

THE METHODIST CHURCH OF SOUTHERN AFRICA.
CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP DEPARTMENT.

Study Document: SHOULD WE BECOME A PEACE CHURCH?

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
1 The Conference Resolution	2
2. What do we mean by "A Peace Church"?	3
3. Implications of the Methodist Church declaring itself a "Peace Church"	5
4. Some arguments against becoming a Peace Church	7
5. Some arguments for becoming a Peace Church	9
6. The present stance of the Methodist Church on participation in war	18
7. Action for Quarterly Meetings	20
8. Appendices:	21

8.1. The Defence Act of 1983

8.2. The Just War Theory

8.3. Anglican Report on the Commission
on the "Just War"

8.4. Catholic Report on Police Conduct
during Township Protests

-----oOo-----

THE METHODIST CHURCH OF SOUTHERN AFRICA

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP DEPARTMENT

STUDY DOCUMENT :

"SHOULD WE BECOME A PEACE CHURCH?"

For use by Circuit Quarterly Meetings and
Society Leaders.

INTRODUCTION: A note to Superintendents

This study document is in two parts : A Bible Study (the loose-leaf insert) and the booklet itself.

1. At your November 1987 Quarterly Meeting: Please hand out copies of the Bible Study sheet (only) to all Class Leaders, Fellowship Group Leaders, YMG, Manyano, WA, Youth Guilds etc and ask them to study it before your January 1988 Quarterly Meeting. You need not at the November quarterly Meeting have any debate about the Peace Church resolution. Simply mention that it is on the agenda for the January and April 1988 Quarterly Meetings.
2. At your January 1988 Quarterly Meeting:
 - 2.1. Hand out copies of the booklet
 - 2.2. Tell your people that debate and decision will take place at your April 1988 Quarterly Meeting. Leaders are asked meanwhile to study the booklet with their Classes and groups as they did with the Bible Study.
 - 2.3. Read out the Peace Church resolution (Sec 1 below)
 - 2.4. Simple read out the headings of the other Sections of the booklet to help your people become familiar with the booklet.
 - 2.5. Invite Society Leaders' Meetings and Council Meetings to debate this issue and bring questions, ideas and resolutions to the April Quarterly Meeting.
 - 2.6. Remind the meeting that the April QM'S report to Synods and thence to the Conference of 1988. Conference will take very seriously the resolutions it receives from our people.
 - 2.7. Stress that if people do not respond on this crucial issue, their voice will not be heard by Conference.
3. At your April 1988 Quarterly Meeting
 - 3.1. Put the Peace Church resolution on your QM Agenda at a suitable place so that there will be time available for debate and decision.
 - 3.2. Relay the QM's decision to the Synod Secretary.

SECTION 1: THE CONFERENCE RESOLUTION

(ref: 1986 Minutes page 340, para 29.9.34)

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY ON PEACE CHURCH CONCEPT

Conference refers to Quarterly Meetings for debate and report through the District Synods of 1988 to the Conference of 1988 the proposals that:

1. The Methodist Church of Southern Africa should declare itself a Peace Church;
2. Conference should specifically state its rejection of violence and war and declare that its members ought not to participate in violence or in military service of any form, although such non-participation should not be an article of faith or a condition of membership;
3. Methodists should not participate in the manufacture, propagation or advertising of munitions, weapons or instruments of war, or in scientific, educational or cultural programmes designed to contribute to war, or in propaganda or activities promoting ill-will or hatred among people or nations;
4. Methodists should enter into the study, training and practice of forms of non-violent action as a positive substitute for the violence of war in resisting injustice and bringing about change.

Conference instructs the Christian Citizenship Department to prepare and circulate a study document on the issue for the use of Quarterly Meetings and Synods.

-----oOo-----

SECTION 2: What do we mean by "A Peace Church"?

2.1. The usual meaning of "Peace Church" is that a denomination takes as its highest priority the effort and cost of being peacemakers in a divided society. It chooses to seek and live out the best Gospel meanings of justice, liberation and righteousness.

Such a denomination would state its rejection of violence, killing and war. It would declare that its members ought not to participate in military service in any form, whether pro-Government or anti-Government.

