

A CHRISTIAN RESPONSE TO MILITARY CALL-UP

- An Anglican's Perspective

CHARLES YEATS 1981

CONTENTS

1. Article "Reflection on Military Service in South Africa"

The Anglican Church and War  
Conscientious Objection to War  
Just War Theory

2. Personal Statement: "Why I am a Conscientious Objector to War"

**"Let us bring our own failures and the corporate guilt of our country to the foot of the cross and ask for strength and courage to share that cross, and in the power of the Crucified to share in His redemptive work." (1)**  
**GEOFFREY CLAYTON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAPE TOWN 1949 - 1957**



## THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND WAR

### Supremacy of conscience:

The Anglican Church will not specify a single response to war. The reason is that Christ does not expressly reject the vocation of soldier for his disciples.

The gospels do however contain references to love of enemies and give many accounts of Christ healing the suffering. These passages convict some Christians not to fight in any war.

Their decision to obey conscience is always upheld by the Church. This is clearly stated by Bishop Russell in his monthly newsletter:

'One of the basic requirements made on any Christian anywhere at any time is obedience to conscience. This does not mean that the action flowing from such obedience will always of necessity carry with it the approval and support of other Christians. Indeed the action in itself may be wrong, for the other fundamental dictum is that conscience must be continually educated, informed and possibly reformed. Nevertheless when action is to be taken it is a person's conscience which dictates what is to be done.' (2)

While continuing to urge a decision of conscience the Anglican Church has however declared the Just War doctrine to be the official teaching of the church. This is contained in Article thirty-seven, where it is made lawful for Christians to participate in a 'just war'.

### Lamberth Conference Resolutions:

It is illuminating to examine the changes to the majority position reflected in the Lamberth Conference resolutions on 'war and violence'. These reveal a growing uneasiness about Christian participation in a 'just war'.

The 1930 Resolution reads, 'War, as a method of settling international disputes, is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ'. It continues, 'We do not deny the right of..... a nation to defend itself if attacked, or to resort to force in fulfilment of international obligations.'

This view corresponds with that of International Law which has come to condemn all aggressive wars. Now the only accepted justification for the use of force in international affairs is that of self-defence.

For most people the resort to force in self-defence is reasonable. While the majority teaching in the Church still does not seriously contest this for individuals its application to a war situation has become increasingly problematic.

The difficulty arises in the problem of identifying the enemy in certain wars and in deciding who is acting in self-defence. This is especially difficult in civil war situations. But of seemingly even greater moral complexity is the danger posed by thermonuclear warfare. Here defensive nuclear action against aggressors using conventional weapons may destroy nations not directly involved in the conflict.

These reservations are reflected in the 1978 Lamberth Conference Resolution. It reads, '..... Christians in the past have differed in their understanding of limits to the rightful use of force in human affairs, and that questions of national relationships and social justice are often complex ones'.

### Pondering the mind of Christ:

The different emphases in the two resolutions reveal that at least the Anglican Church is still pondering the mind of Christ on war. While it could be held that the



Church continues to speak with a divided voice on war, with the majority voice still accepting Christian participation in a defensive war, the minority voice urging Christian pacifism is becoming increasingly heard.

Every Lambeth Conference the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship petitions the assembled bishops with the slogan, "The Year of Decision", hoping that year the pacific witness of the early Church will be re-instated in the Anglican Communion. The charter of the Fellowship reads:

"We, communicant members of the Church of England, or of a Church in full communion with it, believing that our membership of the Christian Church involves the complete repudiation of modern war, pledge ourselves to renounce war and all preparation to wage war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world."

Ambivalent teaching:

Meanwhile the Church finds itself supporting different and sometimes contradictory responses to armed conflict. In South Africa Christians are supported in their decisions of conscience when they are prepared to defend or oppose with violence what the Church condemns as an unjust and discriminatory society. Other Christians are supported in their decision to become conscientious objectors.

In commenting on the ethics supporting these moral decisions Fr Oswil Magrath states 'All the possible stances.... seem to be capable of reasonable ethical grounding, showing that such a decision is not unreasonable nor demonstrably wrong.' (3)

This can be put more positively in that the ambivalent teaching of the Church will ensure that Christians will be found occupying many different and opposing roles in armed conflict. For this reason support of a particular stance cannot purport to reflect on the moral decisions of others.



## CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO WAR

### A Christian Vocation:

The word "pacifist" derives from pax and facere and therefore means "peacemaker". Christians are all given this vocation in its wider sense following Christ's blessing of the peacemakers in the Beatitudes.

Christian peacemakers however differ in their approaches to peacemaking. Some will wage war in order to restore peace while others, for the same motive, will seek to avoid a direct involvement in war.

### Levels of Refusal:

It is no longer possible to refuse all participation in war for the reason that governments employ a "total strategy" in modern warfare. This strategy attempts to harness all the resources of the economy for the war effort. Citizens therefore cannot avoid some degree of complicity in war, even if this amounts only to their paying taxes which contribute to the efficiency of their country's defence force.

The factor of complicity complicates a definition of conscientious objection. It may even make a logical defence of conscientious objection, based on graded levels of refusal, impossible. Nevertheless the consensus is that conscientious objection involves at the very least a refusal to serve as a combatant in war.

### How does the Christian support his 'no' to war?

In areas where the Gospels appear to be silent Christians frequently rely on inferences drawn from Jesus' example to guide their decisions. The approach is consistent with the command, often repeated in the New Testament, that the disciples ought to model themselves on their Master. With this in mind, James Moulder's demonstration that Christ's example supports a refusal to submit to combat training is helpful. (6)

He advances a positive and negative thesis in support of this claim.

