

# Peace and War

Christian Reflection

A SERIES IN FAITH AND ETHICS

BAYLOR  
UNIVERSITY

---

**GENERAL EDITOR** Robert B. Kruschwitz  
**ART EDITOR** Heidi J. Hornik  
**REVIEW EDITOR** Norman Wirzba

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANT** Julie Bolin  
**DESIGNER** Eric Yarbrough

**PUBLISHER** The Center for Christian Ethics  
Baylor University  
One Bear Place #97361  
Waco, TX 76798-7361

**PHONE** (254) 710-3774  
**TOLL-FREE (USA)** (866) 298-2325  
**WEBSITE** [www.ChristianEthics.ws](http://www.ChristianEthics.ws)  
**E-MAIL** [Christian\\_Reflection@baylor.edu](mailto:Christian_Reflection@baylor.edu)

All Scripture is used by permission, all rights reserved, and unless otherwise indicated is from *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, copyright 1989, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

---

ISSN 1535-8585

*Christian Reflection* is the ideal resource for discipleship training in the church. Multiple copies are obtainable for group study at \$2.50 per copy. Worship aids and lesson materials that enrich personal or group study are available free on the website.

*Christian Reflection* is published quarterly by The Center for Christian Ethics at Baylor University. Contributors express their considered opinions in a responsible manner. The views expressed are not official views of The Center for Christian Ethics or of Baylor University.

The Center expresses its thanks to individuals, churches, and organizations, including the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, who provided financial support for this publication.

© 2004 The Center for Christian Ethics at Baylor University  
All rights reserved

# Contents

Introduction	8
Robert B. Kruschwitz	
War in the Old Testament	11
John A. Wood	
The War of the Lamb	18
Harry O. Maier	
Terrorist Enemies and Just War	27
William T. Cavanaugh	
Just Peacemaking in an Age of Terrorism	36
Glen H. Stassen	
Reconciliation in Christian Art	44
Heidi J. Hornik	
<i>Mercy and Truth Have Met Together</i>	
William Blake	
<i>Peaceable Kingdom</i>	
Edward Hicks	
Worship Service	48
David M. Bridges	
Let Us Sing a Song of Peace	58
Terry W. York and C. David Bolin	
The Armor of God	60
Bob Fox	
Making Peace with Our Enemies	64
George A. Mason	
Moral Equality among Soldiers	69
Scott A. Sterling	
Restorative Justice	74
Lorraine Stutzman Amstutz	

*continued*

---

Peace and the Divine Warrior	83
Scott W. Bullard	
Pacifism and Just War: Beyond the Stereotypes	88
Erin Dufault-Hunter	
Editors	94
Contributors	95
Advertisement	96

# Christian Reflection

Thoughtful Christian reflection  
and reliable guidance  
in engaging the ethical dimensions  
of today's world.

FORGIVENESS

MORAL LANDSCAPE OF CREATION

HEAVEN AND HELL

SABBATH

THE PORNOGRAPHIC CULTURE

PROPHETIC ETHICS

AGING

CHILDREN

CONSUMERISM

VOCATION

INKLINGS OF GLORY

PEACE AND WAR

FOOD AND HUNGER

SUFFERING

CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

CLONING

MYSTICISM

Order your free subscription today.

*Christian Reflection* is an ideal resource for discipleship training in the church. Multiple copies are available for group study at \$2.50 per copy. Study guides and lesson plans are available free on the website.

[www.ChristianEthics.ws](http://www.ChristianEthics.ws)


phone (toll-free): 1-866-298-2325

# Christian Reflection

## STUDY GUIDES & LESSON PLANS



Excellent companion pieces  
to each issue of *Christian Reflection*  
integrate prayer, Bible study, worship, music,  
and ethical reflection for personal or group study.

Free  ONLINE [www.christianethics.ws](http://www.christianethics.ws). Click on "Free Study Guides."



[www.ChristianEthics.ws](http://www.ChristianEthics.ws)

## STUDY GUIDES & LESSON PLANS

These six study guides integrate Bible study, prayer,

worship, and

reflection on themes in the *Peace and War* issue.



### WAR IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Can God be both a God of peace and a God of war? The ancient Israelites reached no consensus about holy war, just war, and pacifism. Yet Scripture faithfully records their long and difficult debates, for they arose out of a deep faith in God who had brought the people out of the land of Egypt.

### THE WAR OF THE LAMB

The book of Revelation cross-examines the claims of divine blessing upon the civil order, especially when it is violent and economically exploitative. The War of the Lamb is a call to arms, to wage war with what at first glance seems to be no weapons at all—the words of faithful testimony.

### TERRORIST ENEMIES AND JUST WAR

How do we respond to terrorists who don't even pretend to play by the rules? The just war tradition, if we take it seriously, calls for a response to terrorism that is radically at odds with approaches being pursued in the "war on terrorism."

### JUST PEACEMAKING

We need a positive theology of peace that spells out the proactive practices for individuals and nations that work to prevent war. The ten practices of the new ethic of just peacemaking tell us what actions will dry up the sources for terrorist anger and recruitment.

### PEACE WITH OUR ENEMIES

Peace is thrown into doubt every time we are confronted with the choice of dealing with our enemies as righteous warriors or pitiful peacemakers. In our fantasies we imagine our struggle against evil is about running to the front lines and charging into the fray. It's not. We are called to wear God's defensive armor and wield just one weapon—"the Word of God."

### RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Restorative justice, by dealing with crime and harm in a holistic way, promises to sew together the pieces of torn lives into a fabric of justice that is meaningful for victims, offenders, and the community. How can we implement restorative practices to transform our criminal justice system?

# Introduction

BY ROBERT B. KRUSCHWITZ

**How should we negotiate our dual identities, as followers of Christ and citizens of a democratic state, when the state goes to war? In exploring this question, our contributors engage Scripture's alarming images of war, the teachings of Christ, and the long and difficult debates on peace and war in Christian history.**

---

**I**n warfare, we confront the most destructive power of human imagination, whether the war is fought for self-preservation, righteous solidarity with the oppressed, greedy acquisition, or the passion for supremacy. "War is a stern teacher," Thucydides warned the ancient Athenians, even if it's teaching justice and courage rather than avarice or vengeance.

Is war ever a faithful option for the Christian community? "But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile," God enjoins the exiles, even about their arch enemy Babylon, "and pray to the LORD on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare" (Jeremiah 29:7).

Christians disagree. The Schleithem Confession (1527) rules out Christians' participation in war, for "the sword is ordained of God outside the perfection of Christ," but the second London Baptist Confession of Faith (1689) declares the opposite, that Christians may serve in the government where "they ought especially to maintain justice and peace, ... [and] for that end they may lawfully now, under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions."

"The ancient Israelites reached no consensus about holy war, just war, and pacifism," John Wood notes in *War in the Old Testament* (p. 11). This diversity of viewpoints expressed in Scripture continues to fuel intense debates about war among Christians. "The pacifist and just-war positions are



more biblically and theologically responsible approaches," he concludes, for "they share a presumption against violence and place severe limits on the use of violence to resolve conflict."

Harry Maier's *The War of the Lamb* (p. 18) urges us not to ignore the book of Revelation, though it is brimming with alarming visions of war, for it can shake us from our comfortable culturally-accommodating sleep of civil religion. "The metaphor of a war waged and won by a slain lamb is one of the most paradoxical and jarring images in the Bible," Maier writes. "It transforms holy war in a way that finally renounces violence as the means by which God's purposes are achieved." Bob Fox gives a similar reading to another militaristic image, the call to resist evil in Ephesians. "In our fantasies we imagine our struggle against evil is about running to the front lines and charging into the fray," he notes in *The Armor of God* (p. 60). "It's not. We are called to wear God's defensive armor and wield just one weapon—the Word of God."

Warfare has taken a morally perplexing turn in the twenty-first century. We find ourselves fighting international terrorism, and terrorists don't fight fair. Can just-war thinking apply to terrorists who don't intend to play by its rules, William Cavanaugh asks in *Terrorist Enemies and Just War* (p. 27). "The just war tradition, if we take it seriously," he suggests, "calls for a response to terrorism that is radically at odds with the approaches being pursued in the 'war on terrorism.'"

Among the greatest evils of war is the spiritual destruction it wreaks on warriors, regardless of the merits of their fight, when it tempts them to dehumanize and shamefully abuse their enemies. Every soldier assents to the moral equality among soldiers "in a classroom discussion, conversation with a chaplain, or interview by CNN," Chaplain (Major) Scott Sterling notes in *Moral Equality among Soldiers* (p. 69). The challenge is for American service men and women to remain just warriors in combat, even when the enemy has absolutely no intention of following suit.

"Efforts to restrain war by teaching just war theory and pacifism are needed, but they are not adequate," says Glen Stassen. "We need a positive theology of peace that spells out the proactive practices for individuals and nations that work to prevent war." The ten practices he describes in *Just Peacemaking in an Age of Terrorism* (p. 36) point us toward actions that will dry up the sources for terrorist anger and recruitment.

True reconciliation among nations, communities, or persons is a delicate balance of peace with justice, and mercy with truth. Heidi Hornik's *A Gentle Embrace* (p. 44) shows that in William Blake's *Mercy and Truth are met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other* this balance is God's gift through the cross. That congregations often need God's reconciling balance is a subtle theme in Edward Hicks' well-known *Peaceable Kingdom*, as Hornik explains in *Kingdom Come* (p. 46).

In Terry York's new hymn, *Let Us Sing a Song of Peace* (p. 58), we welcome Jesus' call to peacemaking as we sing "Let us praise the Prince of Peace with actions He would claim, forsaking modern-day crusades that break commandments in His name." The service of corporate worship by David Bridges (p. 48) gives rich voice to our hope for peace, even as it leads us to confess the reality of violence in our lives. It concludes in hopeful confidence, as does Scripture, with John's prophetic view toward "the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven."

"Peace is thrown into doubt every time we are confronted with the choice of dealing with our enemies as righteous warriors or pitiful peacemakers," observes George Mason in *Making Peace with Our Enemies* (p. 64). Having pity, he suggests, is an expression of humility. It means we respond to violence only after we "try to identify with our enemy and imagine what it might be like to live in that person's skin."

Closer to home is the violence of crime within our society, where prison experience has become "normal" and over two million citizens are incarcerated. Lorraine Amstutz, in *Restorative Justice* (p. 74), explores how we can discover and implement restorative practices that will transform our criminal justice system. "Restorative justice helps us think about harm in a holistic way," she writes, and so it addresses the needs of victims, offenders, and our community.

Walter Brueggemann's *Peace*, which explores God's vision of well-being for all of creation, and Tremper Longman III and Daniel Reid's *God is a Warrior*, which traces the divine warrior motif that permeates Scripture, should be read together. That is Scott Bullard's suggestion in *Peace and the Divine Warrior* (p. 83). "Brueggemann tempts us to ask, 'How can we reconcile the emphasis on shalom with God's apparent endorsement of war in the Old Testament?'" he says, and reading "*God is a Warrior* we will inevitably struggle to relate the divine warrior motif to the teaching of Jesus, who proclaimed 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'" In asking these questions, we will see the need to study the entire Bible honestly and prayerfully.

In her review essay, *Pacifism and Just War: Beyond the Stereotypes* (p. 88), Erin Dufault-Hunter broaches the hub of this issue of *Christian Reflection*: "How do we negotiate our dual identities, as followers of Christ and citizens of a democratic state, when the state goes to war?" She recommends Lisa Sowle Cahill's *Love Your Enemies: Discipleship, Pacifism, and Just War Theory* for its review of the history of Christian thinking about war and peace, while Terry Nardin's edited collection, *The Ethics of War and Peace: Secular and Religious Perspectives*, helpfully examines the topic from various Christian, Jewish, and Islamic points of view. Dufault-Hunter writes, "Both challenge us to reflect deeply on our discipleship in a pluralistic and war-torn world." ☩

# War in the Old Testament

BY JOHN A. WOOD

How can Israel be a “light to the nations” while taking up arms against them? How can God be both a God of peace and a God of war? The ancient Israelites reached no consensus about holy war, just war, and pacifism. Yet Scripture faithfully records their long and difficult debates, for the diversity of viewpoints arose out of a deep faith in God who had brought the people out of Egypt.

---

**H**istorian Ronald Wells, writing in 1991 about the wars of America, just as easily could be writing about the wars of the Old Testament when he notes:

While the history of war is not the history of humankind, humankind’s history cannot be studied fully without reference to war. Moreover, the way in which a nation wages war reveals a great deal about its basic values. Thus, the illuminating qualities of war should be of greater interest to the historian of society than the actual stuff of warfare, such as armaments, battles, and tactics. *To examine a nation’s experience of war, and its response to it, is to learn something fundamental about a nation’s values and its social order* (emphasis added).<sup>1</sup>

Though the history of war is not the history of the Old Testament, we cannot understand the Old Testament without reference to war. It may be too much to claim that one can find war and conflict on every page of the Hebrew Bible, but not by much. War was almost a daily part of ancient Israelite life, primarily because of that nation’s size and location. Here was a nation no larger than the state of Vermont located in the strategic Syria-Palestinian corridor—and all the surrounding nations coveted it. Egypt in

the south and various Mesopotamian empires in the north-northeast saw that territory as a buffer zone to protect themselves from encroaching armies bent on conquest and pillage. The Old Testament scholar Norman Gottwald observes the Israelites' preoccupation with war "imparts a vigor to the biblical records but also often casts about them an aura of somber realism and a sense of the fragility of human life."<sup>2</sup>

---

**Pessimism and hope existed side-by-side. Isaiah and Micah's breathtaking visions of peace are even more startling in the light of the constant threat of warfare that hung like a dark shadow over the land. War-weary Israelites longed for peace, but instituted policies that made war inevitable.**

---

It is difficult for Americans to fathom what it must have been like for citizens of this tiny country to live with the prospect of large, invading armies camped out on their doorstep on a regular, unrelenting basis. Consider that Bethel, an important city to ancient Israel, was destroyed four times in the two-hundred-year period from the time of the Judges to the establishment of the Davidic monarchy. For comparison,

consider the city of Philadelphia being destroyed four times since the Declaration of Independence. America's "dean of biblical archaeology," W. F. Albright, noted over half a century ago that under these conditions "one can hardly be surprised...[that] Israel became martially minded."<sup>3</sup>

We also discover a great deal about ancient Israel's values by analyzing how the Israelites conducted battles and how they reacted to warfare. Although many similarities existed between Israel and her neighbors with regard to warfare, there were stunning differences that point to very distinct values. For example, the Israelites did not glorify warfare as did their neighbors, refusing to engage in hero worship or erect great monuments commemorating battles, which are seen most clearly in the brutal Assyrian Empire. Contrast the more restrained narratives of the Old Testament to the gory and blood-curdling history of war in Assyrian records. Assyrian King Ashurnasirpal boasted that he draped the skin of enemy corpses over the walls of their cities, and "with their blood I dyed the mountain red like red wool...I cut off their heads...I burnt their adolescent boys and girls." The annals of Assyrian king and warrior Sennacherib chronicle in grisly detail how he surpassed his predecessors in cruelty. "I cut [the enemy warriors'] throats like lambs," he bragged. "My prancing steeds harnessed for my riding, plunged into the streams of their blood as into a river.... With the bodies of their warriors I filled the plain like grass. Their testicles I cut

off, and tore out their privates like the seeds of cucumbers."<sup>4</sup> Miles of the excavated bas-reliefs in the sumptuous palaces of Assyrian kings demonstrate such brutal torture techniques as ripping the tongues out of enemy warriors, cutting off their hands and feet, decapitating them, and staking their heads like human totem poles to use for target practice. Clearly Israel's war methods, however brutal they may seem to us, were relatively mild in comparison to other ancient cultures. Indeed, Israelite kings were reputed for being merciful in victory (1 Kings 20:31). Furthermore, ancient Israel's wars were generally defensive in nature, for as noted earlier, the nation was almost constantly under attack. Israel's God, Yahweh, is never viewed as merely a tribal, victory God of Israel. Yahweh is the God of *all* nations, demanding righteousness and justice for all, and punishing Israel as well as other nations for any evil and injustice. Finally, an element of humility was injected into Israel's understanding of war. Israel's securing of the Promised Land, and the blessings that followed, were gifts of God's grace and not the result of the nation's military prowess. Nowhere did Israel claim that she deserved the land, and passages like Deuteronomy 8:11-18 are powerful reminders for the people to be thankful to God.

Though war was a constant and brutal fact of daily life, it is striking how many times the biblical prophets condemn Israel's militarism and how much they long for peace. The prophet Hosea scolds the Northern Kingdom (Israel) for having "trusted in your power and in the multitude of your warriors" (Hosea 10:13), and faults the Southern Kingdom (Judah) for building "multiplied fortified cities" (8:14), indicating that the foreign policy of both kingdoms had become thoroughly militarized. A "mystique of violence" permeated Israelite society in the eighth century, and the prophets cried out against it.

Pessimism and hope, then as now, existed side-by-side. The prophet Amos concludes that sin and evil are so rampant in Israel that destruction, not peace, must be the inevitable outcome (Amos 2:13-16; 4:2; 5:18-20; 7:17). Meanwhile Isaiah and Micah doggedly maintain their hope of lasting peace. Their breathtaking visions of peace (Isaiah 2:2-4; 9:5; 11:1-9; and Micah 4:1-7) are even more startling in the light of the constant threat of warfare that hung like a dark shadow over the land. War-weary Israelites longed for peace, but instituted policies and developed a mindset that made war inevitable.

### **A COMPLEXITY OF TRADITIONS**

The Old Testament does not speak with one voice regarding warfare. We might hope that the constant threat and experience of war would have forged a consensus among the ancient Israelites about this fundamental reality of their existence, but this consensus was not to be. What happened instead, by all evidence, were vigorous debates about war during virtually all periods of Israel's history. Scripture faithfully records these debates, for

the diversity of viewpoints arose out of a deep faith in God who had brought the people out of the land of Egypt.

Events on the international scene certainly played a part in the debate about war as well as the efforts to grapple with what it meant to be God's chosen people in the midst of a hostile environment. How can Israel be a "light to the nations" while taking up arms against them? How can God be both a God of peace and a God of war? This conversation was a long and difficult one among the people of faith. The Hebrew Scriptures record elements of the classical positions of holy war, pacifism, and just war; and these three understandings of war, of course, have persisted in the biblical religious traditions for centuries.

### **HOLY WAR**

The concept of holy war was widespread in the ancient Near East during the biblical period. After examining the historical records from areas surrounding Israel, Gwilym Jones concludes that all the nations believed that their affairs were controlled by the gods, and they attributed military successes to the work of their gods.<sup>5</sup>

One important strand in Israel's tradition of holy war was the belief that God fought *with* the nation. Patrick Miller describes this as a belief in "synergism," that victory was the result of a fusion of divine and human activity.<sup>6</sup> The great military strategist Joshua is the classic example of the noble warrior in Israel: while the biblical texts insist that victory was ultimately from God, his careful military preparation and brilliant strategy were essential. Numerous warriors in the book of Judges—Deborah, Gideon, Samson, and so on—as well as the incomparable King David later on, fit this mold.

However, this synergistic understanding of holy war is not the only one present in Scripture. Beginning with the Exodus event, there is a firm belief that God fights not with or through Israel, but *for* Israel. "The Lord will fight for you," Moses tells the people, "and you have only to keep still" (Exodus 14:14). Israel's role was "limited" to worship and singing. The power of this story was not lost on the early Christians who struggled with the issue of participating in warfare. The third-century Christian theologian Origen responded to the Roman philosopher Celsus's charge that Christians were aloof and irresponsible in refusing to join the Roman army. Origen insisted that Christians through prayer and faith can "overthrow far more enemies who pursue them than those whom the prayer of Moses—when he cried to God—and of those with him overthrew."<sup>7</sup> The book of Isaiah especially seems to embody this approach toward war. Isaiah, who prophesied during numerous military crises in the eighth century, constantly exhorts the nation to trust in God alone to meet these military emergencies (see Isaiah 19:1-3; 30:15-18; 31:1-5). God alone has the right to destroy and kill, Isaiah claims; Israel trusts and obeys.



## PACIFISM

Many passages express the classic pacifist view that God will bring about peace without violence. The roots of Old Testament pacifism are found as early as the patriarchal period. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob coexisted peacefully with the inhabitants of Canaan, refusing to fight over territory and water rights, and offering alternative solutions for problems that war would not solve (for example, Genesis 21:25-34; 26:17-33; 36:6-9). Even the Exodus story contains elements of traditional pacifism, placing the Egyptians in a good light when some of them donate items to the Israelites and even accompany them out of Egypt (Exodus 12:35-36, 38). All the hostility is directed toward Pharaoh, who embodies the evil of rejecting God.