2.2. The injunction is often extended to "the manufacture of munitions, weapons, and instruments of war or destruction", and to participation in "scientific, educational or cultural programmes designed to contribute to war, or in any propaganda or activity that tends to promote ill will or hatred among men or nations". (Statement by USA Mennonite Churches, Words of Conscience, National Interreligious Service Board for Conscientious Objectors, NISBCO, 9th ed, March 1980, (p 75))

2.3. The injunction may extend to the discouragement of financial support for war, usually through "war bonds" (NISBCO p 75).

2.4. The injunction may also extend to the discouragement of payment of whatever proportion of taxes are used for "defence".

2.5. The degree to which the injunction not to participate in war is binding upon members of the denominations varies according to the heritage and choice of the denomination. Quakers, for example, are "urged" and "called" to refuse participation in the military, even as non-combatants but the Society would hold in respect those who in conscience choose to enter the armed forces (NISBCO pp. 53-54). They certainly do, however, teach their members not to participate in the army and vigorously support members who are called up but refuse to serve.

2.6. The "Methodist Rule of Life" can certainly be seen as compatible with this desire to work peaceably for justice and liberation. (L & D page 10, paras 3/6 and 3/7):

3/6

Upon the same foundations of brotherly love rest the social obligations and sacrificial service for the Kingdom of God to which those who confess Christ commit themselves, after the example of their Lord and Master ...

3/7

- (1) That of "Doing no harm, avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is more generally practised" ...
- (2) That of "doing good by being merciful" ... within this obligation are embraced personal testimony for Christ, missionary effort, the manifold forms of social and philanthropic service, and the pressing necessity for promoting lasting peace and goodwill among the nations.
- (3) That of ... worship ... fellowship ... self-discipline ... family worship.

2.7. Summary:

A Peace Church is one which declares as a basic tenet of its teaching its objection to war, participation in war, financial support for war and training for war. This would apply whether the war was to support a government or to displace it. The degree to which this teaching is binding upon members various from church to church.

-----000-----

SECTION 3: IMPLICATIONS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH
DECLARING ITSELF A "PEACE CHURCH".

- 3.1. It is crucial that our people generally participate in and take responsibility for this decision and its implications.
- 3.2. It is crucial that our people generally accept that we are being asked not simply for a declaration by Conference, but a costly commitment to an ongoing process by which we allow ourselves to be transformed into a Peacemaking Church.
- 3.3. It is crucial that this process be understood as a contribution to the liberation process. In making this declaration and instituting this process we must be saying that we are on the side of the oppressed. We cannot be saying that we are neutral, simply "passive" in the struggle. Rather, we are committing ourselves to an active programme of promoting justice and peace, liberation and reconciliation. We are wanting to offer our lives without taking life.
- 3.4. This will involve a costly and ongoing educational process. Finances will be required. Existing programmes such as the "Faith and Life" lessons could contribute strongly to this process.
- 3.5. The educational process should also involve Sunday Schools, Guilds, Confirmation Classes, Manyano, WA's, YMG's, Men's Leagues etc.
- 3.6. The educational process will have to be situational. For example, it will have to work with issues like:

Should our boys do Cadets at school?

How can the Church help in resolving
the violent polarization happening
in the Black community?

How can the Church witness about the:

increasing militarization of the
SA Government, and SA society at large?

3.7. Military Chaplains, both full-time and part-time must be seen to be committed to this process, and even to take a leading role in it.

3.8. We will have to work out very carefully how binding all this should be on our members, and how we would enforce it if we made it binding.

-----000-----

SECTION 4: SOME ARGUMENTS AGAINST BECOMING A PEACE CHURCH

4.1. We are facing a "total onslaught", master-minded by the Communists. What would become of the Church and Christianity here if South Africa came under Communist control? Christians must therefore do their duty and take up arms to defend the Church and Christianity. This is a "just war" we are fighting.

4.2. The only thing that stopped Hitler was armed force. If we hadn't fought then, perhaps the light of Christianity would have been extinguished. People like Gandhi would have simply disappeared in Hitler's Germany. Only armed force can deal with the present situation.

