge To The Church, The Kairos Document, London: Catholic Institute for International Relations and the British Council of Churches, 1985.

The Combatant, Lwanda, Angola: SWAPO Department of Information and Publicity, November, 1986.

Dickson, Kwesi A., Theology in Africa, New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

ESCA Bulletin, New York, NY: Episcopal Churchpeople for a Free Southern Africa, April 23, 1987.

Ferguson, John, The Politics of Love, New York: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1977.

God's Promise, Our Response, Letter of the American Catholic Bishop's Conference, New York: American Catholic Bishop's Conference, 1984.

Hoekema, David A., "A Practical Christian Pacifism," The Christian Century, Vol. 103, No. 31, Chicago: Christian Century Foundation, Oct. 22, 1986. pp. 917-919.

In Place of War, The American Friends Service Committee, New York: Grossman Publishers, 1967.

Johnson, Christopher, "A Time for Peace, A Time for War," Senior Thesis, Dept. of Religion, St. Peter, MN: Gustavus Adolphus College, May 17, 1985.

Keegan, John, "Is South Africa Invulnerable?" US News and World Report, Vol. 102, No. 11, Washington DC: US News and World Report, Inc., March 23, 1987.

Luther, Martin, "The Sermon on the Mount," Luther's Works, Vol. 21, St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.

Luther, Martin, "Temporal Authority: To What Extent Should It Be Obeyed?" Luther's Works, Vol. 45, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

Lutheran Church in America, Peace and Politics, Social Statements adopted by the twelfth biennial convention, Toronto, Ontario, June 28-July 5, 1984.

LWF Documentation, "Statement on South Africa," Geneva, Switzerland: Lutheran World Federation, No. 19, April, 1986.

Massey, Harold, "Southern Africa is Dying for Freedom," Engage/Social Action, Vol. 14, No. 5, May, 1986, pp. 4-10.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, Moral Man and Immoral Society, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1960.

Pro Veritate, "An Open Letter Concerning Nationalism, National Socialism and Christianity," London: British Council of Churches, July, 1971.

Ramsey, Paul, The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1968.

Sider, Ronald J. and Rickard K. Taylor, Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope, New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Yoder, John Howard, He Came Preaching Peace, Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1985.

Yoder, John Howard, What Would You Do?, Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1983.

Yoder, John Howard, When War is Unjust, Being Honest in Just War Thinking, Minneapolis, Mn: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.