Later stories stun us with their radical inclusiveness and demonstrate that there is a better way to deal with conflict than resorting to violence. For example, the prophet Elisha cures the enemy Syrian general Naaman of his leprosy (2 Kings 5:1-14) and later insists that a captured army of Aramaeans be fed and released (2 Kings 6:8-23). The remarkable conclusion to the latter story reads: "And the Aramaeans no longer came raiding into the land of Israel." In similar fashion, the obscure prophet Oded challenges the standard treatment of captives by having them clothed, fed, and returned to their homeland (2 Chronicles 28:9-15). These prophets believed the horrible domestic consequences of warfare not only *must* be but *could* be averted by bold non-violent initiatives. The famous Isaiah and Micah passages cited earlier attest to a persistent belief that genuine reconciliation and peace are possible. Knowing what we know about Israel's often-violent history, it is remarkable that this pacifist tradition survived. These patriarchs and prophets pointed to a more excellent way of dealing with conflict than the well-worn pattern of violence and vengeance.

## JUST WAR

The "just war" perspective, developed within the Christian tradition by medieval theologians such as Augustine, Suarez, and Aquinas, has roots in the Old Testament. In a few

passages war is justified not on the basis of a perceived direct command from God or a unique Israelite theological principle, but on the basis of humankind's universal sense of justice. Jephthah's speech in Judges 11:14-27 has a courtroom ring to it, when he asks God to judge the merits of the land dispute with the Ammonites not on the basis that Israel can claim to

---

**Knowing what we know about Israel's often-violent history, it is remarkable that its pacifist tradition survived. Some patriarchs and prophets pointed to a more excellent way of dealing with conflict than the well-worn pattern of violence and vengeance.**

---

be God's chosen people, but on the reciprocal rights and obligations of the disputants.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, King Jehoshaphat argues against a military coalition attacking him as if they were in "the courtroom of Yahweh"; he details that Judah has clear title to the disputed land, has possessed it peacefully, and mercifully had not destroyed these nations when Judah had power to do so (2 Chronicles 20:5-12). Jehoshaphat appears to argue that Judah earlier had waged war with a view to establishing an enduring and equitable peace, a theme found in traditional just-war theory. Later, the prophet Amos condemns the surrounding nations for violating commonly accepted norms of justice (Amos 1-2). In these settings, God is not perceived as a might-makes-right sovereign. Such just-war scenarios occur often enough in the Bible to show that this tradition co-existed in ancient Israel alongside other understandings of war. Their experience of being under almost constant threat from neighboring peoples understandably pushed the Israelites toward more militant and emotional views of warfare. Yet at times they moved beyond a visceral response to a calmer, more reasoned one.

#### **FROM THEN TO NOW**

Having seen the diversity within the inspired texts, we can more easily understand the intense debates about war during the two thousand years of Christian history. Facing a hostile Roman Empire during the first two hundred years after Christ, most Christians were pacifistic. After Emperor Constantine's conversion to the faith in the fourth century, when Christianity became a dominant religion in the Empire, a holy-war mentality grew stronger. This reached a peak during the eleventh through thirteenth centuries with the Crusades to regain territory controlled by Muslims. The just-war tradition, which continued to develop from the Middle Ages to the present, probably is the dominant position among Christians today. Yet all three views have persisted throughout Christian history precisely because each is rooted in the biblical texts.

As we have seen, Israel believed that God had put severe restraints on its use of state violence and therefore depicted war in a far less gory way than other ancient societies. Nevertheless, some Christians struggle to move beyond the holy-war mentality in the Old Testament. We judge that many other ancient Israelite practices—including polygamy in the family, patriarchal treatment of women in society, monarchy in government, and dietary laws in religion—are not normative, for we insist that Jesus Christ is the standard by which all Scripture is interpreted and applied. By this standard we should discern that ancient Israel's holy-war mentality was more influenced by the surrounding cultures than by the revelation of God. Regardless of whether holy war was *ever* normative for ancient Israel, we should acknowledge that holy war is not a proper Christian response to war and conflict.

The pacifist and just-war positions are more biblically and theologically



responsible approaches to issues surrounding warfare. Whether “brothers” or merely “cousins,” they share a presumption against violence and place severe limits on the use of violence to resolve conflict. Pacifists urge that there is *always* a non-violent way to respond to conflict. Just-war theorists, while admitting their approach has been misused by some people to justify virtually any use of state violence, insist that violence, when it is truly justified at all, must be the last resort, carried out in a restrained manner, and used with humility and grief. For example, when Christians first served in the Roman army in the third century, churches welcomed home their soldiers not with tickertape parades, but with the requirement that they retreat and mourn over their participation in killing, even when their participation in war was morally justified.

Expressing a sentiment that both ancient Israelites and modern-day Christians could affirm, historian Ferdinand Braudel writes, “Historians refer constantly to war without really knowing or seeking to know its true nature—or natures. We are as ignorant about war as the physicist is of the true nature of matter. *We talk about it because we have to: it has never ceased to trouble the lives of men*” (emphasis added).<sup>9</sup>

## NOTES

1 Ronald A. Wells, ed., *The Wars of America* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1991), 1.

2 Norman K. Gottwald, “‘Holy War’ in Deuteronomy: Analysis and Critique,” *Review and Expositor* 61 (Fall 1964), 296.

3 W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940), 219.

4 Cited in Erika Bleibtreu, “Grisly Assyrian Record of Torture and Death,” *Biblical Archaeological Review* (January/February, 1991), 57 and 60.

5 Gwilym Jones, “The Concept of Holy War,” in *The World of Ancient Israel*, edited by Ronald Clements (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 300.

6 Patrick D. Miller, Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 156.

7 Cited in C. John Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (London: Headley Brothers, 1919), 132.

8 Robert M. Good, “The Just War in Ancient Israel,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 104/3 (1985), 395.

9 Ferdinand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. II (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 836.



**JOHN A. WOOD**

is Professor of Religion at Baylor University in Waco, Texas.

# The War of the Lamb

BY HARRY O. MAIER

**Shaking us from our comfortable culturally-accommodating sleep of civil religion, the book of Revelation cross-examines the claims of divine blessing upon Caesar's order, especially when it is violent and economically exploitative. The War of the Lamb is a call to arms, to wage war with what at first glance seems to be no weapons at all—the words of faithful testimony.**

---

**T**he Book of Revelation is the book of war. There is no writing in the New Testament as occupied with warfare as John's Revelation, nor is there any book as violent. The statistics are startling. Of the twenty-five New Testament instances of the Greek word for "war," *polemos*, or "to make war/fight," *polemein*, almost two-thirds of them (fifteen) are in the Book of Revelation. On the other hand, the word for "peace," *eirene*, found ninety-two times in the New Testament, appears in Revelation only twice (1:4; 6:4).

To some degree its emphasis on warfare and violence is characteristic of ancient apocalyptic literature. The Old Testament uses apocalyptic warfare imagery to dramatize human wickedness and the inevitable victory of God over those opposed to his purposes (e.g., Isaiah 24:1-23; Daniel 11:2-12:4; Joel 2:1-20; Zechariah 9:14-16). Visions of war and battle imagery are similarly a typical feature of the dozen-and-a-half non-canonical apocalyptic writings from the inter-testamental period (200 B.C. - 200 A.D.) onward, some of which, like the Apocrypha's 4 Ezra, are roughly contemporary with John's Revelation.<sup>1</sup> Taken together, the recurring uses of warfare imagery in this literature should caution us against a literal reading of John's references to war and to interpret them instead as a characteristic feature of an ancient literary genre deployed to achieve a certain end.

Still, these statistics take on added weight when we compare the content of Revelation's references to war with the other New Testament uses of battle imagery. Whereas Jesus promises believers that there will always be "wars and rumors of wars" (accounting for five of the references to war outside Revelation—Matthew 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9), only in Revelation are there visions of Jesus personally waging war. "Then I saw heaven opened, and there was a white horse! Its rider is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he judges and makes war (*polemei*)" (19:11). There are allusions to Jesus as apocalyptic conqueror elsewhere in the New Testament (1 Corinthians 15:24-28; 1 Thessalonians 4:16; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10; 2 Peter 3:10-13). But only in Revelation does he "tread the wine press of the fury of the wrath of God the Almighty" (19:15) so that blood flows "as high as a horse's bridle, for a distance of about two hundred miles" (14:20). While other New Testament writers borrow military metaphors to urge Christians to battle evil and spiritual forces of wickedness (e.g. Ephesians 6:10-17), only in Revelation is warfare threatened against members of the church (2:16). Representations of war typify ancient apocalyptic literature, with visions of nation rising against nation and a warrior God intervening to punish idolatry and sinfulness. But in the Bible's last book divine warfare reaches a new level. Apocalyptic application of holy war, drawing on Old Testament traditions of God fighting evil with a heavenly army (Joel 3:11b; Zechariah 14:5b), now has Jesus as a divine warrior going forth with the faithful behind him to wage battle (19:14).

As a consequence, Revelation receives mixed reviews, as indeed does the whole apocalyptic tradition representing God as warrior. On the one hand are those who embrace apocalyptic warfare imagery as a potent vision for the church militant. Apocalyptic violence, whether originating with God or Satan or unrepentant humankind, is a sobering reminder that Christians are in a spiritual battle—in Revelation, with the Devil, the serpent who "makes war" on the faithful (12:17). Augustine of Hippo interpreted the militaristic imagery of Revelation, together with apocalyptic references to divine warfare in the rest of the Bible, as representing the war between the City of Man and the divinely elect City of God—the invisible Church—that has been waged from the time that Cain slew Abel (*City of God*, book 19). His was a call to Christians to be disciplined in resisting evil, whether personal or societal, and to be vigilant in pursuing justice and love of neighbor. Augustine offered a sophisticated reading of apocalyptic violence that resisted a straightforward literal interpretation to arrive at a deeper, more spiritual and theological truth. Others were more direct in applying apocalyptic visions to both religious and secular visions of world history. Biblical warfare imagery was invoked to rally support for the Crusades. Medieval and Reformation prophets were inspired by warfare texts to justify the use of the sword to engineer theocratic utopian states. Religious representations of divine warfare against unjust rulers helped fire

American patriots to revolt against the king in the War of Independence. Famously Revelation 19:15 inspired Julia Ward Howe to write “The Battle Hymn of the Republic” and portray the Civil War against slavery as a war of righteousness, truth, and justice.<sup>2</sup> Apocalyptic imagery and the theory of a just war were recently combined with American civil religion to rally public support for a pre-emptive strike against enemies. President George

---

**Revelation’s warring Jesus seems in conflict with the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount who urges disciples to love their enemies. How can we harmonize John 3:16 with the book’s militaristic visions of divine judgment and violent subjugation of enemies?**

---

W. Bush’s promises to be victorious in the War on Terrorism, as well as the belief that America is at war with an invisible enemy, and that “God is not indifferent” in the battle of a righteous and just nation against the enemies of Liberty, resonates with themes that can be traced back to Revelation, if not Old Testament apocalyptic visions of God’s use of a holy Is-

rael to punish unrighteousness. On these accounts John’s Apocalypse, like the apocalyptic warfare traditions from which it draws, is a sobering reminder to not be naïve about evil and to be vigilant and decisive in a divinely appointed fight against wickedness.

On the other hand, many Christians have resisted such militant visions as opposed to the Gospel. In the case of Revelation, John’s warring Jesus seems in conflict with the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount who urges disciples to turn the other cheek and to love their enemies (Matthew 5:38-39, 43-44). How can we harmonize the affirmation of John 3:16 with the book’s militaristic visions of divine judgment and violent subjugation of enemies? Some have found the accounts in Revelation so contradictory that they question whether it should be in the Bible at all. Because of its violent imagery and easily misinterpreted visions, its inclusion in the canon was still a matter of debate as late as the sixth century. One strand of the Orthodox Christian tradition explicitly rejects its authority as Scripture. The nineteenth-century American philosopher C. S. Peirce well sums up the ethical and theological discomfort with Revelation as well as apocalyptic violence more generally:

Little by little the bitterness increases until in the last book of the New Testament, its poor distracted author represents that all the time Christ was talking about having come to save the world, the secret design was to catch the entire human race, with the exception of a paltry 144,000, and souse them all in a brimstone lake, and as

the smoke of their torment went up for ever and ever, to turn and remark, 'There is no curse anymore.' Would it be an insensible smirk or a fiendish grin that should accompany such an utterance? I wish I could believe St. John did not write it.<sup>3</sup>

"Its existence and its place in the Bible," remarks New Testament exegete Jack T. Sanders, "are, in the fullest sense of the word, evil."<sup>4</sup>

Revelation with its potent application of apocalyptic warfare imagery is a book that invites extreme reactions. If the Book of Revelation is a call to arms to join God in battling evil, what are the weapons of the faithful? Does it ask Christians to renounce Jesus' command to love their enemies? Does it replace Jesus' life of non-retaliation with an ethics of violence? If Jesus blesses the peacemakers (Matthew 5:9), does Revelation's holy war imagery imply that God blesses warmongering? In wrestling with these questions, attention to genre and the literary application of apocalyptic warfare imagery is especially important. One of the chief rhetorical aims of that imagery in ancient apocalyptic literature is to urge the faithful to decision and commitment in resisting evil and sin. As a literary device it seeks to persuade those who might be tempted to despair in the face of the world's suffering and injustice to have courage and to live faithfully in the conviction that God's good purposes will prevail. Most importantly, it demands that the faithful take an active role in resisting wickedness, especially when the state promotes evil or endorses injustice, even if that means ridicule, the loss of material security, or one's life. The warfare imagery of apocalyptic literature and of Revelation in particular is a serious call to a devout and holy life of public witness. As we shall see, Revelation is far from renouncing Jesus' call to a peculiar life of non-violent witness as the counter-cultural sign of God's presence in the world and passionate love for it. Rather, it deploys a paradoxical use of warfare imagery to insist that it is through Jesus' way of costly witness that evil is overcome and God's purposes prevail.<sup>5</sup>

#### **FOLLOWING THE SLAIN LAMB**

John's representation of war draws directly from ancient apocalyptic traditions that build on Old Testament holy war traditions.<sup>6</sup> These typically present God as a divine warrior surrounded by cosmic powers and characters, wielding divine power—often represented in highly charged symbolism and associated with social and natural calamity—to punish evildoers and reward the faithful. John, however, does something remarkable with that imagery. He unites the traditional apocalyptic portrait of a warring Yahweh with the unlikely image of a conquering slain lamb (Revelation 5:5-6; 6:15-17; 12:11; 14:4-5; 19:6-8). It is as the slain lamb that John's apocalyptic Lord wages war. Perhaps the most terrifying image of the Apocalypse—the vision of the warrior with eyes like a flame of fire,

clothed in a blood-stained garment, and riding forth on the white horse to wage war on God's enemies (19:11-16)—similarly moves, upon close examination, in a completely counter-intuitive direction. At first glance, with its reference to the wine-press of God's wrath, this is a recapitulation of the vision of the warring Lord of Isaiah 63:1-6, with Yahweh's garments spattered with the blood of his enemies. But a closer reading of that vision in

---

**The metaphor of a war waged and won by a slain lamb is one of the most paradoxical and jarring images in the Bible. It transforms holy war in a way that finally renounces violence as the means by which God's purposes are achieved.**

---

the context of Revelation as a whole reveals that the robe dipped in blood (19:13) is not that of enemies, but Jesus' own (5:9; 12:11) shed on account of his life of faithful witness (1:5; 3:14). Likewise, those who ride after him and similarly conquer are those who have given up their lives in faithful witness (7:14-17; 12:11; 14:4-5).

When we look to see the weapon that he and his army wields, it is nothing other than a two-edged sword issuing forth from his mouth (19:15; see 2:16)—the bold and vocal witness before enemies in faithfulness to God's purposes (see also 12:11).

Revelation's metaphor of a war waged and won by a slain lamb is one of the most paradoxical and jarring images in the New Testament, if not the Bible as whole, and is perhaps the most dramatic reconfiguration of apocalyptic war imagery in antiquity. Holy war waged by word of testimony takes up the violent imagery belonging to the tradition of apocalyptic warfare and transforms it in a way that finally renounces violence as the means by which God's purposes are achieved. This dramatic reconfiguration brings us face to face with the Apocalypse's ethical demand on Christians to follow on the way of Jesus in loud and faithful witness before all that opposes God's purposes in the world.

That ethical demand takes on startling relief when read against the backdrop of the militaristic and triumphalist political culture of the Roman Empire. As we shall see, John's adaptation of the divine warrior as conquering slain lamb challenges Roman might and asks Christians to consider what counts for power and victory in the world. Reading Revelation against the backdrop of its cultural, especially political, setting helps to draw out how John uses military imagery rhetorically to urge his audience toward faithful Christian identity. Such a historical and political reading helps to bring out the enduring power of Revelation's paradoxical warfare imagery to shape public witness in our own day.



## RESISTING THE EMPIRE'S CIVIL RELIGION

John's Revelation was offered to early Christian communities of ancient Asia Minor (contemporary Turkey) inhabiting one of the most powerful and economically prosperous empires in recorded history. It is often suggested that his visions address a situation of Roman persecution of Christians; Revelation's violence has sometimes been explained as the unfortunate but understandable desire of a persecuted community wanting to get even with its persecutors.<sup>7</sup> But a closer look at the evidence indicates that the audience of Revelation inhabited a situation a good deal more ambiguous than the traditional reading assumes.

Of the seven churches mentioned by John (2:1-3:15), five are criticized for lack of faithfulness. Two of them he censures for the consumption of food sacrificed to idols and immorality (2:14, 20); a third is condemned because it says "I am rich, I have prospered, and I need nothing" and does not know that it is "wretched, pitiable, poor, blind, and naked" (3:17). These charges offer a fascinating snapshot of early Christians wrestling with remaining faithful in a pagan environment. Unlike contemporary secular society where religion, state, and economics are strictly separated, in the Roman Empire they were intimately interwoven. The charges against the Laodicean Church for its self-reliant prosperity and against the Churches at Pergamum and Thyatira for eating food sacrificed to idols reflects an ancient culture in which economic prosperity and civic harmony depended on right religious observance.<sup>8</sup> Participation in civic religious festivals, which often included consumption of offerings dedicated to patron deities, allowed the inhabitants of ancient cities to celebrate civic identity and assure divine blessing on their common life. Improper observance or religious neglect threatened economic and political disaster by risking the wrath of the gods. The criticisms against the seven churches should be read against this backdrop. John's charges of idolatry and self-assurance reveal communities divided over the proper response to their pagan environment. Some perhaps took a more accommodating stance, allowing some degree of participation in local civic culture, while others, like John, rejected such accommodation in principle.

The attraction of accommodation must have been difficult to resist. And it was reinforced by Roman imperial ideology. The genius of Roman imperial rule was its ability to insert itself in local cultures, to draw upon civic religious, cultural, and political structures, but to reconfigure them so that support of them became a vehicle to express devotion to Rome. Each of the seven cities named by John erected temples dedicated to the worship of the emperor or the imperial family. From a pagan perspective this was for good reason—thanks to their Roman overlords, these cities had not seen war for more than a century. Situated along major trade routes delivering goods to Rome, those cities were economic centers prospering

from imperial patterns of commercial enterprise. Rome promoted a vision of its rule that capitalized on its economic and military successes. On coins, monuments, in civic rituals, even in public amusement, Rome was celebrated as a political order established by the gods triumphing over all enemies and bringing a cornucopia of material goods. It sought to convince those under its rule that it was divinely appointed militarily to pacify and

---

**Revelation critiques Roman rule as an idolatrous, economically exploitative, and violently tyrannical military order. Like other ancient critics, John lambastes it as a cruel and unjust order destined to destruction.**

---

govern the world because of Roman moral superiority, religious faithfulness, and devotion to the rule of law. The *pax romana* (Roman peace)—again a military pacification of subject peoples—was interpreted as bringing to the inhabitants of the world the mirror image of a heavenly peace, a *pax*

*deum* (peace of the gods). “Peace and security,” or “peace and concord,” favorite phrases used to represent Rome rule, were the visible result of that heavenly blessing and imperial piety.<sup>9</sup>

It is no accident, then, that the Book of Revelation repeatedly critiques Roman rule as an idolatrous, economically exploitative, and violently tyrannical military order. John is not the only ancient author to call Rome’s glowing account of its rule a lie, nor is he alone in using apocalyptic to unmask it as idolatrous.<sup>10</sup> Like other critics, John lambastes Roman rule as a cruel and unjust order destined to destruction. The famous vision of the “mark of the beast” (13:16-18) links the ability to buy and sell with idolatrous emperor worship (13:11-15). John’s vision of the destruction of Babylon centers on the laments of kings, merchants, and sea merchants—significantly those who have benefited most from Roman trade (18:9-24), and pointedly those who have dealt in slavery (18:13). In no way the morally superior, pious embodiment of a divinely appointed rule of law, Rome is a blasphemous, idolatrous whore astride the scarlet beast (associated with the serpent/dragon of 12:15-17 in 13:2), fornicating with rulers, and drunk on the blood of believers (17:1-6). Far from representing a heavenly “peace of the gods,” her rule is the fruit of a war in heaven (12:7); she makes war “on the Lamb” (17:14), and is destined to collapse in civil war (17:15-17). The emperor is not, as in political celebrations of the day, a divine descendant of the gods, placed on earth to be their vice-regent. He is rather a counterfeit of God, who seeks to deceive the nations with his divine claims (13:11-15).