(Note: The above arguments may be broadly described as "White" viewpoints. The next two may similarly be called "black" viewpoints).

4.3. The liberation movements tried the way of non-violence for 50 years. Sharpeville and the continued intransigence of the SA regime showed us that violence was the only way left. The institutional violence of the South African regime has now reached horrific levels. In such a violent society, what possible hope is there for non-violence? Those who truly seek effective change in such an already violent society have no choice but to take up arms, much as they might hate the thought of killing.

Church is out of touch with the real situation in South Africa if it thinks that non-violence will work now. Leaders who preached and practiced non-violence (like Steve Biko) have simply been eliminated by this regime. Faced with this, with detentions, torture, exploitation, vigilantes and danger to our children, non-violence is just a "dead end". Self-defence and the armed struggle is the only way ahead.

4.4. "Non-violence" and "reconciliation" are dirty words just now, especially among the youth. Both words have been taken away from the biblical context and used from the perspective of the ruling group to mean, "Let's be friends, but don't threaten the system". Scepticism about both concepts will remain strong so long as the Biblical and black contexts of oppression are ignored, and so long as disinherited people perceive that there is no serious and effective desire for restitution of land and of the means of production. In other words, reconciliation must go hand-in-hand with liberation. Attitudinal changes must proceed in tune with structural changes. And if those who are proposing non-violence wish to be taken seriously, they must describe and demonstrate strategies which will reverse alienation and produce liberation.

4.5. (A "Church" argument) The more we talk about this kind of issue, the more we polarize and damage the Church. We should leave these debates to the politicians and get on with the real work of the Church, which is to preach the Gospel and save souls.

-----oOo-----

SECTION 5: SOME ARGUMENTS FOR BECOMING A PEACE CHURCH

5.1. The witness of the New Testament

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. (Matt 5:9)

Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. (Matt. 5:44)

Put your sword back into its place: all who take the sword will perish by the sword (Matt 26: 52)

If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight, that I might not be handed over to the Jews; but my kingdom is not of this world. (John 18:36)

Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing. (Luke 23:24)

Lord, do not hold this sin against them. (Acts 9:60)

Ask God to bless those who persecute you ... if someone has done you wrong, do not repay him a wrong ... never take revenge ... conquer evil with good (Romans 12:14-21)

The weapons we use in our fight are not the world's weapons (1 Cor 10:4)

Christ suffered for you and left you an example ... when he was insulted he did not answer back with an insult : when he suffered he did not threaten. (1 Peter 2: 21-23)

Love one another ... Whoever does not love does not know God ... If someone says he loves God, but hates his brother, he is a liar. (1 John 4:7-8, 20)

Comment: The witness of the New Testament is clear and consistent. God loved us while we were sinful and He calls us to do the same for others. Loving and killing are incompatible. I cannot save anyone's soul by taking his life.

5.2. The witness of the Early Church

There is no evidence of any Christian serving as a soldier until about 170 A.D. and for more than another century most Christians still believed that love was incompatible with killing and therefore with any military service.

Justin Martyr (165 A.D.) said, "We who formerly murdered one another now not only do not make war upon our enemies, but, that we may not lie or deceive our judges, we gladly die confessing Christ". Hypolytus (about 200 A.D.) indicates that a follower of Christ who is a soldier "must be taught not to kill men and to refuse to do so if he is commanded".

Tertullian (also about 200 A.D.) is quite clear that no Christian can be a soldier. He can take no oath of loyalty to anyone other than Christ. He cannot live by the sword.

Clement of Alexandria (220 A.D.) said: "Various people incite the passions of war by martial music; Christians employ only the Word of God, the instrument of peace".

Origen (about 240 A.D.) defended Christians against the charge of disloyalty made by such as Celsus, a pagan philosopher who said, "If all men were to do the same as you, there would be nothing to prevent the king from being left in utter solitude and desertion". Origen said, "No such occasion (to take the sword) is allowed by this evangelical teaching" (referring to Matthew 26:52). The power of God is

much greater than that of any earthly ruler, said Origen, and if barbarians invaded the Empire, God would save it. He would certainly act if Christians prayed in faith. If the whole Empire united in prayer, what great things could be accomplished! Origen acknowledged that Christians benefitted from the state, but claimed that Christians gave what we would call "alternative service" by improving the moral fibre of society and by praying for the government.