John’s Revelation is a frontal assault on Roman impiety and tyranny. For those of his original audience who were tempted to take a more ac-



commodating position with respect to their imperial civic environment, Revelation must have come as a shock. Indeed, Revelation's power historically has been its ability to wake Christians from a comfortable culturally-accommodating sleep to embrace lives of bold witness and vigilant discipleship. As the most subversive political writing in the New Testament it has inspired generations of Christians to cross-examine the glowing progress reports of civil government and to be suspicious when Caesar invokes divine blessing upon his order, especially when that order is economically exploitative and centered in violence.

### **THE CALL TO FAITHFUL TESTIMONY**

Revelation calls Christians to embrace their counter-cultural identity. Its use of apocalyptic holy war tradition in urging resistance to Roman rule and its imperial economic and religious culture is startling. For John claims that God does not overturn the tyrannical military and idolatrous might of Caesar with an even greater display of brute force. Given the context of the militaristic culture of ancient Rome, this is especially remarkable. It is as the slain lamb and in the power of his faithful testimony to God's loving purpose that Jesus conquers, and it is as courageous disciples who bear public testimony to the pattern of love on the cross that evil and injustice are overcome in the world (12:10-11).

In Revelation the War of the Lamb is waged and won on the field of worship of the victim of Empire, Jesus of Nazareth. The Book of Revelation reverberates with the sounds of heavenly worship (4:8-11; 5:8-14; 7:15-17; 11:15-18; 12:10-12; 14:2-3; 15:2-4; 19:1-8; 22:3). It is no accident that much Christian hymnody has its origins in the imagery of the Bible's last book. But it is important to note that worship here is no parochial matter and that heavenly-minded praise of God in Revelation always has earthly goods in view. This is the biblical book whose final vision includes those erstwhile economic and military exploiters of the nations, "the kings of the earth" (6:15; 18:9) bringing their wealth as offering to the holy city Jerusalem (21:24, 26). Even they are caught up in God's project of healing of the nations (22:2). John takes worship to the streets and demands an audience, tempted to be too accommodating and uncritical of the socio-political order around it, that it give public testimony to the Lamb who calls the unjust to account and renounces the violent with his more costly way of love. It is as a slain lamb that Jesus is worshiped and as slain lamb that he is victorious over idolatry and injustice.

The War of the Lamb is a call to arms, to wage war with what at first glance seems to be no weapons at all—the words of faithful testimony—but to those with eyes of faith are mightier than bullets and bombs, because their power resides in the promise and faithfulness of God. As in every generation, Revelation asks if there are those with ears to hear what the Spirit is saying to the church (2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22), who will find

the courage to believe what they hear, and will dare to open their mouths to declare God's word.

## NOTES

1 For a collection of these texts with contemporary translation and critical commentary, see James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (Volume 1): Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (New York: Doubleday, 1983); and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha (Volume 2): Writings Related to the Apostles, Apocalypses, and Related Subjects*, revised edition, translated by R. McL. Wilson (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003). 4 Ezra is readily available in *The Jerusalem Bible* or *The Revised New English Bible*.

2 For a fascinating survey of uses of apocalyptic in western history, with attention to warfare imagery in inspiring warfare and revolutionary causes, see Eugen Weber, *Apocalypses: Prophecies, Cults and Millennial Beliefs Through the Ages* (Toronto, ON: Random House, 1999).

3 Charles S. Peirce, "Evolutionary Love," in Nathan House and Christian Koesel, eds., *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1992), 1.365-66.

4 Jack T. Sanders, *Ethics of the New Testament: Change and Development* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1975), 115.

5 For a thorough exegetical discussion that follows the pacifist position taken up here, with an even-handed review of alternative interpretations, see Loren L. Johns, *The Lamb Christology of John: An Investigation into Origins and Rhetorical Force* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr/Siebeck, 2003).

6 Thus, Exodus 14:4, 14, 18; 15:1-18; 17:14-16; Numbers 21:14-15; Deuteronomy 7:16-26; 9:4-7; 20:10-18; 33:27-28; Joshua 1:1-18; 3:7-13; chapters 6-7; 10:14, 42; 11:6; Judges 5; 1 Samuel 14:23; 2 Samuel 5:17-25; Psalm 68; 78:53-55; Isaiah 26:16-27:6; 52:7-12; 59:15-20; 63:1-6; Amos 2:9; Habakkuk 3; Zechariah 14. See Patrick D. Miller, Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

7 See for example the highly readable and instructive interpretation of Adela Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1984).

8 Paul B. Duff offers a full analysis in *Who Rides the Beast? Prophetic Rivalry and the Rhetoric of Crisis in the Churches of the Apocalypse* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

9 For an overview of Roman political ideology, see Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*, translated by John Bowden (London: SCM, 1986).

10 For a readable account of Rome's bad press among ancient critics, see J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 161-92. Other contemporary apocalyptic renunciations of Rome are 4 Ezra 11-13 and Sibylline Oracles 8:1-216 (Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, 418-23).



### HARRY O. MAIER

is Associate Professor of New Testament Studies at Vancouver School of Theology in Vancouver, British Columbia, and a pastor in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada.

# Terrorist Enemies and Just War

BY WILLIAM T. CAVANAUGH

**Terrorists don't fight fair. So how can just-war thinking possibly apply to these non-state actors who don't even pretend to play by the rules? The just war tradition, if we take it seriously, calls for a response to terrorism that is radically at odds with the approaches being pursued in the "war on terrorism."**

---

**T**errorists don't fight fair. To Christians who are accustomed to approaching matters of organized violence through the just war tradition, terrorist tactics are a source of frustration. Within the tradition are criteria for deciding when and how violence can be used legitimately in a limited fashion for the correction of injustice, but for the last few centuries at least, the tradition primarily has been applied to conflicts between states. What happens when major acts of violence are perpetrated by non-state actors who don't even pretend to play by the rules?<sup>1</sup>

According to George Weigel and others, the just war theory needs to be developed to fit the "war against terrorism." The terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, were an act of war rather than a crime, Weigel asserts in "Reality of Terrorism Calls for a Fresh Look at Just-War Tradition," and therefore the just war tradition needs, as he puts it, to be "stretched" to accommodate this reality.<sup>2</sup> For the last three centuries, says Weigel, just war theory has "assumed that the state is the only significant 'unit' in world politics," but recent events have made us aware that non-state actors, like terrorist organizations, are "crucial units-of-count in the world. States are not all there is." Nevertheless, he claims, states remain the only legitimate authority for making war; we must resist the idea that the United Nations

or some other transnational authority is invested with the responsibility to act. "If someone is making war on us, as the terror network surely is, we do not require the permission of others to defend ourselves or to take the war to the enemy in order to defeat him."

The criterion of just cause—limited by some just-war thinkers to repelling acts of aggression already under way—needs tweaking as well, according to Weigel. Given that terrorists give no warning to their aggression, we cannot wait for them to act. "When facing terrorist organizations, pre-emptive military action is not only morally justifiable but morally imperative."

The criterion of last resort is also in for a facelift. Traditionally, the just war theory allows going to war only after all reasonable diplomatic means of avoiding the conflict had been tried and exhausted. According to Weigel, diplomacy is a waste of time with terrorist enemies. "Terrorists, by definition, do not play by the rules, diplomatic or otherwise. I can't see how it makes moral sense to argue that one must first attempt to negotiate with people who regard negotiation as weakness, who think of the 'other' as vermin to be exterminated, and for whom acts of mass murder are deemed religiously praiseworthy."

This "stretching" of the just war tradition raises difficult questions about how far the tradition can be stretched before it snaps. As a tradition, just-war thinking has developed to meet new situations, but the criteria are not indefinitely malleable. Traditionally, if a war cannot be fought justly, then it should not be fought, for to be in mortal sin is worse than defeat. It would, for example, be better to accept defeat than to attack innocent noncombatants directly. How can we complain that terrorists don't play by the rules, but then adjust the rules to fit what we feel we need to do? A skeptic might think that in this "stretching" we see the just war theory doing what it does best: justifying violence, not limiting it. A more charitable reading would see Weigel and others attempting to adjust the just war tradition, rather than abandon it, in order to bring its moral reasoning and limits to what is likely to be a difficult and bloody struggle.

I can sympathize with this effort, but thinking within the just war tradition in the contemporary context is significantly more demanding than stretching it to conform to American foreign policy as it is currently conceived. Indeed, I believe that if Christians really take the just war tradition seriously, it will call for a response to terrorism that is fundamentally at odds with the approaches being pursued by the political and military establishments. The just war tradition raises the following three challenges to our thinking about the "war on terrorism."

### **IS IT A WAR, OR A CRIME?**

Should we agree with the judgment of the Bush administration and of Congress that the United States has been engaged in a "war on terrorism"

since September 11, 2001? For many years U.S. policy treated international terrorism as a species of crime, writes Weigel, but September 11 made abundantly clear that this is war, not crime. He supposes, I think, that treating terrorism as a crime would somehow diminish the gravity of the acts, and show a lack of seriousness in the face of this monstrosity.

The just war tradition, to the contrary, suggests that calling an act “war” gives it a certain dignity that it would not otherwise have. The idea of “just war” –with its criterion of legitimate authority–was developed to distinguish the public use of violence from mere private vengeance and murder amongst quarreling citizens and from acts of brigandage. The intent of the just war tradition was to bring some moral order and limits to the use of violence by restricting its legitimate use to civil authorities properly constituted by God. To call an attack “war” is to recognize its potential legitimacy as an act of violence (for after all, there can be acts of just *war*, but there are no just *crimes*). It is not at all clear, therefore, that we should dignify acts of terrorism with the label “war.” To the contrary, the word “crime” seems far more fitting.

This basic insight of the just war tradition is enshrined in many twentieth-century efforts to respond to atrocities. After World War II, for example, some leading Nazis were not treated as mere combatants, but were charged at Nuremberg with committing “crimes against humanity.” To call Auschwitz an act of war against the Jews would be to give it a certain proximity to legitimacy that it does not deserve. Indeed, many Nazis tried to defend themselves at Nuremberg by arguing that their atrocities were a regrettable byproduct of war. The Nuremberg tribunal was operating within the broad just war tradition when it called such atrocities crimes, not war.

Terrorism is unlike war in a number of ways. Terrorism is carried out without explicit support or direction from any sovereign political unit. It is the work of small groups of individuals, not armies, and terrorists do not tend to wear uniforms or otherwise identify themselves as

combatants. Terrorists tend to seek disruption rather than the clear defeat of an opponent. Both in practice and in theory, terrorists ignore traditional distinctions between combatants and noncombatants in choosing their targets. For these reasons and others, the United Nations Security Council has repeatedly called terrorism a crime, though it should be acknowledged

---

**To call an act “war” is to recognize the potential legitimacy of an act of violence. It is not at all clear, therefore, that we should dignify acts of terrorism with the label “war.”**

**The word “crime” seems far more fitting.**

---

that terrorism tends to resemble “hate crimes” more than crimes done for personal gain, such as robbery.<sup>3</sup>

Why should it matter which term is used for terrorism? To say that terrorists are at war with us is to indicate that we are at war with them. To speak of crime, on the other hand, is to indicate that policing is required, even if military forces are involved. And war and policing, though they are not completely discontinuous, have very different dynamics. Policing seeks to secure the common good within a community, and is therefore limited by the law and customs of that community. War pits one community against another, and is therefore less restrained by the rule of law. War is expeditionary, taking the capacity to kill and destroy into someone else’s territory. In other words, war is us-versus-them, whereas policing is about promoting the common good amongst us. Because of this, policing has an inherent mandate to minimize violence; in policing, lethal force is the last resort, whereas in war it is the first. In war, soldiers are less restrained by law, for they serve simultaneously as judges and executioners for those they kill.<sup>4</sup>

For Weigel, the Bush administration, and others, to call terrorism a “crime” might limit the goals of the response to the apprehension and punishment of those directly responsible. This would require cooperation with foreign governments and transnational bodies such as the United Nations, listening to their vision of the common good for the international community. The U.S. government’s ambition in the Middle East, however, is to topple governments and remake the whole of Middle Eastern society in our image in order to destroy the root causes of terrorism. Because the just war tradition is about limiting violence and avoiding war, however, there are good reasons for just war advocates to resist the crusading impulse at work here. To treat terrorism as crime and not war is to adopt the basic just-war conviction that violence should be used for the limited goal of restoring justice and not, as some would have it, to convert others by force, to make them think and act like us. This strategy is likely to produce more opposition and more terrorism, not root out its causes.

#### **WHO HAS LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY?**

Part of the reason Weigel insists that this is a war is to resist those who would “think that the U.N. or some other transnational agency is the ‘legitimate authority’ for sanctioning the use of armed force.” Weigel assumes that the nation-state is the sole legitimate authority for waging war; it can wage war preemptively, if necessary, and without the approval of any other international body, either the church or the United Nations. Christian just war advocates, however, have good reason to question the sole legitimacy of the nation-state to respond to terrorism. The just war tradition developed long before there was any such thing as a nation-state. What existed in the medieval period was a complex network of overlapping



loyalties to various princes and nobles. Territorial sovereignty was not yet sorted out neatly, and all princes were subject to a higher authority, the pope, at least in theory. There was no sense that the civil authorities somehow operated “outside” of the Roman Catholic Church. As one commentator put it, the civil authorities in the medieval period were “the police department of the Church.”<sup>5</sup> When one prince used violence against another, it was within a larger order, and appeal for arbitration could be made to the pope. The analogy to the police function is relevant here.<sup>6</sup>

It is crucial to note, therefore, that what became known as the just war tradition was developed as a form of moral reasoning *within* the Church, most often in the context of the confessional. Whether or not a war was just had an effect on the length of penance that was imposed on those who had killed as an act of war (with penances of up to one year imposed on soldiers who killed, even in a just war). Candidates for priesthood were excluded from ordination for participating in bloodshed. Furthermore, bishops and popes had a direct hand in limiting the violence of war. Ecclesiastical authorities promulgated the Peace of God and the Truce of God to declare certain places and time periods off limits to warmaking. Bishops often reinforced these initiatives by denying the Eucharist to offenders.<sup>7</sup>

It is only in the early modern period that the just war tradition becomes primarily a tool for rulers in independence from the church. As the leading historian of the just war in the medieval period puts it, “What with Augustine had started out

as a problem of morality and scriptural exegesis ended up as a tool of statecraft in the hands of secular monarchs.”<sup>8</sup> Weigel simply assumes that legitimate authority has passed to the nation-state in the modern era, and he refuses to allow that authority to be shared by the United Nations or other transnational bodies.

Nation-states may currently have the military power to wage war, unlike other bodies, but we should not conflate this power with the moral authority to decide whether a particular use of force is just.

As we have seen, the just war tradition was not developed as a tool of statecraft, but as an intra-church aid to moral reasoning for Christians grappling with serious matters of violence and coercion. Discernment in these grave matters is not a matter of just anyone running down a checklist

---

**Nation-states may currently have the military power to wage war, unlike the United Nations or other transnational bodies, but we should not conflate this power with the moral authority to decide whether a particular use of force is just.**

---

of criteria. "Justice" is the name of a virtue. Traditionally, it was assumed that those who would judge rightly in these matters would be followers of Jesus Christ, formed in the virtues of a disciple, and given authority by the Holy Spirit within the community of disciples. There is no reason to suppose that the leaders of a secular nation-state are so formed, or that narrow national self-interest will not trump the Gospel in foreign policy decisions. Some wish to defer to the President's judgment on the basis of his superior access to information; but in the first place, formation in the virtues is not primarily a matter of information, and in the second place, information is easily manipulated to the service of narrowly defined interests. The secular nation-state is not set up to be a community of virtue; rather, it is a community of interests. In theory, at least, a liberal nation-state is established to maximize the freedom of individual actors to pursue their own interests. Justice is primarily a matter of giving each his or her due. Decisions of statecraft about the justice of a particular use of force will inevitably be based on interest and power, and not primarily on the kind of justice proper to the community of Christian disciples.

For this reason, the just war tradition, if taken seriously, would mandate at least that the church not abdicate to the nation-state its ability to decide when a particular use of force is just. It is troubling that, despite vocal opposition by leaders of nearly every major Christian denomination to the attack on Iraq in March 2003, most Christians in America were content to leave the matter to the state to decide. The just war tradition presupposes that the church be ready and willing to step out of line with national policy when Christian discipleship demands it.

#### **MAY WE DEMONIZE ENEMIES?**

It is easy to demonize terrorists because of the stark contrast between the evil of the perpetrators of terror and the innocence of their victims, who usually are noncombatants. To guard against such demonization of the enemy, the just war tradition distinguishes between appropriate and inappropriate targets, combatants and noncombatants. For example, the behavior of German troops in World War II, even though in service to an evil cause, is nevertheless deemed appropriate if their object was to kill only Allied combatants. It is not that the Allied soldiers deserved to die, but their status as combatants means that they are not simply classified as "innocents." Just war produces a certain leveling: the enemy combatant is not simply evil, and the soldier on "our" side is not simply innocent. Terrorism, however, highlights a sharp contrast between the evil and the innocent. The images of September 11, 2001, are so powerful precisely because the victims were unsuspecting civilians going about their everyday lives: making copies, talking on the phone, cleaning floors, chatting with clients. The wholesale slaughter of these people marks the clearest contrast between evil and innocence.



Because the terrorists do not play by the rules, we might be tempted to abandon the leveling impulse of the just war tradition; the terrorists certainly have. The terrorists have committed a grave evil. It is not necessarily the case, however, that the innocence of the victims transfers over to those who would respond in their defense. We should resist assuming that we who identify with the victims are also innocent, and that an unbridgeable moral gulf separates us from the terrorists.

Certainly we are justified in defending ourselves against terrorism, yet it is salutary to remember that we have not always acted so well by the rules of just war. The U.S. government defines terrorism as “premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.”<sup>9</sup> Under this definition, the United States has supported terrorism on a large scale. In Central America, for example, the United States—through its policies of “counter-insurgency,” “low-intensity warfare,” and the attacking of “soft targets”—financed, armed, and provided cover for groups that terrorized noncombatants, mostly peasants, in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guatemala.<sup>10</sup> In World War II, the United States directly targeted noncombatants in Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Dresden, Tokyo, and other cities.

The criterion of last resort must not be reinterpreted so that the need to dialogue with our enemies is dismissed. The criterion of last resort is based on the dual presumption that our enemies—even in the grip of evil—remain children of God, and that our own actions and intentions are never above examination.

In the wake of the September 11 attacks, the question “Why do they hate us?” has often been given a self-serving answer—for example, “They hate us for our freedoms”

—or the question has been angrily dismissed as giving reason to evil. I believe the criterion of just cause requires us to dwell with this question more searchingly. Middle Eastern Muslims have a long list of grievances against the United States and the West, from the installation of the Shah of Iran and his brutal regime in 1953, to the treatment of Palestinians by U.S.-supported Israel, to the presence of the U.S. military in Saudi Arabia and Iraq. Nothing can justify terrorist attacks. If the purpose of the response to ter-

---

**The criterion of last resort must not be reinterpreted so that the need to dialogue with our enemies is dismissed. Our enemies—even in the grip of evil—remain children of God, and our own actions and intentions are never above examination.**

---

rorism is to correct injustice, however, then we must not simply ignore the claims to justice that our enemies make on us. We must not be blinded by the evil of terrorism into assuming that the injustice of terrorist tactics necessarily negates the possible justice of their cause. The history of American dealings with the Muslim world is long and complex. We must actively explore that history in dialogue with Muslim friends and enemies, and not

---

**The just war tradition developed in a penitential context. We would do well to approach terrorism in the same spirit. At its best, the just war tradition does not simply justify violence but questions it, both “ours” and “theirs.”**

---

allow terrorism to impose a fog of amnesia on our dealings with others.

Where foreign policy is driven by narrowly-defined national and corporate interest, Christians must realize our vocation to confess the Christian story truthfully and speak truth to power.

The just war tradition developed in a penitential context. Christian just-war advocates would do well to approach terrorism in the same spirit. At its best, the just war tradition does not simply justify violence but questions it, both “ours” and “theirs.” In doing so, the hope is to build bridges—not just burn them—between us and our enemies, so that the common good of all of God’s creation is actively pursued. If this does not sound like statecraft, it is because it is not. The church must take a prophetic role in resisting the violence of both state and non-state actors, and witnessing to the peace of Jesus Christ in a violent world.

## NOTES

1 According to most thinkers in the just war tradition, here are the criteria: war should only be waged (1) for a just cause, (2) after being declared by a legitimate authority, (3) as the last resort, (4) with good intentions, (5) with promise of a high probability for success, (6) by targeting only combatants, and (7) by ensuring the damage done will be proportional to the offense to which the war is a response.

2 Theologian George Weigel is a Senior Fellow of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington, D.C. Quotations are from his “Reality of Terrorism Calls for a Fresh Look at Just-War Tradition,” *The Catholic Difference* (September 20, 2001), available on the Center’s website at [www.eppc.org/news/newsID.585/news\\_detail.asp](http://www.eppc.org/news/newsID.585/news_detail.asp). For a similar argument, see Michael Novak, “‘Asymmetrical Warfare’ & Just War,” *National Review Online*, February 10, 2003, at [www.nationalreview.com/novak/novak021003.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/novak/novak021003.asp).

3 See Edward Leroy Long Jr., *Facing Terrorism: Responding as Christians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 13-15.

4 See Gerald Schlabach, “Just Policing: How War Could Cease to Be a Church-Dividing Issue,” soon to be published, but available now at <http://personal.stthomas.edu/gwschlabach/docs/policing.htm>.

5 John Neville Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius: 1414-1625* (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1960), 5.

6 John Howard Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace, and Revolution: A Companion to Bainton* (Elkhart, IN: Peace Resource Center, 1983), 60.

7 Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 31-36; and John Howard Yoder, *When War is Unjust*, revised edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 10-12.

8 Russell, 302

9 22 U. S. C. 2656f (d), quoted in Long, 2.

10 For declassified government documents on the U.S. role in these atrocities, see George Washington University's National Security Archive at [www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/](http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/).

---



**WILLIAM T. CAVANAUGH**

is Associate Professor of Theology at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota.

# Just Peacemaking in an Age of Terrorism

BY GLEN H. STASSEN

**We need a positive theology of peace that spells out the proactive practices for individuals and nations that work to prevent war. The new ethic of just peacemaking tells us what actions will dry up the sources for terrorist anger and recruitment.**

---

**P**eachemaking is proactive. It provides transforming initiatives that deliver us from war, including terrorism. The prophets of Israel warn us against making war, but even more they call us to make peace. If we want to avoid the destruction of war and exile, they say, we must repent and do justice. The injustice that we do causes resentment and division among us, and brings the destruction of war. We must cease putting our trust in idols, warhorses, and war chariots instead of God. We must repent and return to living the way that fits those who trust in the Lord.

Jesus teaches us not to get stuck in vicious cycles of revenge and hatred toward enemies. (Jews called the Roman occupiers “pigs,” and their hatred of occupation boiled over into an irrational rebellion in 66 A.D., to which the Romans responded by destroying Jerusalem and the temple, as Jesus had prophesied, and exiling Israel for nineteen centuries). But much more he instructs us to do the things that make for peace. He teaches the peacemaking practices of going to make peace with the brother where there is anger, going the second mile to make peace with the Roman soldier, loving our enemy and praying for our persecutors, practicing the justice of investing our money in God’s justice and righteousness rather than hoarding it all for ourselves, and acknowledging the log in our own eye rather than putting all the blame on the other. Jesus weeps over Jerusalem because the city does not recognize “the things that make for peace” (Luke 19:41-42a).

When a child is stuck in a self-defeating habit, the effective treatment is not just to punish the child and yell “No, no, no!” The effective treatment is to instill in the child a proactive alternative habit of response to temptation. If a teenager immediately turns on the television after dinner, gets stuck on watching it, and then is too tired to get her homework done, effective parenting is not to yell and shame her for having bad habits, but to discuss respectfully how another life-pattern would be more effective, like starting homework immediately and finishing it before turning on the television.

My father and many others returning from the devastation of World War II came back saying that we must not have World War III, or a nuclear war. So they got to work creating a United Nations, and developing practices of peacemaking that we point to in just peacemaking theory.

### **THE CALL FOR JUST PEACEMAKING**

When church leaders saw that nations were involved in an idolatrous and self-destructive arms race that threatened to kill us all, with great wisdom they wrote book-length calls to the practice of peacemaking: the Catholic *Challenge to Peace* (1983), the Presbyterian *Peacemaking the Believers’ Calling* (1983), the Methodist *In Defense of Creation* (1986), and the United Church of Christ *The Just Peace Church* (1985). They called for a new ethic of just peacemaking, a positive theology of peace. Efforts to restrain war by teaching just war theory and pacifism are needed, but they are not adequate. Instead we need to develop a positive theology of peacemaking that spells out the proactive practices of peacemaking that work to prevent war.” Much of the history of Catholic theology on war and peace has focused on limiting the resort to force in human affairs [just war theory and nonviolence]; this task is still necessary,...but it is not a sufficient response,” wrote the U. S. Catholic bishops. “A fresh reappraisal which includes a developed theology of peace will require contributions from several sectors of the Church’s life: biblical studies, systematic and moral theology, ecclesiology, and the experience and insights of members of the church who have struggled in various ways to make and keep the peace in this often violent age” (*The Challenge of Peace*, sections 23, 24).

In response, twenty-three scholars gathered to develop a consensus new ethic of just peacemaking, which we describe in *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1998, 2004). The group included Christian ethicists who helped draft the church statements or had written books arguing that we need a just peacemaking theory, as well as some noted scholars in international relations, and a few activists and practitioners. The twenty-three who developed the new ethic come from Catholic and Protestant traditions; most are just war theorists, but some are pacifists. Remarkably, we reached consensus on ten practices of just peacemaking.

The book opens with a specifically Christian theological argument for

the ten practices of just peacemaking, but then lays out the practices in a public language accessible to all who sense the obligation to make peace and avoid the destruction of war. In this way the new theory is appealing to people in various faiths. Each practice works efficaciously to prevent some wars, based on empirical political science research and the history of war prevention. The book is realistic; it points to what works in reality. It

---

**A bipartisan consensus affirms the just peacemaking practices of advancing democracy and human rights, and fostering just and sustainable economic development. The problem is that present policy emphasizes military action too much and community-development and civil-society development too little.**

---

doesn't say "wouldn't it be nice if," but "it is established that" these practices prevent wars.

foster just and sustainable economic development; (7) work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system; (8) strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights; (9) reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade; and (10) encourage grassroots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations.

The ten practices of just peacemaking are: (1) support nonviolent direct action; (2) take independent initiatives to reduce threat; (3) use cooperative conflict resolution; (4) acknowledge responsibility for conflict and injustice and seek repentance and forgiveness; (5) advance democracy, human rights, and religious liberty; (6)

Realistically wars will still happen, so we still need pacifism and just war theory to guide our response to the violence of war; but much more we need an ethic that tells us what actions will dry up the sources for terrorist anger and recruitment. Just peacemaking theory is that ethic.<sup>1</sup>

#### **DELIVERANCE FROM TERRORISM**

Failed states in which something like anarchy reigns—such as Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Congo, Haiti, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, and Iraq—create havens for terrorist training, drug trading, and money-gathering.<sup>2</sup> The *Washington Quarterly* reader on terrorism, *The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, points out that military action is not sufficient; these states need rehabilitation and democracy-building. A bipartisan consensus in Congress supports efforts at building democracies (p. 235), which is a practice of just peacemaking.

"I would be very careful about using our troops as nation builders. I believe the role of the military is to fight and win war and, therefore, pre-

vent war from happening in the first place," President Bush said during his campaign for the presidency. "Morale in today's military is too low.... I believe we're over-extended in too many places" (pp. 175-176). Yet he placed rebuilding Iraq in the hands of the Pentagon, after having dissolved the office of nation-building in the Pentagon and rebuffing major allies by going to war without them, so that rebuilding responsibility falls largely on the U.S. military with little preparation and international help. This has not worked well, and morale is indeed low. Rebuilding should be led by civilians trained in rehabilitation of civic society, not only military security, and managed by the United Nations, with strong American support. The U.N. is not accused of empire-building and colonialism as the U.S. military is. Democracy-building requires strengthening the rule of law and respect for human rights, developing genuine political processes, fostering the development of civic society, promoting accountable public institutions, and developing governmental capacity to deliver basic public goods (pp. 201, 242). Karin von Hippel, in her especially insightful study of Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor, writes what just peacemaking theory affirms: "The promotion of democracy is based on the assumption that democracies rarely go to war with each other, and therefore an increase in the number of democratic states would imply...a more peaceful and secure world" (p. 109). Democracies produce far fewer terrorists because disgruntled citizens have other means for seeking change (p. 362ff.).

This bipartisan consensus affirms the just peacemaking practices of *advancing democracy and human rights* and *fostering just and sustainable economic development*. The problem is that present policy emphasizes military action too much and community development and civil-society development too little. Therefore, much of the anti-terrorism money and attention goes to strengthening the armed forces in countries like Indonesia, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Israel, where the military forces have been the enemy of human rights and democracy. Thus the United States is seen by many as the supporter of autocracy and the enemy of citizen movements (pp. 103-104, et passim). When the United States declared its war against terrorism, Indonesia canceled peace talks with the rebels in Aceh and instead made war against them, Israel increased its military assassinations of Palestinian leaders, and Russia pursued its destructive war against Chechnya, for they knew the U.S. would not criticize their militaristic approaches.

#### **DELIVERANCE FROM BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS**

Many fear that terrorists could attack the United States with biological weapons.<sup>2</sup> Were terrorists to introduce a fatal virus into an airplane flying from London or Paris to New York (it would not be detected by the x-ray machines), passengers could transmit the infection to their different cities for a week before their symptoms appeared, and the disease might spread further as doctors take another week to diagnose it.



Fortunately, a Biological Weapons Treaty that makes these weapons illegal has been signed by almost every nation. Though its verification procedures are not yet in place, the negotiations to develop them since 1995 have produced widespread international agreement. Two just peacemaking practices, *work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system*, and *strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights*, urge support

---

**Two just peacemaking practices, “work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system,” and “strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights,” urge support for a Biological Weapons Treaty.**

---

and implementation of such treaties. The practice to *reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade* also applies to biological weapons. “The United States has a profound interest in preventing other countries from testing nuclear arms and stopping rogue regimes and terrorists from acquiring biological weapons.” The Comprehensive

Test Ban Treaty and Biological Weapons Convention “would advance these important goals. If the United States rejects the restraints these agreements impose or declines to negotiate improvements, how can it ask others to embrace them?”<sup>4</sup>

Yet “in the summer of 2001, the United States shocked its peers when it rejected” the agreement establishing verification procedures for biological weapons, an action that reflects the George W. Bush administration’s unilateralist course in international policy.<sup>5</sup> Verification of the Biological Weapons Treaty would include annual declarations by nations describing their programs and factories that could be used to produce biological weapons, random visits to declared facilities, and short-notice inspections of suspected facilities. Clearly this would be useful in preventing many likely sources of bioweapons for terrorists.

By mid-2001 a consensus text was emerging, and on July 23, 2001, the twenty-fourth negotiating session convened. Delegates expected their efforts would soon result in a final text. During the first three days, more than 50 nations spoke in favor of promptly completing the negotiations. Then U.S. Ambassador Donald Mahley brought the entire process to an end: “The United States has concluded that the current approach to a protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention...is not, in our view, capable of...strengthening confidence in compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention.... We will therefore be unable to support the current text, even with changes.”



Later in 2001, “the United States tried at the last minute to terminate protocol negotiations completely, throwing the meeting into disorder and leaving no option but to suspend the conference until November 2002.” The U.S. earned disappointment, criticism, and anger from the world community for blocking enforceable inspections of sites where terrorists might develop, purchase, or steal biological weapons for their own use.

When the attack on September 11, 2001, demonstrated the urgent threat of terrorism, the U.S. representative did not try to block the continuation of annual study meetings or the proposal that they might try again for adoption of the treaty in 2006. We do not know whether the United States will support a revised treaty, but just peacemaking urges reducing bioweapons and working with cooperative forces in the international community.

#### **DELIVERANCE FOR ISRAEL AND PALESTINE**

Israel’s occupation of Palestine and assassinations of terrorist leaders, with U.S. support, may be the greatest source of anger and prod to terrorist recruitment among Arabs and Muslims in the Middle East. The just peacemaking ethic calls on all nations involved to practice and support *cooperative conflict resolution*.

Three processes of conflict resolution in the Middle East have occurred: the Oslo Declaration of Principles (1993) signed by the Israeli and Palestinian governments, the offer of the twelve surrounding Arab states to support peace and security for Israel if it agrees to the two-state solution; and the Geneva Accord (2003) negotiated by former governmental leaders of Israel and Palestine. All three reached basically the same solution: there should be two states, Israel and Palestine, with their 1967 borders adjusted to permit some Israeli settlements in the West Bank and compensate Palestine with land in present-day Israel. Yet Israel keeps extending settlements in the West Bank and occupying Palestinian territory militarily; Ariel Sharon calls this “occupation” and admits that it causes great hostility among Palestinians. And Hamas and Islamic Jihad keep fomenting suicide killings of Israeli civilians, violating the just war rule against targeting noncombatants and Muslim teachings against suicide and wrongful killing. Clearly the solution is to support the result of the conflict resolution processes: to return Palestinian homeland to Palestinian rule. Occupation of homeland by foreign forces is what causes suicide terrorism: of the sixteen suicide terrorist campaigns worldwide, from Lebanon to Sri Lanka, Palestine, Turkey, Chechnya, Saudi Arabia, and Kashmir, all have focused on liberating a homeland from foreign occupation.<sup>6</sup>

The prophets of Israel cautioned that if the nation did not keep covenant with God, do justice, and stop trusting in military weapons rather than in the ways of God, it would experience the destruction of war and be sent into exile. Jesus warned five times of the destruction of the temple if

Israel did not do the things that make for peace.<sup>7</sup> Ideologues and Zionists who say today that Israel can practice injustice, put its trust in military weapons, and violate God's ways, yet at the same time maintain security in the land, are doing Israel no favor. They are misleading the people, and betraying the word of the prophets and of Jesus.

Israel is traumatized by the Holocaust, the hostility of surrounding Arab nations, and the violent terrorism of the Palestinians. Palestine is traumatized by the occupation, the expanding settlements, and the violence and assassinations by Israel. They both need help if peace is to be made.

When the Bush administration in its first days disengaged from conflict resolution efforts in the Middle East, a weak and divided Palestine faced a powerful Sharon-led government, Palestinians faced injustice and lost hope, and there was a huge increase in terrorism. "By any measure 2002 was an astonishing year for Israel in terms of suicide bombings. An average of five attacks a month were made, nearly double the number during the first fifteen months of the second intifada—and that number was itself more than ten times the monthly average since 1993."<sup>8</sup>

President Bush embraced the "Roadmap for Peace in the Middle East" in 2002, which illustrates the just peacemaking practice of *independent initiatives* in which each side takes actions: Palestine named a Prime Minister other than Arafat, and suspended terrorism for three months; Israel pulled back temporarily from occupation of northern Gaza and Bethlehem, and released several prisoners. But then Israel assassinated terrorist leaders, Palestine re-initiated terrorism, and Israel re-occupied. Peace in the Middle East requires continued firm U.S. support for the two-state solution that was the objective of the Roadmap for Peace, and was the conflict resolution agreement in the Geneva Accords.

### **GETTING INVOLVED IN PEACEMAKING**

Terrorism has become an international problem, sponsored by networks in a hundred countries. Preventing terrorism is much more than the United States, or any single nation, can handle unilaterally, regardless of its great military power. If the United States aligns its power with the cooperative forces in the international system, together they can do a great deal for peaceful change.

A key practice of just peacemaking is to *support grassroots peacemaking groups*. Individuals and congregations can become involved in local community peacemaking groups, or national organizations like Peace Action ([www.peace-action.org](http://www.peace-action.org)) and church groups such as Baptist Peace Fellowship ([www.bpfna.org](http://www.bpfna.org)) and Every Church a Peace Church ([www.ecapc.org](http://www.ecapc.org)).

### **NOTES**

1 Glen H. Stassen, ed., *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices for Abolishing War* (Pilgrim Press: 1998 and 2004) is a good place to start reading about just peacemaking theory. Then see

the seven articles and extensive bibliography in Christine E. Gudorf and Paul Lauritzen, eds., *The Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 23:1 (Spring 2003). Other articles and books are listed at [www.fuller.edu/sot/faculty/stassen](http://www.fuller.edu/sot/faculty/stassen). The long-range strategy of Peace Action, the largest grassroots peace organization, incorporates many elements of just peacemaking theory ([www.peace-action.org](http://www.peace-action.org)).

2 See the *Washington Quarterly* reader on terrorism, Alexander T. J. Lennon, ed., *The Battle for Hearts and Minds* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 73, 79, 91, 153, etc. (further page citations will be in the text).

3 *Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 69, 286; and Arnold Howitt and Robyn Pangi, eds., *Countering Terrorism: Dimensions of Preparedness* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), chapter 5.

4 Anthony J. Blinken, "Winning the War of Ideas," in *The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 285.

5 Mark Wheelis, Malcolm Dando, and Catherine Auer, "Back to Bioweapons?" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 59:1 (January/February, 2003), 40-47 (further quotations in the text are from this article). The George W. Bush administration rejected not only verification of biological weapons, but also the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, the Kyoto anti-global-warming treaty, the International Criminal Court, international restraints on unilaterally making preemptive war, and the treaty banning land mines, and it disengaged from international efforts for peacemaking between Israel and Palestine, and peacemaking with North Korea. Just peacemaking says counterterrorism requires the cooperation of many nations, but to persuade them to cooperate, the United States itself needs a cooperative foreign policy.

6 Robert Pape, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *The American Political Science Review* 97:3 (August 2003), 348-9.

7 Leslie Allen and Glen Stassen, "How Christian is Zionism?" *Sojourners* (July/August, 2003); available online at [www.sajo.net](http://www.sajo.net).

8 Bruce Hoffman, "The Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *Atlantic Monthly* 291:5 (June 2003), 44.



**GLEN H. STASSEN**

is Lewis B. Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California.

This photo is available  
in the print version  
of Peace and War.

**William Blake believed that works of art, by offering insights into the metaphysical world, can help rescue us from our materialism and spiritual doubt. In this watercolor drawing he celebrates, with the psalmist, the graceful kiss of Justice and Peace.**

*William Blake (1757-1827), MERCY AND TRUTH ARE MET TOGETHER. RIGHTEOUSNESS AND PEACE HAVE KISSED EACH OTHER, early 19th century. Watercolor, 43.1 x 37.6 cm. ©V & A Images/Victoria and Albert Museum, London.*

# A Gentle Embrace

BY HEIDI J. HORNICK

The English printmaker, painter, and poet William Blake believed that works of art, by offering insights into the metaphysical world, can help rescue us from our materialism and spiritual doubt.<sup>1</sup> This watercolor illuminates Psalm 85, especially its celebration of God's forgiveness of the people and their responding faithfulness: "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (85:10, KJV).

The artist imagines a scene before God's throne and surrounded by angels. God perhaps is holding a book of judgment. In the foreground, personifications of justice (or righteousness) and peace sit facing away from one another. Yet at this moment they turn to kiss, and within their embrace we see a crimson cross. The entire composition is graceful in its curvaceous lines and willowy forms.

True reconciliation always involves a delicate balance of peace with justice, and mercy with truth. This truth came home to peacemaker John Paul Lederach when he traveled with the International Conciliation team of the Mennonite Central Committee during the Nicaraguan civil war. The team reflected on Psalm 85:10 daily, he recalls, imagining four voices—of mercy, truth, righteousness, and peace—coming before God with their varying perspectives on the tragic discord in Nicaragua.

Lederach discovered that the verse, when understood this way, communicated to diplomats, rebel generals, and peasants alike. As an exercise in reconciliation, he invited individuals or small groups to identify with one of the voices and to ask, "What would this voice say in our situation of conflict? Truth, he reports, wanted to establish what really happened; mercy desired to forgive and move forward. Justice called for a full accounting of wrongdoing; peace was ready for healing to begin.<sup>2</sup>

Blake chooses to depict Justice and Peace, rather than Mercy and Truth. Only through their gentle embrace, as personified in Blake's painting and manifested in Lederach's experience, can reconciliation be achieved.

## NOTES

1 David Bindman: "Blake, William," *The Grove Dictionary of Art Online*, (Oxford University Press, Accessed [11 June 2004]) <<http://www.groveart.com>>.