Martin of Tours (397 A.D.) remained in the Roman army for two years after his conversion. But when he was called upon to participate in battle, he resigned from the service, saying "I am a soldier of Christ. I cannot fight."

5.3. The extraordinary power of non-violence

The words "Non-violence" and "Pacifism" are misleading. They give the impression of sitting back, folding one's hands and opting out of the conflict so that someone else has to pay the price.

In fact peacemakers are called to an active engagement with injustice, a costly involvement in the struggle for true liberation. They simply will not kill while they are involved in that struggle.

Like Jesus, peacemakers are called to forget self, take up their cross every day and follow those bleeding feet on the innocent way to death (Luke 9:24). This takes even more courage than is needed by those who are involved in killing, because peacemakers cannot draw comfort from the cold steel of their weapons. And they must still face the naked weapons of those who call themselves "enemies".

The extraordinary power of non-violent action lies in the way it can transform people. Gandhi called

it a programme, not for seizing power, but for transforming relationships so that there would be a peaceful transfer of power. Non-violent resisters say "God changed me by His patience and by the way He confronted my sin. How can I now let Him use me to change this person who calls himself my enemy?" Non-violent action assumes that human nature can be changed.

Non-violent resisters also know that they have to root out their own self-righteousness, pride and violence. They believe that "It is not out there, but in me, that the oppressor must die". They do not then sit in judgement over those who resort to violence. Rather they generate their own creative alternative or complementary programmes.

Perhaps the best modern example of the extraordinary power of non-violent action comes from the Philippines. The Marcos regime was as brutal as any modern regime. After Ninoy Aquino was assassinated on August 21, 1983, Church, labour, peasant and student groups mounted campaigns for justice. Forty seminars on non-violent resistance were held in thirty provinces. Cory Aquino insisted throughout that the struggle was to be non-violent. Over half a million unarmed poll watchers risked their lives to monitor the 1986 elections. In February 1986, after Marcos had declared the elections null and void and a civil war seemed imminent, a call went out from Radio Veritas, the Catholic station calling people to place their unarmed bodies between the troops and the defectors. Upwards of two million people poured into the streets of Manila. After only four days of continuous, disciplined, unarmed intervention, the Marcos government surrendered.

5.4. The ineffectiveness of violence

5.4.1 The problem with violence is that it achieves no change in the long run. Close to two-thirds of all

governments that assume power by means of violent revolution are ousted by the same means. The same applies to pro-government violence. Torture, assassination, detention and armed suppression of some part of a country's population are never effective in extinguishing a passion for justice. Indeed, this only hardens the opposition and drives it into counter-violence. The deepest danger about violence is that we are likely to become what we fight in the very act of fighting it.

5.4.2. The problem with violence is that it cannot redeem people. Certainly the ones who are killed cannot repent. And those who survive have a legacy of guilt, horror and vengeance to cope with. It is doubly difficult then for the survivors to forgive and to practice peacemaking. There is an unbreakable link between violence and hatred.

5.4.3. But the biggest problem with violence is the testimony it makes about the nature of God. It must say either that God is unable to intervene in history or that He is using this violence as His means of intervention in history - and therefore that He is vengeful and destructive rather than loving and creative.

Violence testifies that God cannot or will not protect us. It testifies that our weapons are more powerful and more reliable than God.

A derisive verse exemplifies this "testimony"

"The Lord is my Shepherd",
So says the Psalm,
But just in case not,
I'll get a bomb.

5.4.4. Further, those who espouse violence make a testimony about the nature of the Church. Either the

Church is the continuation of Christ (the body of Christ) - in which case they must revive the long-discredited arguments that Jesus died as a violent revolutionary - or the Church is living in such a different context that its practical ministry must differ from the impossible ideal of Jesus' life - in which case the Church is not literally the continuation of Christ. A Church which offers a "just war theory" must acknowledge that it is offering a response to violence which is not in continuity with the overwhelming witness of the New Testament and the early Church.