2 See the interview "The Heart of Reconciliation: A Conversation with John Paul Lederach" in *Forgiveness*, volume 1, *Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics* (2001):78-84. His story of using Psalm 85:10 is on pp. 83-84.

This photo is available  
in the print version  
of Peace and War.

**The innocence of the child, hugging the neck of the lion,  
is a powerful appeal for concord in the church. PEACEABLE  
KINGDOM presents the prophet Isaiah's vision clearly.  
Only one thing eludes us—the request Edward Hicks  
makes of his audience—peace.**

*Edward Hicks (1780-1849), PEACEABLE KINGDOM, 1826. Oil on canvas, 32 ½ x 41 ½ in. Philadelphia Museum of Art: Bequest of Charles C. Willis.*

# Kingdom Come

BY HEIDI J. HORNICK

Edward Hicks famously painted sixty-two versions of *Peaceable Kingdom*, portraying Isaiah's prophecy: "The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them" (Isaiah 11:6). Though the artist was neither well-trained by today's standards nor well-known during his lifetime, his paintings are displayed now in classrooms, churches, art studios, and art history lecture halls. *Peaceable Kingdom* presents the biblical narrative clearly and in pleasing colors. Only one thing eludes us—the request Hicks makes of his audience—peace.

In the foreground, domestic and wild animals share a common space with a child. The Philadelphia work illustrated here, like most versions of the theme, also depicts Englishman William Penn signing a treaty with the Leni-Lenape Indians in 1682. According to tradition, this ceremony occurred under the "Treaty Elm" at Shackamaxon, half a mile north of the center of Philadelphia. The poem in the border relates Isaiah's vision of peace to the founding of Pennsylvania, which means "Penn's woods."

It's not quite accurate to describe the painting's style as naïve or simplistic. The artist intentionally worked in the American folk art tradition, as a major retrospective, "The Kingdoms of Edward Hicks," showed in 1999. He preferred simple figures in an organized placement on a flat picture plane.

A devout Quaker family raised Hicks after his mother's death in 1781. Trained as a craftsman, as measured by their Quaker sensibilities, he painted only utilitarian objects: coaches, houses, and signs, and decorations on milk buckets, clock faces, and fireboards. After farming for a time, he became a Quaker minister at the age of thirty-two.

Hick's religious beliefs, simplicity, and self-discipline were rooted in eighteenth-century quietism. He traveled widely and saw the division between orthodox Quakers in England and more liberal-minded American Quakers. The *Peaceable Kingdom* series began about eight years into his ministry, as "painted sermons" to teach other Quakers his intense religious conviction. The innocence of the child, hugging the neck of the lion, is Hicks' powerful statement of peace. In later versions, the animals represent different factions in the Quaker unrest.



# Worship Service

BY DAVID M. BRIDGES

---

## The Hope for Peace

*Solo:*

“Let There Be Peace on Earth”

Let there be peace on earth  
and let it begin with me;  
let there be peace on earth,  
the peace that was meant to be.  
With God as our Father  
brothers all are we,  
let me walk with my brother  
in perfect harmony.

Let peace begin with me,  
let this be the moment now;  
with every step I take,  
let this be my solemn vow:  
to take each moment and live each moment  
in peace eternally.  
Let there be peace on earth  
and let it begin with me.

*Jill Jackson and Sy Miller*

*Copyright 1955, 1983 by Jan-Lee Music; used by permission.*

*Call to Worship: Isaiah 11:1-2a, 6, 9*

Leader: There shall come forth a shoot from the branch of Jesse,

**People: and a branch shall grow out of his roots.**

The spirit of the LORD shall rest on him,

**the spirit of wisdom and understanding.**

The wolf shall live with the lamb,

**the leopard shall lie down with the kid,**

the calf and the lion and the fatling together,  
**and a little child shall lead them.**  
They shall not hurt or destroy  
**on all my holy mountain;**  
**All: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord**  
**as the waters cover the sea.**

*Hymn:*

“Your Kingdom Come, O Lord”

Your Kingdom come, O Lord,  
wide circling as the sun;  
fulfill of old Your Word  
and make the nations one.

One in the bond of peace,  
the service glad and free  
of truth and righteousness,  
of love and equity.

*Frederick L. Hosmer (1905)*

*Tune: ST. CECILIA (Hayne)*

*Scripture Reading with Sung Response: Psalm 122*

*(Congregation sings refrain of “On Jordan’s Stormy Banks I Stand”<sup>1</sup>)*

**I am bound for the promised land,  
I am bound for the promised land,  
O who will come and go with me,  
I am bound for the promised land.**

I was glad when they said to me,  
“Let us go to the house of the LORD!”  
Our feet are standing  
within your gates, O Jerusalem.  
Jerusalem—built as a city  
that is bound firmly together.  
To it the tribes go up,  
the tribes of the LORD,  
as was decreed for Israel,  
to give thanks to the name of the LORD.

**I am bound for the promised land,  
I am bound for the promised land,  
O who will come and go with me,  
I am bound for the promised land.**

For there the thrones for judgment were set up,  
the thrones of the house of David.  
Pray for the peace of Jerusalem:  
“May they prosper who love you.  
Peace be within your walls,  
and security within your towers.”  
For the sake of my relatives and friends  
I will say, “Peace be within you.”  
For the sake of the house of the LORD our God,  
I will seek your good.

**I am bound for the promised land,  
I am bound for the promised land,  
O who will come and go with me,  
I am bound for the promised land.**

### *Prayers for Peace*

The leader reads communal petitions for peace,  
and the congregation responds: **Gracious God, grant us your peace.**

### *Anthem:*

“Dona Nobis Pacem (Grant Us Peace)”

*Traditional round*



## The Reality of Life

### *Scripture Reading: Ecclesiastes 1:1-11*

*(Individuals read a news headline of conflict, war, or violence, as indicated.)*

The words of the Teacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem.  
Vanity of vanities, says the Teacher,  
vanity of vanities! All is vanity.

What do people gain from all the toil  
at which they toil under the sun?  
A generation goes, and a generation comes,  
but the earth remains forever.

*From the headlines ...*

The sun rises and the sun goes down,  
and hurries to the place where it rises.  
The wind blows to the south,  
and goes around to the north;  
round and round goes the wind,  
and on its circuits the wind returns.

*From the headlines ...*

All streams run to the sea,  
but the sea is not full;  
to the place where the streams flow,  
there they continue to flow.  
All things are wearisome;  
more than one can express;  
the eye is not satisfied with seeing,  
or the ear filled with hearing.

*From the headlines ...*

What has been is what will be,  
and what has been done is what will be done;  
there is nothing new under the sun.  
Is there a thing of which it is said,  
"See, this is new"?  
It has already been,  
in the ages before us.

*From the headlines ...*

The people of long ago are not remembered,  
nor will there be any remembrance  
of people yet to come  
by those who come after them.

*Solo:*

"Come Sunday"

*Duke Ellington (1945)*

*Sermon:*

“Not Peace But a Sword” (Matthew 10:34-39)

“Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.

For I have come to set a man against his father,  
and a daughter against her mother,  
and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law;  
and one’s foes will be members of one’s own household.

Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me;  
and whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me;  
and whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy  
of me. Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their  
life for my sake will find it.”

*Scripture Reading with Sung Response: Matthew 24:1-8*

As Jesus came out of the temple and was going away, his disciples  
came to point out to him the buildings of the temple. Then he asked  
them, “You see all these, do you not? Truly I tell you, not one stone  
will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down.”

*(Solo or choir sings verses, congregation sings refrain.<sup>2</sup>)*

We are tossed and driv’n on the restless sea of time;  
somber skies and howling tempests oft succeed a bright sunshine;  
in that land of perfect day, when the mists have rolled away,  
we will understand it better by and by.

*By and by, when the morning comes,  
when the saints of God are gathered home,  
we’ll tell the story how we’ve overcome,  
for we’ll understand it better by and by.*

When he was sitting on the Mount of Olives, the disciples came to him  
privately, saying, “Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign  
of your coming and of the end of the age?” Jesus answered them, “Be-  
ware that no one leads you astray.”

We are often destitute of the things that life demands,  
want of food and want of shelter, thirsty hills and barren lands;  
we are trusting in the Lord, and according to God’s Word,  
we will understand it better by and by.

*By and by, when the morning comes,  
when the saints of God are gathered home,  
we'll tell the story how we've overcome,  
for we'll understand it better by and by.*

"For many will come in my name, saying, 'I am the Messiah!' and they will lead many astray. And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that you are not alarmed; for this must take place, but the end is not yet."

Trials dark on every hand, and we cannot understand  
all the ways that God could lead us to that blessed promised land;  
but He guides us with His eye, and we'll follow till we die,  
for we'll understand it better by and by.

*By and by, when the morning comes,  
when the saints of God are gathered home,  
we'll tell the story how we've overcome,  
for we'll understand it better by and by.*

"For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famines and earthquakes in various places: all this is but the beginning of the birth pangs."

Temptations, hidden snares often take us unawares,  
and our hearts are made to bleed for a thoughtless word or deed;  
and we wonder why the test when we try to do our best,  
but we'll understand it better by and by.

*By and by, when the morning comes,  
when the saints of God are gathered home,  
we'll tell the story how we've overcome,  
for we'll understand it better by and by.*

*Hymn:*

"Lead On, O King Eternal"

Lead on, O King eternal,  
the day of march has come;  
henceforth in fields of conquest  
Thy tents shall be our home.  
Through days of preparation  
Thy grace has made us strong;  
and now, O King eternal,  
we lift our battle song.

Lead on, O King eternal,  
till sin's fierce war shall cease,  
and holiness shall whisper  
the sweet amen of peace.  
For not with swords' loud clashing,  
nor roll of stirring drums;  
with deeds of love and mercy  
the heavenly kingdom comes.

Lead on, O King eternal,  
we follow, not with fears,  
for gladness breaks like morning  
where'er Thy face appears.  
Your cross is lifted over us,  
we journey in its light;  
the crown awaits the conquest;  
lead on, O God of might.

*Ernest W. Shurtleff (1888)*  
*Tune: LANCASHIRE*



## The Kingdom of God

*Anthem or Solo:*

*"Down by the Riverside"*

*Traditional spiritual*

*Hymn:*

*"God is Working His Purpose Out,"* verses 1, 3, 4, and 5

God is working his purpose out  
as year succeeds to year;  
God is working his purpose out,  
and the time is drawing near;  
Nearer and nearer draws the time,  
the time that shall surely be,  
when the earth shall be filled  
with the glory of God  
as the waters cover the sea.



What can we do to work God's work,  
to prosper and increase  
the brotherhood of all mankind,  
the reign of the Prince of Peace?  
What can we do to hasten the time,  
the time that shall surely be,  
when the earth shall be filled  
with the glory of God  
as the waters cover the sea?

All we can do is nothing worth  
unless God blesses the deed;  
vainly we hope for the harvest-tide  
till God gives life to the seed;  
yet near and nearer draws the time,  
the time that shall surely be,  
when the earth shall be filled  
with the glory of God  
as the waters cover the sea.

*Arthur C. Ainger (1894)*

*Tune: PURPOSE*

*Sermon:*

"Loving Enemies" (Matthew 5:9, 38-48)

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called the children of God...."

"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 an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also; and if anyone wants to sue you and take your coat, give your cloak as well; and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile. Give to everyone who begs from you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you.

"You have heard that it was 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 children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax

collectors do the same? And if you greet only your brothers and sisters, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.”

*Scripture Reading: Revelation 21: 1-4*

*(Let the words be unprinted, and the reader hidden from worshipers.)*

*Hymn:*

“In Christ There is No East or West”

In Christ there is no East or West,  
in him no South or North,  
but one great fellowship of love  
throughout the whole wide earth.

In him shall true hearts everywhere  
their high communion find;  
his service is the golden cord  
close binding humankind.

Join hands, then, members of the faith,  
whate'er your race may be!  
Who serves my Father as his child  
is surely kin to me.

In Christ now meet both East and West,  
in him meet North and South;  
all Christly souls are one in him  
throughout the whole wide earth.

*William A. Dunkerley (1908)*

*Tune: ST. PETER (Reinagle)*

*Passing of the Peace:*

*(spoken to one another)* **The peace of God be with you now and forever.**

*Benediction: John 14:27*

Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. I do not give to you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled, and do not let them be afraid.

*Choral or Solo Response:*

"Go Now in Peace"<sup>3</sup>

*Natalie Sleeth (1976)*

**NOTES**

1 "On Jordan's Stormy Banks," text by Samuel Stennett (1787), music by Miss M. Durham, *The Southern Harmony and Musical Companion*, edited by William Walker (New York: Hastings House, 1835); arranged by Rigdon M. McIntosh, 1895.

2 "We'll Understand It Better, By and By," text and music by Charles A. Tindley, 1905.

3 © Hinshaw Music, Inc. Available by calling 1-800-568-7805.

---

**DAVID M. BRIDGES**

*is Director of Music at McKendree United Methodist Church in Nashville, TN, and teaches at Belmont University and Middle Tennessee State University.*

# Let Us Sing a Song of Peace

BY TERRY W. YORK

---

Let us sing a song of peace  
that will not fade away,  
a song of peace that grips our hearts  
and sings in all we do and say.

Let us pray a prayer for peace  
that goes beyond, "Amen,"  
a living, loving, lasting prayer  
that's prayed for always and again.

Let us live each day for peace  
against each type of war  
that takes from those who have the least  
and gives to those with most, much more.

Let us praise the Prince of Peace  
with actions He would claim,  
forsaking modern-day crusades  
that break commandments in His name.

# Let Us Sing a Song of Peace

TERRY W. YORK

G. DAVID BOLIN

Let us sing a song of peace that will not fade a -  
 Let us pray a prayer for peace that goes be - yond, "A -  
 Let us live each day for peace a - gainst each type of  
 Let us praise the Prince of Peace with ac - tions He would

way, a song of peace that grips our hearts and  
 men," a liv - ing, lov - ing, last - ing prayer that's  
 war that takes from those who have the least and  
 claim, for - sak - ing mo - dern - day cru - sades that

sings in all we do and say.  
 prayed for al - ways and a - gain.  
 gives to those with most, much more.  
 break com - mand - ments in His name.

Tune: BYODO INN 7.6.8.8.

# The Armor of God

BY BOB FOX

In our fantasies we imagine that the struggle against evil is about running to the front lines, charging into the fray, and setting things right by projecting our own power. It's not. The book of Ephesians calls us to put on God's defensive armor and wield just one weapon, as it were, "the Word of God."

---

*Ephesians 6:10-18*

**Y**ou were not surprised to see political novice Arnold Schwarzenegger elected governor of California, were you? I wasn't. "The Terminator" as leader fits well with our underlying cultural programming. It's the epitome of our obsession with power and rugged individualism to elect a man who offers no carefully nuanced positions, but only Hollywood catch phrases.

Arnold Schwarzenegger's movie characters project power. Typically they are bare-chested with guns in both hands, and always on the offensive. They resonate well with the people of a super power. If our security is threatened, we prefer a first-strike policy to get rid of the bad guys.

Doesn't God want evil to be fully defeated and utterly destroyed? Shouldn't we be God's little action heroes ridding the world of all the bad people and things? Isn't the word of God an offensive weapon to beat people over their heads until they agree with the truth?

In our fantasies as we imagine the struggle against evil, it's about running to the front lines and charging into the fray. It's not, "Put on the full armor of God, so that when the day of evil comes, you may be able to stand your ground" (Ephesians 6:13, NIV<sup>†</sup>). The American way is to grab a howitzer of holiness, a grenade launcher of grace, and an M-16 of mercy as the weapons for God's warriors so that we can be victorious over evil.

### **FACING THE REAL ENEMY**

Certainly evil is a serious presence in our lives. Some people may have the notion that human beings will do the right thing if left to our own devices, but Scripture and common experience tell us that is not so. In the newspaper every day we read about evil happening in our world. We see evil present in our own lives and, disturbingly, in the life of the church.

Evil is insidious and seeps into our lives wherever it can. Like water into a leak-prone basement, evil keeps on probing until it eventually finds a way in.

We prefer to think of evil differently, as embodied in a person; then it is easier to understand and to target. “If only we change *or* eliminate so-and-so,” we say, “the world will be safer and everyone will be happier.” We’ve done this for years, yet the world is not discernibly safer.

Though we’d like to live in a simple and straightforward world, the truth is we are called to “take our stand against the devil’s schemes” (6:11, NIV). Evil is so much more conspiring and sneaky than we can handle. If temptations were not so attractive, we wouldn’t buckle under to them—we’re never tempted to steal the neighbor’s garbage, are we? Evil would be easy to best if it were not so infernally attractive. Ironically, just at that moment when evil does not seem all that bad, it is really insidious.

“For our struggle is not against enemies of flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places” (6:12). Evil is not a small matter to be dealt with flippantly; it is a cosmic reality that exists not only in people’s hearts, but in systems and cultures that sit on top of human beings and lead them to behave in malicious ways. This makes evil even more dangerous and powerful—thus, the American soldiers who abused the Iraqi prisoners were not all wicked people, but they were caught up by a cascading system of evil that swept them away from their moorings.

The forces of evil are pushing us toward what John Paul II calls “a culture of death,” where life generally is devalued; most people are cast as members of interest groups to be manipulated, rather than individuals to be loved; and the non-productive ones are shuffled out of sight entirely so that their needs can be ignored. Evil fosters an atmosphere where attractiveness, rather than our common creation by God, determines one’s value. No one cares much about community anymore; each individual’s reality is bounded by self-interest that brackets out the rest of the world.

### **DRAWING THE PROPER WEAPON**

No wonder we think the truly Christian response is to launch an offensive against evil. Yet, if we go on the offensive—setting things right by projecting our own power, judging people, and killing the bad guys—the message of the Gospel is distorted and its power is dulled by our own evil.



Jesus never attempted to take over the political realm to make the world behave. Jesus never raised an army of the elect to slay the oppressors and to bring about justice and righteousness.

Two radically different worldviews stand opposed. One says we should use the world—the power of government and its political systems—to make people choose faith. The other is the ethic of Jesus who

never led an army, but died on a cross.

---

**Adequately prepared for battle, we expect that we will be ordered into the fight against evil. Yet when we are fully armed, this is not the time to fight, Ephesians warns, but to pray! Prayer is our ministry and our means in the clash.**

---

Radical evil is defeated, Ephesians tells us, by standing firm. The defeat of evil is already accomplished in the cross, where the Son's willingness to die for humanity results in the salvation of all who would follow him.

We are called, then, not to take up offensive weapons, but to put on the ar-

mor of God. The belt of truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the shoes of peace, the shield of faith, the helm of salvation: not a single offensive weapon is among them. The only weapon, as it were, is "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."

Notice that the shield of faith protects disciples from the "flaming arrows of the evil one." Flaming arrows—finally, here is mention of a long-range offensive weapon, one that can be fired from distant hiding places! But isn't a sword (of any kind) a poor match against this sort of attacker? The sword of the Spirit is surely a defensive weapon to be used only when the enemy has gotten too close; it is no help until we can look into the face of our opponent. Put on this defensive armor Ephesians says. Carry only the gospel truth and wield it only at close range.

This scripture passage takes another startling turn at the end. Once we are adequately prepared for battle, we expect that we will be ordered into the fight against evil. Yet when we are fully armed, this is not the time to fight, Ephesians warns, it is time to pray! It is our cultural expectation (probably not shared by the people of Ephesus) that in prayer one bows the head and bends the knee. How does such a warrior, who is fervently praying with hands clasped and body folded into a fetal position, reach for a big metal sword? As one is praying that God will defeat the evil that is at one's door and push back the evil that is already in one's life—what good is such an unwieldy weapon of death anyway? The sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, is what we really need.

**WHEN THINGS ARE UPSIDE DOWN**

A four-year-old elbowed his father one Sunday during the morning worship service in our church. “You know what you get when you turn the cross upside down?” the boy asked, his active mind fixed upon the large cross suspended over the baptistery. Quickly he supplied the answer, “You get a sword!”

When you turn the cross upside down, you get a sword—that uncomfortable truth has plagued the church throughout its history in our ungodly holy wars and military crusading. But when you turn a sword upside down, you get the cross. It is the hope of the world.

Peter drew his big metal sword to cut off the ear of the high priest’s servant in a futile effort to forestall the crucifixion. But Jesus healed the man, turned Peter’s sword upside down, and hung there in suffering obedience.

Put on the armor of God, Ephesians says, and then pray. Pray that the mystery of the gospel, through its powerful ways that we cannot understand, will change the world. In this cosmic struggle between God and the forces of evil, prayer is our ministry and our means in the clash.