5.5. Some brief responses to arguments against becoming a Peace Church, in 4.1. - 4.5. above.

5.5.1. In the last 1600 years, no sociologically identifiable group of people has slaughtered more people in war than that group that can be identified as Christian. If violence was effective in protecting or sustaining Christianity, the world Church would be in fine shape today. Weapons cannot defend the Gospel against Communism or any other "-ism". The fundamental error in 4.1. is the assumption that the kingdom of man in South Africa is in some way a carrier of the kingdom of God.

5.5.2. Everyone must acknowledge the agony of conscience with which many went to fight against Nazism, and their amazing courage and the sacrifices which they made. But we must also acknowledge that that war was unnecessary and could have been prevented by determined pressure against Hitler in the 1930's instead of the policy of appeasement. War marks the abject failure of diplomacy. And many who fought in that war now look back and say "what was it all for?" because half of Europe is under tyranny not very different from Hitler's, because Japan and West Germany are now industrial giants and leaders in the world's economy, and because tyranny and oppression are just as strong now as they ever were.

5.5.3. The liberation movements have now tried the way of violence for 25 years. The gains of this violence have been minimal and the costs have been enormous. Someone must do a cost - effectiveness survey on these 25 years of violence. This will count the money spent on arms, camps and supply routes instead of on human development. It will measure the loss of democracy necessitated by the secrecy and autocracy of a military struggle. It will count the loss of support from the international community who begin to see the liberation movements simply as "terrorist movements". And it will measure the propaganda benefit given to the South African State and the dwindling opposition to the militarisation of the State and to the power of the National Security Management System.

The crux of the argument in 4.3. is that there are two kinds of violence - one that liberates and one that enslaves.

The problems with this theory are twofold:

Firstly, it subordinates the human bodies at the receiving end of any violence: it forgets that violence means human beings screaming in pain and fear. To the victims there is only one species of violence.

Secondly the theory of two kinds of violence never tells us how to make the practical calculations about how to measure which kind of violence is good, better or best; nor the precise measurements of how much of the best kind of violence to deal out. The theory certainly tells us that liberating violence comes from the oppressed, comes from the majority, will produce a good result and is for the genuine good of people. This is easy to support ideally and philosophically. But the pragmatics are not so clear. At which point of oppression is violence justified? Can this be quantified into a general theory, or must it be a subjective judgement? Can a

minority who feel they are oppressed justly use liberating violence (e.g. Renamo)? Who will see the "good results"? Justified violence presupposes coercive institutions. These cannot by definition be for the "genuine good" of people. The theory tells us that liberating violence is to combat an evil doer - but how does one calculate how much evil I should inflict or how much of it will be justified by the evil he has done? The unhappy fact is that violence operates only for the good of its users. All violence is of a piece. All violence breaks relationships. All violence generates more violence.

The theory of two kinds of violence ultimately fails at the same place that classic just war theories fail: they don't stop people killing each other.

5.5.4.

It is true that the words "non-violence" and "reconciliation" have been misused both by those who run violent institutions and by those who wish to avoid confronting evil and injustice. It is right that reconciliation must go hand-in-hand with liberation. As Section 3 above states, the purpose of the Peace Church process is to transform the Methodist Church into an active agent of reconciliation and liberation. We should surely all agree that there must indeed be restitution and social justice - and then go on to debate about the best means to achieve that. The Peace Church argument, as laid out in 5.3. and 5.4. above, is that lasting peace and justice are best achieved by non-violent methods.

As far as strategies are concerned, it is worth noting that the theory and techniques of non-violent action have been well-described in an extensive literature (e.g. Adam Roberts, Civilian Resistance as a National Defence,

Penguin 1969, or Gene Sharp, "The Political Equivalent of War" - Civilian Defense, International Conciliation, Nov 1965).