It is time we got off of our high horses, stopped believing in our innate goodness and all we suppose we can do, and acknowledge that we can never defeat evil. We are called to pray.

**NOTE**

† Scripture quotations marked (NIV) are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

---

**BOB FOX**

*is Pastor of Faith Baptist Church in Georgetown, Kentucky.*

# Making Peace with Our Enemies

BY GEORGE A. MASON

We wholeheartedly long for “the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding,” but it is not a personal privilege of the privately pious. It is thrown into doubt every time we are confronted with the choice of whether we will deal with our enemies as righteous warriors or pitiful peacemakers.

---

*Matthew 5:43-48*  
*Romans 12:17-21*

A brief scene in *Till We Have Faces*, C. S. Lewis’s wonderful retelling of the fable of Cupid and Psyche, reveals something we never seem to repair in our natures. Redival, the king’s second daughter who’s always been a bit feather-headed, has grown wayward and reckless. When a palace maid sees Redival whispering intimately with and kissing a young officer of the guard named Tarin, the servant awakens the king to inform on the lovers. Enraged over his property being violated, the king immediately orders the young man neutered and sold as a slave to a nearby kingdom. The king hoped that would be the end of the matter. Of course, it never is, is it? Years later, Tarin’s father organizes disgruntled nobles and other malcontents in a revolt against the king. A single act of violence committed in anger against one man begets a civil war in the kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

Isn’t this the way of the world? Violence begets violence, revenge breeds revenge, and retaliation produces retaliation ad nauseam and ad infinitum. The eye-for-an-eye, tooth-for-a-tooth principle, which is often mistakenly cited as the pinnacle of biblical justice, originally was given to limit vengeance and prevent violence from getting out of hand. But taking

justice into our own hands by chopping off the hand of an enemy for stealing does nothing but hand us a lifetime of animosity and worry.

Original sin, G. K. Chesterton once observed, is the only empirically proven Christian doctrine. Just look at any child born into the world and before long you see that cute innocent nature turn ugly like the rest of us sinners. Close behind original sin in the empirical proof sweepstakes, is the principle that violence begets violence. If we hate our enemy, we may be doing what comes naturally, and we may even be justified for doing it, but we only end up caught in a cycle of hatred that will always, always, always end badly for everyone, including us.

### **LOVING OUR ENEMIES**

We wholeheartedly long for “the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding” that the Apostle Paul promises the Christians of Philippi “will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus” (4:7). The peace of God, our peace with God, is made possible by and experienced continually in Christ, the Prince of Peace. Yet it is not a personal privilege of the privately pious. It is thrown into doubt every time we are confronted with the choice of whether we will deal with our enemies as righteous warriors or pitiful peacemakers.

I mean the word *pitiful* in its noblest sense. To have pity is not to look down on someone, but rather to look up at what that person might be if it weren't for the evil that has taken hold in the soul. It is to have mercy upon another and to see, as we say, there but for the grace of God go I. We try to identify with our enemy and imagine what it might be like to live in that person's skin. Only then do we act.

This is, after all, the kind of pity God has for you and me in Christ Jesus. God puts on the uniform of flesh and shares the injustices and insults of all who make themselves our enemies. And yet Christ refuses to be his enemies' enemy. He sets himself against their hate by loving them instead.

Jesus practices what he preaches in a way few of us do. In the Sermon on the Mount, he turns the values of the world on their head and shows how our practices can be redemptive instead of retributive: “You have heard that it was 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 children of your Father in heaven” (Matthew 5:43-45a).

We don't know where it was ever said, “You shall hate your enemy.” Maybe it was one of those pieces of street wisdom that passed for Scripture right alongside “God helps those who help themselves.” But it does benefit our instinct for payback.

We practice vengeance at every level of human relationship. When we argue as spouses, our repeatedly unsuccessful strategy is to match one another blame for blame, as though we could make the other person's point

go away by proving our spouse has been as bad as we have been. This never works, if “works” means winning. The only thing we accomplish is their deeper unhappiness with us. Now multiply this hurtful result by a factor of the distance between strangers or enemies instead of loved ones, and you see where this leads. Think of school bullies or work colleagues locked in a struggle of estrangement. Or the strategy in the Middle East

---

**Only the gospel of Jesus Christ breaks the cycle of human vengeance and violence. God forgives us first, not waiting for us to ask, and then makes loving appeal to win our hearts and make friends out of enemies.**

---

right now, where Israel and the Palestinians act as though the way to peace is to kill their enemies until no one is left on the other side or they get too tired of attending funerals. How does vengeance become a victory? How can it bring peace? All it will produce is deeper hatred.

Only the gospel of Jesus Christ breaks the cycle of human vengeance and violence. God forgives us first, not waiting for us to ask, and then makes loving appeal to win our hearts and make friends out of enemies.

J. R. R. Tolkien’s trilogy, *The Lord of the Rings*, helps us to understand Jesus’ difficult teaching. “The pity of Bilbo may rule the fate of many” is the only line appearing in all three books and is, as Ralph Wood notes, the “moral and religious center” of Tolkien’s story.<sup>2</sup> Bilbo Baggins, you recall, is the hobbit who vouchsafed the evil Ring after saving it from the deformed and wicked Gollum. Bilbo’s nephew, Frodo, remarks to the wise wizard Gandalf, “What a pity that Bilbo did not stab that vile creature when he had a chance!” “Pity? [Gandalf replies] It was Pity that stayed his hand. Pity, and Mercy: not to strike without need. And he has been well rewarded, Frodo. Be sure that [Bilbo] took so little hurt from the evil, and escaped in the end, because he began his ownership of the Ring so. With Pity.” Gandalf understands that Gollum deserves death and that he will likely not be cured of his evil before he dies. Yet he says, “even the very wise cannot see all ends.”<sup>3</sup> Likewise we must, as the Apostle Paul warns, “leave room for the wrath of the God” who alone is able to see all ends (Romans 12:19). We must not judge others ourselves.

Bilbo’s pity becomes a counter-cultural value that pervades the epic. When at last the evil wizard Saruman is captured, the hobbits clamor for his execution. Yet Frodo, having learned the power of the pity of Bilbo from Gandalf, offers pardon to Saruman. “It is useless to meet revenge with revenge,” says Frodo; “it will heal nothing.” Pity and pardon are not what Saruman wants, however. Knowing that he is doubly defeated by

Frodo, he becomes angrier. “You have grown, Halfling. Yes, you have grown very much. You are wise, and cruel. You have robbed my revenge of sweetness, and now I must go hence in bitterness, in debt to your mercy. I hate it and you!” (3:298-299).

We cannot be certain that our pity will bring about the transformation of our enemies, but we know that it brings about ours and makes possible theirs. If we do as Jesus commands, if we make peace with our enemies by loving them, we can know at least that we are children of our heavenly Father. We may not be perfect—which means to be fully mature and completely true to our created nature—but we will be more like our perfect Father (Matthew 5:45, 48).

#### **OVERCOMING EVIL WITH GOOD**

Orelander Love had never met a Christian, at least not one whom he knew really followed Christ, until he met Ms. Jeanette D. Aldred. She was eighty-eight when they met while Orelander Love was robbing her house. He thought the house was empty, but when he found Ms. Aldred in her bed, he panicked and started hitting her over the head. “[She] did what Jesus did under the worst circumstance, under the threat of her life and limb. She said to me, ‘Jesus loves you. I forgive you. God bless you.’ She said these things even as I beat her, kicked, robbed and cursed her. She did not deserve it, but she did as Christ did.”

In days following, Mr. Love continued to rob houses, but he was haunted by the words of the woman who forgave him even as he hurt her. He was finally arrested and when the police questioned him about other burglaries, they mentioned Jeanette Aldred’s name. He began to cry. He confessed to the crime and wanted more than anything else to speak to her family. He never was able to see her again personally, but his life has not been the same since their encounter. Orelander Love has been a Christian now for six years. In a letter composed after Jeanette’s death at age 95, he wrote: “I do not now care about the years I will spend in prison or the media or the church screaming for vengeance. It was God with the rod that I feared. Ms. Aldred wanted no vengeance She wanted me saved. Well, I have been saved ... I praise God to every inmate who will hear. I thank God for Ms. Aldred.”<sup>4</sup>

This is what the Apostle Paul means by overcoming evil with good. It helps us understand his peculiar phrase “for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads” (Romans 12:20). In ancient times a house would be heated from a stove filled with burning coals in the center of the room. When a poor family was without adequate coal, the woman of the house might walk by her neighbors’ windows with a bowl balanced on her head. To preserve her dignity, neighbors would pluck a burning coal from their stove and drop it on her head as she passed by. Thus, to heap burning coals of fire on a person’s head was an act of kindness. But it could also

be something that leads to repentance, if it adds heat to the head of our enemy and causes her to think about what she has done.

The story is told of a Christian rice farmer in the south of China who employed a waterwheel driven by a treadmill to irrigate his crop during times of drought. On one occasion the farmer found that a neighbor, who owned two fields below his own, had breached the retaining wall between their fields in order to drain the irrigation water onto the neighbor's land. After the first time, the farmer repaired the breach and tried again. But twice more the neighbor drained away the water. At last the man consulted friends from his church, who prayed with him and agreed that something must be done that is beyond mere fairness. The farmer took it to heart, and the next day he watered the neighbor's two fields first and then watered his own. The neighbor, when he realized what had been done, was moved by the mercy of the Christian farmer. He began to inquire about the faith of this man who would return good for evil.

We may never become friends by making peace with our enemies, but we might just become neighbors. And that's a beginning. Are we making a start?

## NOTES

1 C. S. Lewis, *Till We Have Faces, A Myth Retold* (San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1956; reprinted San Francisco, CA: Harvest Books, 1980), 25.

2 I am indebted to Ralph C. Wood's discussion in *The Gospel According to Tolkien: Visions of the Kingdom in Middle-earth* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 117-155.

3 J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Lord of the Rings*, revised edition (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, 1967), volume I, pages 68-69 (further page citations will be in the text).

4 L. Gregory Jones, "Saint Jeanette," *The Christian Century* (September 20, 2003): 37.

---



**GEORGE A. MASON**

*is Pastor of Wilshire Baptist Church in Dallas, Texas.*



# Moral Equality among Soldiers

BY SCOTT A. STERLING

Though soldiers are not responsible for the declaration of war, they bear appropriate responsibility for how enemy soldiers and non-combatants are treated within war. How might the character of American service men and women be formed to recognize the inherent dignity of the enemy soldier?

---

In the just war tradition is a relatively obscure concept that Paul Christopher calls the “moral equality among soldiers.”<sup>1</sup> He traces the idea to Ambrose of Milan (ca. 340-397), who lifts up David as a military leader who showed love toward an enemy. Ambrose observes that David believed “justice should be shown to those who had borne arms against himself the same as to his own men,” a commitment that was sorely tested during the civil war that broke out after King Saul’s death. David’s formidable opponent and chief rival for the throne was Abner, Saul’s cousin and commander-in-chief. Yet “[David] admired Abner, the bravest champion of the opposing side, whilst he was their leader and was yet waging war,” writes Ambrose, referring to the events recorded in 2 Samuel 3, “Nor did he despise him when suing for peace, but honored him by a banquet. When killed by treachery, he mourned and wept for him.”<sup>2</sup> As Christopher suggests, “David accepts Abner as a moral equal because of the way he fights in war—independent of the rightness or wrongness of the war itself.”<sup>3</sup>

Likewise Augustine, whom Ambrose tutored in the faith and baptized in 387, startles us when he advises a warrior “even in waging war, [to] cherish the spirit of a peacemaker, that by conquering those whom you attack, you may lead them back to the advantages of peace; for our Lord

says: 'Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God.'<sup>4</sup> This is surely oxymoronic, for how can peace have anything to do with war? Yet Augustine reminds us that what is most evil in war "is not the death of some who would soon die in any case," but rather the "love of violence, revengeful cruelty, fierce and implacable enmity, wild resistance, and the lust of power, and such like."<sup>5</sup> In this opinion Augustine is

---

**Every service member would assent to the doctrines of right intent and proportionality, at least in a classroom discussion, conversation with a chaplain, or interview by CNN. The challenge is to maintain them in combat, even when the enemy has absolutely no intention of following suit.**

---

not naively dismissing the loss of human life, but is pointing us toward the grave spiritual dangers of warfare.

The ghastly images of U.S. soldiers torturing and pornographically humiliating Iraqis detained in Abu Ghraib prison are not only a deeply shameful embarrassment to our country, but also an unambiguous warning sign of the horrible spiritual destruction wrought by

the war. In the Abu Ghraib photos we see in our own soldiers "the real evils of war" of which Augustine warns, and they prompt us to wonder how soldiers today can practice justice in the treatment of individual enemy combatants, including even the terrorists who target innocents and violate the canons of the just war tradition.

#### **TREATMENT OF THE ENEMY**

Though individual soldiers are not responsible for the declaration of war, they bear appropriate responsibility for how enemy soldiers and non-combatants are treated within war. Two aspects of the just war tradition—the doctrines of right intention and proportionality of means—give shape to this responsibility and define the moral equality among soldiers.

Usually we think of right intention as the goal of the military enterprise, which according to the tradition must be the restoration of peace. John Howard Yoder calls this the "objective sense" of intention.<sup>6</sup> "We do not seek peace in order to be at war, but we go to war that we may have peace," writes Thomas Aquinas. "Be peaceful, therefore, in warring, so that you may vanquish those whom you war against, and bring them to the prosperity of peace."<sup>7</sup> Waging war for national glory or to weaken or destroy enemy regimes are not valid goals according to the doctrine of right intention.

Soldiers also must have proper motives in carrying out wartime duties.

This is right intention in a “subjective” sense, and it must never be hatred, revenge, cruelty, annihilation, the desire for power, or hunger for material gain. War is not glorious, and while we may celebrate military victory and the cessation of hostilities, this celebration must not include rejoicing over an enemy’s loss of life or devastation of their land. In place of such attitudes, right intentions include care for the victims of aggression and the desire to restore peace for the nation, dignity for individuals, and justice.

The doctrine of proportionality of means requires that the damage inflicted by the war not exceed the assumed injury prevented or offense avoided, and be proportionate to the guilt of the offender. Proportionality of means also refers to maintaining the dignity of humankind in the conduct of war, by avoiding unnatural cruelty (e.g., mutilation or torture), keeping faith with the enemy and not lying (with exceptions for ambush or subterfuge), not pillaging or destroying property (unless the enemy might use it for making war), not poisoning wells or rivers, not profaning of places of worship or cemeteries, and by “giving quarter” (i.e., not killing, even in combat, an enemy soldier who surrenders).

I believe that every service member would assent to these doctrines, at least in a classroom discussion, conversation with a chaplain, or interview by CNN. The challenge is to maintain these principles of right intention and proportionality while in combat, even when the enemy has absolutely no intention of following suit. Contemporary combat may only complicate how soldiers will behave, if, as many assume, when warriors have less face-to-face contact with enemy fighters, it becomes easier to dehumanize them.<sup>8</sup>

#### **BEYOND CODES OF CONDUCT**

How might the character of American service men and women be formed to recognize the inherent dignity of the individual enemy soldier? How can they take up the principles of the just war tradition not merely as a checklist to be scrutinized, but a lifestyle to be lived out both in peacetime and war?

Codes of conduct—in international laws and conventions, or merely informal—help many service members to act appropriately in times of war. Most soldiers, like most people in general, want to “do the right thing,” and this desire helps deter unlawful behavior. Yet when soldiers are consumed with fear or anger in battle, it is unrealistic to expect them to conduct themselves appropriately merely because they have studied abstract codes or manuals.

Some may internalize the moral equality of soldiers through their experiences in war. They may acknowledge that nobody on either side wants to be on the battlefield; they’d all rather be home with their families. Soldiers value courage, honor, loyalty and obedience, and when they see these characteristics in enemy soldiers, they are no longer just enemies in

the abstract; they are human beings, "poor sods like me."<sup>9</sup> Stories are told of soldiers feeling compassion as they listen to the cries of wounded enemy soldiers screaming for their loved ones, or when coming upon slain enemy soldiers who are clutching pictures of their spouses and children. They realize these soldiers are not the criminals who started the war, but the unfortunate souls who were sent to fight the battles, "just like me." Soldiers also learn from one another by example in wartime. Chaplain Leroy Ness describes an experience regarding the treatment of slain enemy soldiers:

In my first action there were some Vietnamese enemy killed. We were back on a firebase with bodies. I said to the battalion commander, "Before...the slick [helicopter] comes in to take them away for whatever intelligence purpose they have, I would like very much to have a memorial service for these two dead enemy soldiers.... It's important to remind soldiers that these soldiers had mothers, wives, and sweethearts who grieve and whose hopes had been dashed. We pray for the enemy. All of us must learn to love the enemy. As a Chaplain or as a pastor in the military or in a civilian context, I cannot abide trying to make myself believe, or the people whom I serve, believe that my enemies are the enemies of God." This position got me into a little trouble. But it set a new tone for how we behave with prisoners and how we treated the dead."<sup>10</sup>

The moral formation of soldiers will only be successful when military communities inculcate the character traits that embody their moral equality with enemies. From the first day of basic training, ROTC, Officer Candidate School, and the Military Academies through the end of a service person's career, we must consistently teach, model, and expect soldiers to embrace the virtues of a just warrior. Every aspect of military life is important in achieving this end. "Almost all the songs played while the soldiers march are songs about peace," writes composer Pnina Isseroff, who was struck by the music performed when she visited her two sons in the Israeli Defense Forces, "About the end of war. About how glorious it will be when we can take off our uniforms and live in peace. About flowers in the barrels of our guns. About using destroyers to transport oranges. About the dove with the olive branch." She goes on to describe what she sees as a consequence of this philosophy of military music:

We know of the reservist guys who took up a collection from their own pockets and gave a Palestinian family 2000 shekels to repair the hole they had to break in the wall of their house when looking for terrorists. We know the guys who rolled up the carpets and washed the floor of the house they had to occupy, so they could

return it in good condition to its owners. We know the soldiers who volunteered to give blood to help the Arab civilians that were wounded during a battle.<sup>11</sup>

The process of moral formation of soldiers takes time—perhaps a few generations of training. Schools, religious institutions, government, media, and the larger community should also embody the principles of just war for this to be most effective. But it is a process worth undertaking in order to enable our soldiers to live into the moral equality of soldiers.

## NOTES

1 Paul Christopher, *The Ethics of War and Peace* (Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999), 25. Michael Walzer uses an equivalent phrase, “the moral equality of soldiers,” in *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), 34.

2 Ambrose, *On the Duties of the Clergy*, II.VII.33 ([www.newadvent.org/fathers/34012.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/34012.htm), accessed May 31, 2004).

3 Christopher, *The Ethics of War and Peace*, 25.

4 Augustine, *Letter to Boniface* (189), 6 ([www.newadvent.org/fathers/1102189.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1102189.htm), accessed May 31, 2004).

5 Augustine, *Reply to Faustus the Manichean*, 22.74 ([www.newadvent.org/fathers/140622.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/140622.htm), accessed May 31, 2004).

6 John Howard Yoder helpfully distinguishes the objective and subjective senses of right intention in *When War is Unjust: Being Honest in Just-War Thinking* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 152-153.

7 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II.II, Question 40, article 1, citing Augustine’s *Letter to Boniface* (189) ([www.newadvent.org/summa/304001.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/summa/304001.htm), accessed May 31, 2004).

8 Lieutenant Colonel (Ret) Dave Grossman addresses this in *On Killing* (New York: Little Brown & Company, 1995), quoting Ben Shalit’s observation: “Increasing the distance between the [combatants]—whether by emphasizing their differences or by increasing the chain of responsibility between the aggressor and his victim allows for an increase in the degree of aggression” (156).

9 Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, 36.

10 Gaylord T. Gunhus, in the monthly newsletter from the Office of the Army Chief of Chaplains, March 2002, (accessed from a website restricted to registered users).

11 Pnina Isseroff, “Choose Your Music” ([www.aish.com/jewishissues/israeldiary/Choose\\_Your\\_Music.asp](http://www.aish.com/jewishissues/israeldiary/Choose_Your_Music.asp), accessed June 1, 2004).



**CHAPLAIN (MAJOR) SCOTT A. STERLING**

is Subject Matter Expert/Instructor in Ethics for the United States Army Chaplain Center and School in Ft. Jackson, South Carolina.

# Restorative Justice

BY LORRAINE STUTZMAN AMSTUTZ

**Restorative justice, by dealing with crime and harm in a holistic way, promises to sew together the pieces of torn lives into a fabric of justice that is meaningful for victims, offenders, and the community. How can we discover and implement the restorative practices that will transform our criminal justice system?**

---

**T**he sacred meeting occurred in the men's prison in Frackville, PA, between an inmate and the mother of the man he was convicted of killing a decade before. Another facilitator and I, who met with them for six hours, were standing on holy ground as they began cautiously, but then became immersed in conversation.

We knew the mother's preparation for the conference had begun two years earlier when she petitioned the Office of the Victim Advocate in Pennsylvania to speak with the man convicted of murdering her son. "Ten years ago when he walked out of that courtroom after sentencing, he looked me straight in the eye and said, almost in a whisper 'I did not kill your son,'" this mother had told me when we first met and I asked her why she wanted to meet with the man. She admitted, "I have to know why he said that to me." Later when I visited the inmate to see if he was willing to meet with the mother, he responded, "I told her 'I did not kill your son' in hope that someday she would want to find out why I said such a thing after being sentenced to life in prison for murder." She had decided to find out and he intended to tell her.

Obviously the inmate had prepared for their meeting as well. Each knew what they wanted to say to the other. In a moment of silence at the close of the session they simply looked at one another, each one knowing they had received what they needed to hear. Then they hugged.

A few weeks later I phoned the woman to ask her an important question. The inmate had talked to his own mother after the meeting, and she had written a letter to the victim—mother to mother. I was calling to know if the woman wanted to read this letter from the inmate’s mother. She was astounded. “Isn’t this what we were put on this earth to do,” she told me, “to be in community with one another, to find the connections where we can?”

### THE CALL TO DO JUSTICE

The meeting between the mother and the inmate is an example of restorative justice. It illustrates how we can begin to sew together the pieces of torn lives into a fabric of justice that is meaningful for victims, offenders, and our community. We can understand the goals of restorative justice by examining these well-known words from the prophet Micah: “And what does the LORD require of you, but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” (Micah 6:8b).

Micah prophesied during a complicated period for the southern kingdom of Judah. He spoke for God near the end of the eighth century B.C., when powerful Assyrian armies were destroying the northern kingdom of Israel and its capital Samaria, sending refugees flooding south into Judah. This was a wakeup call for the people of Judah, who like their northern kinsmen had grown tired of God and chosen to go their own way. During such tumultuous times they were trying to make amends, to put things right.

“With what shall I come before the LORD?” the Judeans ask (Micah 6:6a). They rightly assume that the Lord expects something from them, and they begin by mentioning rituals that seemed in that day to be the appropriate human responses to God’s grace. Perhaps God desires “burnt offerings,” in which the whole animal is sacrificed with nothing left for eating. Or does the Lord prefer “thousands of rams,” the sacrifice made by the great kings of Judah? David once offered “a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand male lambs” (1 Chronicles 29:21) and Solomon had made “a thousand burnt offerings” (1 Kings 3:4). Moving quickly beyond the traditional offerings, the people mention an outrageously lavish sacrifice—“Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?”—something not allowed since God rejected Abraham’s sacrifice of Isaac, and made a capital offense under Mosaic law (Genesis 22:12; Leviticus 20:1-5).

Micah begins his reply to the people—somewhat like an exasperated teacher addressing students who are concerned at last about their grade in the class—with a simple answer: there will be no surprises! “God has showed you...what is good” (6:8a). God’s *torah*, or way, is well known to the people through the Ten Commandments and other instruction. The prophet knows the people are misusing the rituals as religious insurance



policies to ensure God's love. The rituals, they believe, buy time for them to continue their misbehavior; they can keep on sinning, but at any time win favor with God again by offering another sacrifice. Micah's response catches these would-be worshipers by surprise. They wrongly assume God is waiting for us to pay *something* to compensate for our sin, when in fact God wants us to live with justice, mercy, and humility.

God calls us "to *do* justice," not merely desire it, hope for it, and appreciate it when it occurs. Justice is something we do. Micah teaches by providing a number of negative examples: the people fail to do justice when the powerful oppress the weak, employers exploit laborers, and judges give corrupt verdicts. Summing up their failure to do justice, the prophet writes (Micah 7:2-3):

The faithful have disappeared from the land,  
and there is no one left who is upright;  
they all lie in wait for blood,  
and they hunt each other with nets.

Their hands are skilled to do evil;  
the official and the judge ask for a bribe,  
and the powerful dictate what they desire;  
thus they pervert justice.

Micah is saying that we need to work for the establishment of justice for all, especially the powerless.

Furthermore, we are "to love kindness." There are a variety of translations for *hesed*, a relationship word that has the connotation of "looking through the eyes of the other." When used to describe our relationships to one another and to God, *hesed* includes a strong element of faithfulness and means "steadfast love" or "love-loyalty." Loving kindness is the way God expects us to act toward one another. Ephesians 4:31 exhorts us to "put away from you all bitterness and wrath and anger and wrangling and slander, together with all malice, and be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ has forgiven you." Now that's loving kindness. It's a life-long process God calls us to grow into, so it must be part of our personal journey.

"To walk humbly with your God" is the third charge to us. In current usage, "humility" does not conjure a positive image, but rather of a person being a doormat. However, in this passage humility refers to being open, empty, and flexible toward what God has to show us, or to offer us. Instead of "humbly," we might translate "carefully" or "circumspectly." We are to be tuned in to and welcoming of what God is doing in the world.

"Walk" is another important word in this charge. Perhaps the prophet employs it to remind his people—often surrounded by comforts never enjoyed by those whom God brought out of slavery in Egypt (6:4)—of their



ancestors' long wilderness trek to the land of promise. For their ancestors, even the physical act of walking had been an act of faith. Walking day-to-day with God continues to be the heart of our faith. Jesus calls his disciples not only to believe or trust him, but also to "follow" and walk with him.

### **WHAT ARE WE DOING?**

In working with victims and offenders of crime, I have found no easy answers to my questions about how to do justice. Everywhere we look the world seems unfair, with unjustified stark contrasts between rich and poor, healthy and ill, advantaged and disadvantaged. It's not a perfect world. Yet God provides us not only with the challenge of living amid such imbalances, but also with the joy of working to make things better for everyone rather than just a few.

God calls everyone to be actively involved in restoring a life-giving world. For those of us who have many resources, the responsibility is greater. But this responsibility is not limited to mere generosity—to the "haves" giving out of their abundance to the "have-nots." Doing justice, loving kindness, and walking humbly with our God means recognizing that we are all part of God's family.

This recognition should move us beyond individual acts of compassion (as important and necessary as they are) to making the systemic economic and societal changes that justice demands. We should address some hard questions, such as: (1) *Why has prison experience become a "normal" aspect of this society, with more than two*

*million of our citizens incarcerated?* (2) *How do we care for the one-and-a-half million children who have a father or mother in prison, and therefore suffer the secondary effects of their parent's imprisonment?* (3) *How do we correct the legal system's persistent racism, as evidenced by those whom we incarcerate?* African Americans comprise only 12.3% of the U.S. population, but half of the Americans be-

hind bars. Thirty percent of African American males from the ages 20 to 29 are "under correctional supervision"—either in jail or prison, on parole, or serving probation. According to an estimate from the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1996, a sixteen-year-old American black man faces a twenty-nine percent chance of spending time in prison during his life. The chance for a young white man is four percent.<sup>1</sup> (4) *How can we help crime victims find*

---

**Doing justice, loving kindness, and walking humbly with our God means recognizing that we are all part of God's family. This should move us beyond individual acts of compassion (as important and necessary as they are) to making the systemic economic and societal changes that justice demands.**

---

*justice outside of the legal system?* Susan Herman of the National Center for Victims of Crime suggests we need a system of “parallel justice” to address the needs of victims, which would be separate from the legal system’s work in responding to the needs of offenders.<sup>2</sup>

Too often in the United States we look for quick solutions to crime; we do not spend the time and money necessary to address the causes of crime.

---

**Victims of crime must live with their dangerous memories, and how they integrate these memories into their lives varies from person to person. This is a critical reason for asking victims what they need rather than making assumptions and decisions for them.**

---

Yet, as Jesus warns, “No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old cloak; otherwise the patch pulls away from it, the new from the old, and a worse tear is made” (Mark 2:21). This analogy applies to our situation, for our society is like a garment that’s been torn by injustice. The current legal system, like a patch made from “unshrunk cloth,”

rather than mending the injustice, only leads to a worse tear in the fabric of our community. We don’t have the option of starting over with a new garment (a perfectly just society); we must employ a better, “prepared” cloth, to patch the damaging tears of injustice in the garment we have. So, I propose we look to restorative justice as the properly prepared or “shrunk” cloth to repair our community and make it stronger.

#### **THE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE ALTERNATIVE**

Though there is no universally-accepted definition of “restorative justice,” I am using this term to mean “the use of inclusive, collaborative processes that involve the victim, the offender, and communities in identifying harms and needs that result from offenses.” Howard Zehr develops this account by contrasting the current legal process to a restorative one. In the current system, *crime* is a violation of the law and the state is the victim; the *aim of justice* is to establish blame (guilt) and administer pain (punishment); and the *process of justice* is a conflict between the adversaries in which the offender is pitted against state rules, intentions outweigh outcomes, and one side wins while the other loses. By contrast, in a restorative justice system, *crime* is a violation or harm to people and relationships; the *aim of justice* is to identify obligations, to meet needs and to promote healing; and the *process of justice* involves victims, offenders, and the community in an effort to identify obligations and solutions, maximizing the exchange of information (dialogue, mutual agreement) between them.<sup>3</sup>

Crime violates people, and these violations create moral obligations for

the offender toward both the victims and the community. By failing to address these obligations well, the criminal justice system does a disservice to everyone involved. Offenders are often discouraged from even acknowledging their responsibility; instead they must look out for themselves in the adversarial legal game. A restorative justice system, on the other hand, would involve victims, offenders, and community members in order to identify obligations and needs, and to search for solutions in a safe, trustworthy process. Community collaboration is essential in order for the processes of justice to strengthen communities rather than weaken them.

Offenders are not well served by a criminal justice system that aims at “warehousing” rather than rehabilitating them. Barb Toews, who works for the Pennsylvania Prison Society, describes how caring communities might better deal with the needs of offenders. She urges us to invite incarcerated men and women into dialogue to learn about their experiences and to elicit their insight on the resources and programs they need. Communities should provide opportunities for meaningful accountability and making amends that do not depend solely on face-to-face interaction with victims and offenders. And we should respect the life experiences of offenders, including those with victimization, and find restorative ways to address these experiences without absolving offenders of responsibility to their victims.<sup>4</sup>

The criminal justice system does not meet the needs of victims either. Being the victim of a crime is a devastating experience. It creates crises of self-identity, meaning, and personal relationships that impact all aspects of life. We need an appropriate sense of control over our lives and a certain amount of personal power; yet for victims, someone else has taken control over their lives in a way that leaves them feeling vulnerable and dehumanized. And they may have a crisis of religious faith, if they had a belief that God would keep them safe. Victims need an opportunity to incorporate their encounter with crime into their lives. This often happens as they re-tell their story to others, sometimes over and over, until they can face their pain without feeling like they are going crazy. Victims must live with their dangerous memories, and how they integrate these memories into their lives varies from person to person. Their response to victimization is a personal journey. There are no formulas, only guidelines along the way. This is a critical reason for asking victims what they need rather than making assumptions and decisions for them.

#### **WHAT VICTIMS NEED**

In order to enhance the voice of victims, a team of restorative justice advocates and victim advocates participated in the Listening Project in 1999-2002. We traveled to seven states to listen to victims and their advocates talk about victim needs, their experience with justice, and their perceptions of restorative processes. We discovered that “where offenders are

provided help to change their lives, but victims are not provided help to deal with their trauma, victims feel betrayed." Victims must have the opportunity "to give voice to their own needs and aspirations" in restorative justice processes and must "not be sidestepped by surrogate voices, such as (prosecutors)."

One interviewee insisted, "In order for restorative justice to even work, there needs to be more education about it." For this reason, the Listening Project concluded that programs of restorative justice should be educational in nature, including education on victim trauma for offenders and the public at large, education on the impact of crime including the needs of victims, education about offenders

---

**One way to gauge the journey inward toward humility before God is to monitor how we are responding outwardly to the brokenness in the world. Are we becoming more responsive to the injustice around us? Are we increasingly sensitive to other people's needs?**

---

and their situations for the victim community, and general education and awareness about restorative justice for 'system' justice personnel.<sup>5</sup>

Unfortunately, when I talk with local school administrators about educating their students in the processes of restorative justice, one of their greatest concerns is that it is time consuming. They conclude, "we can't spend the kind of time you're talking about to teach this to students." It is true, of course, that working through complex issues of injustice, addressing harms, and responding to crime within the context of restorative justice always takes time—whether the venue is our homes, schools, congregations, community organizations, or in the criminal justice system. Yet if we don't invest the time necessary to teach young people about restorative justice, and model the type of behavior we want them to exhibit as adults, then we shouldn't be surprised at the kind of problems concerning justice we see in our society.

The mother, with whose story I began, went into the prison meeting believing this inmate might not be responsible for, yet know some part of the truth about her son's death. Though he did not physically commit the murder, the inmate says, he knows the person who did. The victim thinks this man is telling her the truth, since she did her own investigating when her son was murdered and believes many facts were never revealed during the trial. She is grateful to this young man for telling his side of the story; it has provided her with a great sense of relief and comfort. We know that the criminal justice system does not always produce justice for

those who need it most. It may reach a legal decision, but not offer knowledge and insight for those who have to live with the realities of crime.

In situations such as these, we need to ask “What does justice require?” The principles of restorative justice—crime is a violation of people and relationships; harm creates moral obligations; and adequate responses must address the needs of all those involved, and involve all those affected—point beyond our ineffective bandage solutions and toward the long-term changes in the justice system that we need. These principles guide us toward the transformation of people, systems, and structures that oppress, and thus they allow us to hope for a drastically different system of justice than many people experience in our society.

### **WALKING HUMBLY WITH GOD**

As we’ve seen, we cannot effect these changes to our system of justice by ourselves; we need to garner support for restorative justice from our communities by patiently educating children, youth, and adults. And we cannot do any of this without the spiritual discipline of “walking humbly” with God. In *Toward the Heart of God*, John Dalrymple helpfully compares our spiritual journey with God to the swing of a pendulum—its inward movement exposes us to God, and then the counter-movement outward leads us to address the problems of the world. If the pendulum swings only slightly inward, it can in turn swing only slightly outward. The closer we draw to God, the further we can go in engaging the world’s suffering in a redemptive way.

It follows that one way to tell how we are succeeding in the journey inward toward humility before God, is to monitor how we are responding outwardly to the brokenness in the world.<sup>7</sup> Are we becoming more alive and responsive to the injustice around us? Are we increasingly sensitive to other people’s needs? The journey toward God not only transforms us individually, but motivates and empowers us to do transforming work.

Restorative justice helps us think about harm in a holistic way. Our challenge is to discover and implement restorative practices that can transform our criminal justice system, which today values rules over relationships, laws above needs, and power over others rather than collaboration. Let us continue to listen to the stories of victims and offenders, and ask what they need in order to experience justice. In this way we may answer the prophet’s call “to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God.”

### **NOTES**

1 “Key Crime and Justice Facts at a Glance” (Bureau of Justice Statistics, accessed May 28, 2004), [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance.htm).

2 For more information on the Parallel Justice Project, see The National Center for Victims of Crime website, [www.ncvc.org/ncvc](http://www.ncvc.org/ncvc).

3 Howard Zehr, *Changing Lenses* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1990).

4 Barb Toews, "Listening to prisoners raises issues about prison-based restorative justice," *VOMA Connections*, 11 (Summer 2002). This quarterly newsletter of the Victim Offender Mediation Association is available on the web at <http://voma.org/connect.shtml> (accessed May 28, 2004).

5 Harry Mika, Mary Achilles, Ellen Halbert, Lorraine Stutzman Amstutz, and Howard Zehr, *Taking Victims and Their Advocates Seriously: A Listening Project* (Akron, PA: Mennonite Central Committee, 2002), 6, 12. This report is available from MCC Office on Crime and Justice, 21 S. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, PO Box 500, Akron, PA 17501, or online at [www.restorativejustice.org/rj3/Full-text/ListeningProject.pdf](http://www.restorativejustice.org/rj3/Full-text/ListeningProject.pdf) (accessed May 28, 2004).

6 John Dalrymple, *Toward the Heart of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1982).

7 Francis W. Vanderwall draws this implication in *Water in the Wilderness: Paths of Prayer, Springs for Life* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985).

---



**LORRAINE STUTZMAN AMSTUTZ**

is Director of the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) Office on Crime and Justice, in Akron, Pennsylvania.

# Peace and the Divine Warrior

BY SCOTT W. BULLARD

**These studies of shalom, God's vision of well-being for all of creation, and of the divine warrior motif that permeates Scripture, are best read together. They challenge us to study the entire Bible honestly and prayerfully, and press us to revisit many of our basic assumptions about Christian discipleship within a global village.**

---

Since Walter Brueggemann has a wonderful gift for bringing the Old Testament alive in relevance for the church today, it's no surprise that Chalice Press has republished *Peace* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2001, 205 pp., \$24.99), his essays on peace and war written during the 1960's and 1970's. Back in those turbulent times Brueggemann hoped to rid Christians of sentimental notions of peace and to help them appreciate the sacrifices everyone must make for peace to be realized. Today, as we leave the bloodiest century in human history and enter into a new millennium already marked by violence, Brueggemann hopes his essays will have "resonance for those in the church who care about the public dimension of the gospel and the ministry of the church" (p. 1).

Brueggemann, who is Professor Emeritus of Old Testament at Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia, believes the church has a responsibility to participate in bringing God's peace into the world. He doesn't approach peace strictly at the individual level, nor does he dangle before us a single issue such as international warfare or interracial conflict. Rather, he offers us a firm foundation for addressing all these concerns: a sharpened understanding of the biblical notion of shalom. We've applied this Hebrew concept, which is usually translated "peace," much too nar-



rowly, he writes. It's not a simple idea. Biblical shalom represents God's vision of well-being for all of the creation, at the individual *and* communal levels (p. 26). His claim is that this vision pervades Scripture; and while he is an Old Testament scholar, he demonstrates that he is equally comfortable describing the vision of shalom in the New Testament.

Brueggemann is careful not to idealize or sentimentalize this vision of well-being for all. He has no illusions concerning the dire situations suffered by many of society's "have-nots"; repeatedly he reminds us that what appears to be a situation of shalom from the perspective of the well-to-do may really be an oppressive situation for others (p. 25). In the view of the prosperous who prefer that things stay the way they are, shalom is about maintaining order and celebrating our many gifts. Meanwhile, for the burdened and fortuneless who long for God's liberation, shalom requires individual and social changes in which we are called to participate with God's help. Brueggemann warns that eventually many social and economic systems must collapse; their transformation toward God's peace will be ongoing and their redemption painful.

The church's role, at every time and in every society, is to articulate and concretize the biblical vision of shalom. We live in an era when many Christians are among the "haves" rather than the "have-nots." This dynamic differs from formative periods in the church's history when persecution and poverty were common. Thus, for Brueggemann, Christians face the same choice as always, though our decision will be more difficult personally: Which story will narrate our lives—the biblical vision of shalom or the competitive political and economic directives of the world?

Consider how Brueggemann articulates the vision of shalom in his treatment of health care. In the final chapter, "Health Care and Healing as Caring," he is at his best as a biblical scholar and a very pastoral theologian. He views personal health holistically, as having "stability enough to share in the costs and joys, the blessings and the burdens of the community" (p. 199). "Healing" is closely linked to this definition of health as it is the "restoration of and rehabilitation of persons to their full power and vitality in the life of the community" (p. 199). Brueggemann skillfully helps us see how the Bible applies to hot-button issues like access to health care. Looking to the Old Testament, he sheds light on the stark contrast between Pharaoh and Yahweh, the king who reserved access to "goodies" for Egyptians versus the One who heals all. Regarding the New Testament, he encourages us to ask additional helpful questions: "Is it strange that the temple—the place where healing occurred—became perverted into a place for the elite?" and "Why did the Pharisees *really* disdain Jesus? Was it because he 'saw the issues' and instituted a health care system that frightened and infuriated the 'qualified elite?'" (p. 197)

His understanding of the link between the biblical vision of shalom and contemporary health care is but one example of the many helpful connec-



tions Brueggemann makes in *Peace*. This book presses us to revisit many of our basic assumptions about Christian discipleship and about life in a global village.

In *God is a Warrior* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995, 224 pp., \$16.99), Tremper Longman III and Daniel Reid flesh out the biblical motif of God as the “divine warrior”—a theme that, at least at first glance, stands in stark contrast to the theme of shalom that Brueggemann develops. Longman, a professor of Old Testament at Westminster Seminary, and Reid, the reference book editor for InterVarsity Press, trace the divine warrior motif through both testaments, from Israel’s conflicts with her enemies to Christ’s return in Revelation. Much like Brueggemann, Longman and Reid seem as comfortable in reading and writing about the New Testament as they do the Old Testament.