In fact the most effective strategies in the present struggle for liberation in South Africa have been non-violent. Effective action has flowed from the power of labour organisations, through rent and bus boycotts, through strikes, slow-downs and stay-aways, through school boycotts, funeral demonstrations and through non-collaboration with Government agencies, agents and edicts. Those who support the Peace Church resolution must indeed support and participate in this kind of non-violent action and devise other non-violent actions which will effectively bring change in our society.

This is the very essence and purpose of the resolution to become a "Peace Church".

5.5.5. We Methodists have long ago expressed our convictions in answer to the argument of 4.5. "It is our belief that the lordship of Christ extends to all of life, including the political, social and economic areas of our existence ... we dare not neglect our responsibility in proclaiming the political, together with the other implications of the Gospel in society today". (Ref. 1986 Minutes Page 81, para 18.34 "POLITICS AND RELIGION").

-----oOo-----

SECTION 6: The Present stance of the Methodist Church on participation in war.

6.1. The Methodist Church of Southern Africa has not made a definitive statement on "the Just War". That is to say, the Methodist Church has not committed itself to the theory that all Christians ought to take part in war (or revolution) provided certain conditions are met.

6.2. The Methodist Church of Southern Africa has protested against the present system of conscription and upheld the right of all people to object in conscience to military service (1986 Minutes Page 332, para 29.9.20)

6.3. Methodists have traditionally relied on the power of "an informed conscience" in making ethical decisions - and particularly decisions about whether to participate in war. The Conference resolution on Conscientious Objection is a particularly good example of the Methodist motto "think and let think": "Conference recognises that Christian opinion has always been divided (on this issue) ... the conscientious objector has a legitimate place within the Christian tradition ..." (1986 Minutes, page 333, para 29.9.22.).

6.4. The present stance of the Methodist Church on participation in war could therefore be described as "desiring justice but not requiring its members to fight (on either side) or to refrain from fighting".

6.5. The net effect of this stance is that most of our members take it for granted that it is right for Christians to fight. Virtually all our white male members accept their call-up without question, and many black Methodists appear to be giving approval to a "just revolution" in South Africa today.

6.6. Declaring ourselves a Peace Church would not alter our basic stance of "think and let think" because the choice not to fight would not be a condition of membership in the Church. But the practical effect would be to inform the consciences of our members on this issue much more explicitly than we have done in the past, to put the weight of our teaching against participation in war, and to commit ourselves to initiative and action in bringing about rapid and peaceful change in South Africa.

-----oOo-----

SECTION 7: ACTION FOR QUARTERLY MEETINGS TO TAKE.

7.1. Circuit Quarterly Meetings are asked to take this Peace Church proposal very seriously indeed. As explained in the Introduction, three steps are envisioned:

7.2. At the November 1987 QM: Copies of the Bible Study notes are handed out. All Classes and groups are to study it.

7.3. At the January 1988 QM: Copies of this Study Booklet are handed out with a brief explanation. Classes and groups are to study it and report back to Society Leaders' Meetings or Council Meetings.

7.4. At the April 1988 QM: The QM is asked to make a resolution to its 1988 Synod on the Peace Church issue. The following standard wording may be helpful:

The April 1988 Quarterly Meeting of the
Circuit responds to the "Peace Church" resolution of
Conference as follows:

For becoming a Peace Church

Against becoming a Peace Church

Neutral

The Circuit Quarterly Meeting therefore
accepts/rejects the resolution.

7.5. It may be that a Quarterly Meeting chooses to modify or amend the Conference resolution in some way. They are, of course, free to do that.

7.6. Please encourage your local members to participate in this crucial debate. Conference will make its decision according to the resolutions it receives. Silence is usually taken to mean consent!

-----oOo-----

SECTION 8: APPENDICES : HELPFUL INFORMATION8.1. THE SOUTH AFRICAN DEFENCE AMENDMENT ACT OF 1983.

It does seem important to make sure that all our members know that every white South African man under 55 years has to serve in the South African Defence Force. The Defence Act No. 44 of 1957 left them with no choice in this matter. It is important that this is understood in our Church so that white Methodist men are not universally regarded as desiring or choosing to fight. They are compelled to fight.