According to Longman and Reid, the image of God as one who engages in violent warfare against enemies of God is “one of the most pervasive of all biblical themes” (p. 9). Though the authors acknowledge that this motif “has long been recognized,” they offer a different approach to the motif in two ways (p. 19). First, their study “concentrates on the image of God as divine warrior, not the institution of holy war per se.” In the second place, the authors “approach the Bible as an organic whole...as a single writing that presents

an internally consistent message, including an internally consistent, yet unfolding picture of God as a warrior” (p. 26). Moreover, they note that the divine warrior motif is a source of the Bible’s unity, for it is a metaphor that guided not only writers of Hebrew Scripture but also the leaders of the New Testament church who wrote later works in the church’s infant years.

After an introductory chapter, the authors devote the remaining chapters to the development of the theme of God as a warrior in both the Old and New Testaments. Setting the motif against the broader background of Ancient Near Eastern warrior mythology, they discuss Yahweh’s warfare on behalf of ancient Israel, Yahweh’s judgment battles against rebellious Israel, and biblical prophecies of the coming Divine Deliverer. Most, if not all, of these examples are generally accepted by Old

---

**Many Christians are among the “haves,” not the “have-nots,” unlike the formative days of the church when persecution and poverty were common. We face the same choice, but our decision is more difficult personally: Which story will narrate our lives—the biblical vision of shalom or the world’s competitive political and economic directives?**

---

Testament scholars and others who have written about the divine warrior motif. However, in the second half of the book, the authors provocatively and creatively trace the divine warrior motif through the New Testament. Longman and Reid begin by depicting Jesus' life, ministry, and healings recorded in the Gospels, as an arena of conflict with spiritual, demonic forces. The thread is followed through the letters of Paul, where Jesus

---

**Longman and Reid provocatively trace the divine warrior motif through the New Testament. Especially intriguing is their depiction of God as divine warrior in Revelation.**

---

and His followers must constantly struggle against "powers and principalities," a group which includes "the devil" or "Satan," but also what Paul considers an unfaithful Israel. The motif appears in the book of Revelation, where the Son of Man is

the victor in the final apocalyptic battle. While the authors' unfolding of the divine warrior motif in Part I is representative of a more traditional line of Old Testament studies, their claim that the theme pervades the New Testament is an innovative hypothesis. Especially intriguing is their depiction of God as divine warrior in the book of Revelation.

In one sense, *God is a Warrior* is even more challenging, both intellectually and to our faith, than Brueggemann's *Peace*: the picture of God warring against God's enemies is hardly attractive to many contemporary readers. Moreover, the copious amount of research and biblical evidence provided for the authors' claims may prove quite difficult to wade through. In another sense, however, the book's failure to relate the God-as-a-warrior motif to contemporary ethical issues leaves us wanting more, especially after reading Brueggemann's book. For example, Longman and Reid scarcely address the many occasions in which an individual's or nation's move to violence has been justified by allegiance to a deity, or simply by calling their use of violence a "holy war." Yet the authors are clear about their intentions for their study, and writing on extra-biblical ancient, medieval, or contemporary holy warriors is not one of them. They are clear in illustrating that in Scripture, Yahweh fought on the side of Israel only to the extent that Israel was faithful to Yahweh. When Israel made a "unilateral" move to war, or was less than faithful to the commands and order prescribed by Yahweh for a holy war, the nation inevitably fell.

Brueggemann's *Peace* and Longman and Reid's *God is a Warrior* are clearly written, creative, and challenging works of biblical scholarship for general readers. Both take the biblical text seriously and bring major themes from Scripture before us in new and often shocking ways.

Yet they are most helpful when read together. Brueggemann's study

of shalom, God's vision of well-being for all of creation, and Longman and Reid's reading of the divine warrior motif that permeates the canon, raise and answer important questions on their own. However, other questions that are raised in each book are best answered by the other. Throughout Brueggemann's book, we're tempted to ask, "How can we reconcile the emphasis on shalom with God's apparent endorsement of war in the Old Testament?" Similarly, as we read *God is a Warrior*, we will inevitably struggle to relate the divine warrior motif to the teaching of Jesus, who proclaimed "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God" (Matthew 5:9). In asking these questions, we will not only see the need to read both of these books, but also to study the entire Bible honestly and prayerfully.

---



**SCOTT W. BULLARD**

*is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Religion, Baylor University, in Waco, Texas.*

# Pacifism and Just War: Beyond the Stereotypes

BY ERIN DUFAULT-HUNTER

How do we negotiate our dual identities, as followers of Christ and citizens of a democratic state, when the state goes to war? Two books offer insights—one from a study of contemporary religious perspectives, another through a survey of Christian tradition. Both challenge us to reflect deeply on our discipleship in a pluralistic and war-torn world.

---

When I lecture on violence and the Christian tradition in a secular university, I often begin by asking the students if they believe that they should live in accordance with the commands of Christ in the Bible. Invariably, several hands shoot into the air. Then I read from the Sermon on the Mount the portion about loving enemies and turning the other cheek. I ask all those who raised their hands to the previous question, “How many of you are pacifists, especially in light of September 11?” Inevitably, the number dwindles considerably if not entirely.

The students are fairly sophisticated about why they are not pacifists. They raise important points, like how can we stand on the sidelines while others defend our freedoms, and how can we be loving neighbors if we allow innocents to suffer at the hands of those who are evil? I ask them how a Christian president can order the killing of his enemies as Commander in Chief, and at least one will point out that the President is acting primarily as a statesman, as the leader of a nation, and not merely as an individual.

These students focus on a fundamental issue for believers. As Lisa Sowle Cahill puts it in *Love Your Enemies*, “the question is *how* the mandate

to live in love, peace, and forgiveness is to function in the practical moral life" (p. 13). More specifically, how are we to negotiate our dual identities, as followers of Christ and citizens of a democratic state, particularly when the state goes to war?

Two books offer insights into the complexities of war and peace, one from a comparative ethics perspective and another from a specifically Christian perspective. Both provide believers with valuable information and challenge us to reflect deeply on our "practical moral life" in a pluralistic and war-torn world.

Terry Nardin's edited collection, *The Ethics of War and Peace: Secular and Religious Perspectives* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996, 296 pp., \$22.95), examines war and peace from diverse points of view. The book is structured in sections, beginning with the "classic debate" between political realism (which sometimes allows for morality to be subordinated to expedience in warfare) and Catholic natural law (which says that even for just causes, morality can never be ignored). While this section can be slow going, it offers valuable insight into how politicians and international relations specialists critically analyze war in light of ethical considerations. This is especially helpful in an era of carpet bombs, suicide attacks, and preemptive strikes. The book expands the discussion to include Jewish and Islamic views as well as the "critical perspectives" of Christian pacifism and feminism. The authors not only explain their perspectives, but highlight ways they differ from others who share a broad tradition.

A good place to begin reading this collection is at the end. Here you will find two articles—one by Nardin on "Comparative Ethics" and the other by Richard B. Miller on "Divine Justice, Evil, and Tradition"—that helpfully summarize arguments of other authors and provide conceptual handles for the novice. For example, distinctions between and within religious faiths, Miller suggests, often flow from differences in their "hermeneutical" or interpretative orientation to their scriptures. For example, how do we understand the Bible to function: as a revelation of law, a series of paradigmatic events, or a collection of snippets of good advice? Depending on how we approach our sacred text—or how a Jew or Muslim approaches theirs—we come up with different answers to our questions about war and peace. Indeed, due to this orientation, we might find ourselves closer in practice to those of another tradition than to those in our own—as when a Christian just war theorist finds camaraderie with a secular realist, or a Christian pacifist with some branches of feminism. One of the most helpful contributions of this book is an appreciation of how and why such alliances might form.

This book originated with a conference in 1993 at the Notre Dame of Jerusalem Center. The aim of the conference and, largely, that of the book is to "facilitate a useful exchange of ideas between authorities on different

ethical traditions and between communities shaped by those traditions” (p. vii). Some might find the emphasis on dispassionate dialogue without judgment the epitome of relativism, and at least one of the authors, Mennonite Ted Koontz, questions the assumptions inherent in this methodology. Yet this collection can serve Christians not only as a resource of theories regarding war and peace, but in at least two other crucial ways. First, it delineates theories such as political realism so that we can see where this tradition often creeps into the Church’s discussions of war. We can then question whether or how such a philosophy should influence our choices as Christian citizens. Secondly, the essays by Jews and Muslims help us to appreciate how our traditions’ approaches to warfare are distinct from one another yet share a desire to authentically embody our faith in this particular time and place.

*The Ethics of War and Peace* makes this second point—the quite distinct way each monotheistic religion approaches war—by reminding us that European Christians have had a unique relationship to the state, at least since the time of Constantine. Historically, Jewish rabbis writing on “just” war usually did so within the context of regimes in which they had little if any political influence, and their application of Old Testament teachings and rabbinic thought was almost wholly theoretical. Not until 1948 is there a Jewish nation again, and scholars continue to wrestle with how old teachings apply in this setting.

Islamic thought, on the other hand, developed within tribal culture, in a society uninfluenced by the political structure of the nation state. Teachings on warfare divided the world neatly into *dar-al-harb* (the house of war and of non-Muslims) and *dar-al-Islam* (the home of peace and of believers). In addition, many modern Islamic states were recently European colonies. Americans are known for being forgetful of the past or, more positively, focused on the present and future. As such, we might need to recall that European (“Christian”) oppression and aggression going back to the Crusades remains poignant for many Muslims. It still figures prominently into their discussion of how to be faithful to Allah in a world no longer easily divided into the above categories, such as when two Muslim states (e.g., Iraq and Iran) are at war with one another.

Providing an important background to current debates over how Islam understands warfare, the two articles from Muslim scholars allow us to eavesdrop on an internal debate over the use of this tradition to affirm both violence and peacemaking. While obviously aimed at an academic audience, they offer us a nuanced appreciation of how Muslims, like Christians, argue with one another over the right interpretation of sacred texts and their faithful application to modern dilemmas.

Lisa Sowle Cahill’s *Love Your Enemies: Discipleship, Pacifism, and Just War Theory* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994, 252 pp., \$20.00) reminds Christians of our on-going struggle to be dedicated believers in an ever-

changing world. Her book carefully reviews various Christian approaches to just war and pacifism from the early church to today. Far from seeking to be merely an academic or disembodied reiteration of theory, she recalls our past in order to motivate us to be faithful today.

She nicely mixes two purposes. First, she provides a historical overview of Christian views of pacifism and just war. This makes the book a fine resource for someone looking for an accessible review of a complex topic. While not agreeing with their theology or tactics, she helps us understand our most appalling and fascinating moments—including the Crusades, Joan of Arc, and the reformer's torture of heretics. We are shocked, for example, that some of our Christian ancestors unhesitatingly killed each other over theological differences, but Cahill notes that religious rhetoric is still invoked by many sides advocating violence against enemies. Perhaps in the future these justifications will read as oddly as the words of Cromwell, who—after his armies massacred defenders and confiscated Irish land—claimed he was an instrument of God's "righteous judgment...upon these barbarous infidels" (quoted on p. 143). These incidents remind us that culture and social setting powerfully influence us, even our ethics that we might usually consider unsullied by our position in history. The chapter recounting these episodes, entitled "War in God's Name," encourages us to humbly return to God and seek the Spirit's guidance today as we wage wars and work for peace.

Though Cahill—a Roman Catholic professor of theological ethics at Boston College—writes as an academic, she also writes as one invested in the community of faith and its obedience to Christ. The book also, then, functions as a persuasive text regarding war and peace, challenging us to wed our theology to our ethics. She avoids simplistic answers, and uses the rubric of the kingdom of God to help us negotiate the various approaches the church has had to these issues.

She explains what theologians call the "eschatological tension" inherent in the New Testament. The key question is how we understand the kingdom of God to be a present reality and/or a future one. Our ethics regarding war and peacemaking—and much if not all of our moral life—is, knowingly or not, rooted in our understanding of this important doctrine. As

---

**The Muslim scholars allow us to eavesdrop on an internal debate over the use of Islam to affirm both violence and peacemaking. They offer us a nuanced appreciation of how Muslims, like Christians, argue with one another over the right interpretation of sacred texts and their faithful application to modern dilemmas.**

---



many of my students understand, it impacts how we relate our identity as followers of Christ to our social and national identities. When we pray, “Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,” do we believe that this kingdom is fulfilled in our personal relationships but not in our social and political ones? Does the Sermon on the Mount provide us with an unattainable ideal at which we aim, or does it exhort us in hope to

---

**Does the Sermon on the Mount provide us with an unattainable ideal, or exhort us in hope to embody an alternative to earthly kingdoms that are based on violence? Cahill deals with this crucial link between the kingdom of God and practical Christian discipleship. It’s worth a close read and reminds us of the importance of “theoretical” beliefs for our Christian practice.**

---

embody an alternative to earthly kingdoms that are based on violence? The second chapter of the book deals with this crucial link between the kingdom of God and practical Christian discipleship. It is well worth a close read and reminds us of the importance of “theoretical” beliefs for our Christian practice.

While justification of warfare under certain circumstances continues to dominate Christian history and current thought, Cahill’s book also notes the importance of a pacifist in-

terpretation of the Gospel. Both just war theory and pacifism share a desire to limit violence, but with a key difference. Just war theory is primarily a rule-based morality: it sets conditions for exceptions to the “rule” of peace and criteria for how this violence is to be conducted by Christians. Although many critics of pacifism interpret it as similarly rule-based (e.g., founded on an absolute command against taking human life), Cahill maintains that the heart of pacifism lies elsewhere—in the radical community created when the kingdom of God is preached and embodied. In this way, the practices of peacemaking and nonviolence are not commands *per se*, but rather are integral aspects of a community shaped by the desire to grow into Christ. While most forms of pacifism share this emphasis of the kingdom in the present, Cahill—and two articles on pacifism in Nardin’s collection—also note varieties of Christian pacifism and the differing ways they understand such things as biblical texts, the use of other sources, and the Christian’s participation in government.

Cahill concludes her book by reiterating her chief concern: faithful discipleship. Even in a democratic state, the tension between earthly and heavenly kingdoms remains. She quotes New Testament scholar Ulrich



Mauser, who insists that all Christians are called to “the discipline of being radical,’ by which he means a constant struggle against the idolatries and violence of the public order.... ‘Precisely as a community of peace, the Christian community must constantly be expected to infuse an element of disquietude into public life’” (p. 244).

However we understand this tension between future fulfillment of the kingdom and our present moral life, Christians must live as if the resurrection really matters—or, as some have put it, live a life possible *only* if Christ has been raised from the dead. Our hope finally rests not in our political, social, or military successes, but in our re-identification through our baptism with the risen Jesus, and it is this “‘future’ power in the ‘present’ that sustains compassion, forgiveness, and even nonviolence as the edge of God’s healing action amid the ambiguities, evils, and despair of history” (p. 246).

---



**ERIN DFAULT-HUNTER**

*is a Ph.D. candidate in the School of Religion, University of Southern California, in Los Angeles, California.*

## Editors



### **ROBERT B. KRUSCHWITZ**

General Editor

Bob Kruschwitz is Director of The Center for Christian Ethics and Professor of Philosophy at Baylor University. He convenes the editorial team to plan the themes for the issues of *Christian Reflection*, then he commissions the lead articles and supervises the formation of each issue. Bob holds the Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Texas at Austin and the B.A. from Georgetown College. You may contact him by phone at 254-710-3774 or by email at [Robert\\_Kruschwitz@baylor.edu](mailto:Robert_Kruschwitz@baylor.edu).



### **HEIDI J. HORNİK**

Art Editor

Heidi Hornik is Professor of Art History at Baylor University. She selects and writes analysis of the artwork for *Christian Reflection*. With the M.A. and Ph.D. in Art History from The Pennsylvania State University and the B.A. from Cornell University, her special interest is art of the Italian Renaissance. With Mikeal C. Parsons, she co-edited *Interpreting Christian Art* and co-authored *Illuminating Luke: The Infancy Narrative in Italian Renaissance Painting*. You may contact her by phone at 254-710-4548 or by email at [Heidi\\_Hornik@baylor.edu](mailto:Heidi_Hornik@baylor.edu).



### **NORMAN WIRZBA**

Review Editor

Norman Wirzba is Associate Professor and Chair of the Philosophy Department at Georgetown College. He designs and edits the book review articles in *Christian Reflection*. Norman holds the M.A. and Ph.D. in philosophy from Loyola University of Chicago, the M.A. in religion from Yale University, and the B.A. from the University of Lethbridge, Alberta. His research interests include the intersection of Christian theology and environmental ethics. You may contact him by phone at 502-863-8204 or by email at [Norman\\_Wirzba@georgetowncollege.edu](mailto:Norman_Wirzba@georgetowncollege.edu).

## Contributors

**LORRAINE STUTZMAN AMSTUTZ**

Director, Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) Office on Crime and Justice, Akron, PA

**C. DAVID BOLIN**

Minister of Music, First Baptist Church, Waco, TX

**DAVID M. BRIDGES**

Director of Music, McKendree United Methodist Church, Nashville, TN

**SCOTT W. BULLARD**

Ph.D. candidate in Religion, Baylor University

**WILLIAM T. CAVANAUGH**

Associate Professor of Theology, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN

**ERIN DUFAULT-HUNTER**

Ph.D. candidate in Religion, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

**BOB FOX**

Pastor, Faith Baptist Church, Georgetown, KY

**HEIDI J. HORNIK**

Professor of Art History, Baylor University

**ROBERT B. KRUSCHWITZ**

Director, Center for Christian Ethics, Baylor University

**HARRY O. MAIER**

Associate Professor of New Testament Studies, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, BC

**GEORGE A. MASON**

Pastor, Wilshire Baptist Church, Dallas, TX

**GLEN H. STASSEN**

Lewis B. Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA

**SCOTT A. STERLING**

Subject Matter Expert/Instructor in Ethics, United States Army Chaplain Center and School, Ft. Jackson, SC

**JOHN A. WOOD**

Professor of Religion, Baylor University

**TERRY W. YORK**

Associate Professor of Christian Ministry and Church Music, Baylor University

## CALL FOR PRESENTATIONS

# DIVINE COMEDIES:

THE REDEMPITIVE POWER OF HUMOR

## 2005 ART & SOUL FESTIVAL

THURSDAY, APRIL 7 – SATURDAY, APRIL 9  
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS

**THEME:** Humor is one of the most sublime of the divine gifts. It enables us to embrace hope in the darkest times, display grace under pressure and – on occasion – tweak the high and mighty. The great creative artists bear witness to the transcendent quality of humor as a means of redemption, sometimes in bold, lavish strokes, sometimes in a still, small voice, but always revealing the surprising, unpredictable joy of God's providential goodness. Humor, tragicomedy, wit, satire, and even folly – all are fitting subjects for exploration and celebration in the Christian community.

**PROGRAM GUESTS:** The fifth biennial Art & Soul Festival will include public lectures and readings, writing workshops, panels, lecture-recitals, art exhibits, concerts and a scholarly conference. Featured artists will be Kaye Gibbons (*Ellen Foster, Divining Women*), Madison Smartt Bell (*Doctor Sleep, Master of the Crossroads, All Souls Rising*), Lauren Winner (*Girl Meets God: A Memoir, Mudhouse Sabbath*), Charlene Baumbich (*Dearest Dorothy, Are We There Yet?, Mama Said There'd Be Days Like This*), Robert Flynn (*Growing Up Sullen Baptist, The Devil's Tiger*), Michele Andrea Bowen (*Church Folk. Second Sunday: A Novel*), Jeremy Begbie (*Beholding the Glory: Incarnation Through the Arts, Voicing Creation's Praise: Towards a Theology of the Arts*), and Phyllis Tickle (*Greed: The Seven Deadly Sins, What the Land Already Knows*) among others.

**SUBMISSIONS:** We welcome proposals for individual or panel presentations related to this theme, more generally addressing religion and the arts, or involving creative works by those of faith or dealing with issues of faith. Abstracts will be accepted between September 15 and November 15, 2004. Abstracts should not be more than 750 words and should include title, author, position, institution, mailing address, e-mail address and telephone.

SEND ABSTRACTS TO [IFL@baylor.edu](mailto:IFL@baylor.edu)  
OR BY MAIL TO:  
ATTN: ART & SOUL FESTIVAL  
BAYLOR INSTITUTE FOR FAITH AND LEARNING  
ONE BEAR PLACE #97270  
WACO, TX 76798-7270

(254) 710-4805  
SEE [www.baylor.edu/Rel\\_Lit](http://www.baylor.edu/Rel_Lit)  
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

art & soul

BAYLOR  
UNIVERSITY