Young white men must all do 2 years of army service after school or University. Then they must do 2 months of service every year for 12 years. Then they must do 12 days a year every year until they are 55 years old. Every white South African man is liable to be called up. Exemption is granted only to the medically unfit and a few categories of men such as members of Parliament.

The Defence Act Amendment of 1983, however, has now allowed a measure of choice to some men. This Act allows "universal religious objectors" to do alternative service, or else unarmed service in the SADF. This alternative is not open to men who believe in the "just war" theory i.e. who say that they do not want to fight in this war. Such selective conscientious objectors must either fight, go to prison for up to 7 years, or go into exile. The same is true for any objector who cannot prove that his convictions arise from religious grounds, for example, an atheist who has a moral objection to fighting.

Only those men who refuse to fight in any army at any time, because of religious convictions will be classified under this act. If they apply to do alternative service, they will have to work full-time for the Department of Manpower for a period of up to 7 years. The current rate of pay without perks, for a "non-professional" person doing such work is about R350 per month.

8.2. THE "JUST WAR" THEORY.

Perhaps it would be helpful in the Peace Church debate for our people to have access to the developed just War theory. The early theory was proposed by Augustine of Hippo in about 430 AD after Christianity had become the "official religion" of the Roman Empire. This doctrine states that while it is the norm for Christians to seek peaceful change, i.e. not to engage in armed conflict, they may do so if and only if certain stringent conditions are met.

In the developed Just War theory, these conditions may be summarised as:

1. The War must have just cause, i.e. defence, or to right a wrong.
2. Those who wage it must have a good intention, i.e. not revenge or hatred.
3. War must be declared by the legitimate authority in a land, not by a rebel. (The latest theory would argue that "legitimate" means "based on the consent of the majority").
4. It must be the last resort.
5. There must be a reasonable prospect of victory. Lives must not be lost to no purpose.
6. The suffering caused by war must not be disproportionate to what the war aims to achieve.
7. The War must be waged by just means, without vindictiveness or cruelty.
8. Innocent non-combatants must not be harmed.
9. The peace that would ensue must be just.

8.3. ANGLICAN "REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE JUST WAR"

It is worth noting that the Church of the Province (Anglican) has recently published their Report of the Commission on the "Just War" (1985, Plaka publ. Cape Town). This gives a concise exposition of the just war theory and seeks to apply it to the conflict in Namibia and South Africa.

The following brief quotes from the conclusion of that document's chapter on "Application of The Just War theory to Namibia and South Africa " might help our debate:

1. In all human conflict there are degrees of culpability. In the spiral of violence and counter violence in South Africa and Namibia, there can be no doubt that the primary culpability lies with that policy which has made racial identity its cornerstone, with all its attendant evils.
2. In regard to Namibia, whatever disagreement there may be in attempting to apply Just War criteria, it is clear that a stage has been reached in that conflict where the implementation of Resolution 435 of the United Nations is urgently required, and delay in that implementation can only be described as unjust.
3. In regard to South Africa, whatever disagreement there may be in applying Just War criteria, there remains an over-arching need for concerted effort on all sides towards reducing tension and conflict with a view to finding an agreed, peaceful future for our country. A mobilisation for peace is the only truly Christian answer to the present mobilisation for war. Without such a mobilisation the South African situation has all the making of tragedy. (pp 26-27)

So this document from our sister Church, struggling with the same issue as we are, reminds us that whatever we do we must immediately "mobilise for peace".

8.4. CATHOLIC "REPORT ON POLICE CONDUCT DURING TOWNSHIP PROTESTS"

One of the most sensitive and dangerous areas in South Africa today concerns the presence and conduct of police and army units in the townships. For some white men it has been a reason for refusing to serve in an army which they consider to be making war on our own people. For many black people (and especially young people) these actions have been the final proof that non-violence will not work in South Africa and that armed revolt is the only way to bring change.

The Report on Police Conduct during Township Protests, was published by the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference early in 1985 after police and army actions in Sebokeng and other townships late in 1984. The report contains numerous sworn affidavits from victims of these actions, reports from doctors and photographers.

It is an inexpensive, accessible and timely aid for education our people and helping them contribute more meaningfully to the Peace Church debate.

-----oOo-----