#### a) A Positive Thesis:

The positive thesis is that the 'New Testament contains narratives about Christ which suggest that, if He had been conscripted, He would have refused to submit to combat training'.

Christ's example at His arrest in Gethsemane is cited: After one of those who were with Him had struck off the ear of the high priest's slave, Christ commanded him to sheath his sword with the admonition 'All who take the sword will perish by the sword'.

The difficulty in relying on Biblical interpretation is illustrated by two commentaries on this scripture. S.G.F. Brandon claims that 'the saying cannot be regarded as a proverbial condemnation of the profession of arms, since it is manifestly untrue that all soldiers die in armed combat'. This is thought to be too literal an interpretation, and T.H. Robinson's commentary has received wider support, 'a kingdom founded on force is always liable to be overthrown by superior force'.



### b) A Negative Thesis:

The negative thesis 'is that the New Testament does not record any incident which suggests that, if He had been conscripted, Christ would have been prepared to submit training'.

The closest one comes to an example is in the incident of Christ cleansing the temple. The righteous anger of Jesus, resulting in physical violence, however falls short of the violence inflicted by a combatant in war. Instead, this passage establishes that Christ is not a pacifist who renounces every kind of coercive behaviour.

### The Healing Ministry:

A criticism noted by James Moulder is that the Gospel passages quoted above have no relevance to war. In the first the occasion amounts to a police arrest, and the second to an individual act of coercion.

The counter relies on Christ's healing ministry. The incompatibility of the activities of healing and waging war avoids the irrelevancy argument, even if it has validity, for Christ would not have spent so much of His time healing people were he not also to reject the role of the combatant inflicting suffering in war.

### How does the Christian support his 'yes' to Peace in South Africa?

The Christian peacemaker cannot be content with saying 'no' to war, he needs also to say 'yes' to peace and work to that end.

The conscript in South Africa is constrained in his peacemaking by the Defence Act. The Act makes a limited concession to conscientious objection by permitting a form of non-combatant service. There is no provision made for objectors who refuse to serve and who request a non-military form of national service. These objectors are served with recurring sentences in detention barracks for their disobedience.

The choice facing conscientious objectors is consequently one of serving as a non-combatant or refusing to serve and being sentenced with recurring periods of detention. It is helpful to view this choice in the light of the Incarnation, as it is Christ's example which is used to support a refusal to submit to combat training.

### The Non-Combatant Option:

The conscript who elects to serve as a non-combatant identifies with the suffering, anguish and ambiguity of his fellow conscripts and their families. Service in the Medical Corps provides the opportunity to share in Christ's healing ministry, while service in other non-combatant units may provide opportunities for pastoring fellow conscripts.

The non-combatant may further support his decision to accept a peacemaking role in the military by the belief that it is alongside his fellow conscripts that the pacific witness is best made. For this reason the non-combatant will not refuse conscript for by so doing he might risk alienating himself from his fellows.

The argument may be further developed to take account of a racially segregated society. Here witness is argued to be best directed at ones own racial group, providing further reason for avoiding action which may lead to a distancing of oneself from contemporaries.



### The Non-Militarist Position:

The non-militarist believes that Jesus' example leads him to identify with a wider community than that of white conscripts and their families. He believes himself called to a particular ministry of reconciliation.

This ministry calls for the rejection of any role in the military and a request for alternative national service as a witness to the avoidability of civil war in South Africa.

The contribution of the non-militarist to peace has to be seen in the light of the reasonableness of the Cross. For the secular man, Christ's death must represent an absurdity. As St. Paul describes it, 'the message of the Cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to those who are saved it is the power of God'. (7)

Through Christ's sacrifice a power was unleashed on earth which overcame the separation of mankind and destroyed the power of Satan. This mystery Christians believe.

Christians in themselves cannot repeat the act of redemption but they are called to share in distributing redemptive power. Michael Ramsay captures the meaning behind the creative use of suffering when he writes, 'for Christians to suffer is not defeat or tragedy.... is not a cult of martyrdom or a kind of masochism or a laudation of suffering in itself. It goes with the belief in the divine use of suffering..... creative in its impact.' (8)

For this reason the non-militarist does not invite suffering but, if called to suffer, believes that God will use him for a redeeming work. He is therefore prepared to accept the consequences of conscientious objection if the State will not provide non-military national service.

### Non-Military National Service:

Most conscientious objectors would be willing to serve a non-military form of national service rather than languish idly in detention barracks. Their willingness is based on the premise that the only lasting security possible for society is the development of a caring community. Further they accept that in order to compensate for the hardships of military life their service ought to be for a longer period.

The concept of a non-military alternative enjoys widespread support. Francis Wilson, for instance, has argued for a more positive and comprehensive form of national service in South Africa. (9) Similarly, W.V. Raw, debating the Defence Further Amendment Bill of 1972, argued that it would be more "Humane and more just" not to imprison a conscientious objector. His proposal was that the objector should be allotted to a 'fire station or a hospital or similar service for a period of two years in lieu of military service'. (10)

Most Western countries now provide alternatives outside the military framework. These include the United States, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, Italy, Holland, France and West Germany. This provision is consistent with a growing awareness that conscientious objection to war is a human right.



JUST WAR THEORYTHE KILLING SPIRIT:

Augustine presented a novel justification for Christian participation in armed conflict. His claim is that killing does not necessarily clash with loving the enemy. What is important is the spirit in which the killing is done.

On this foundation and from the principles of natural law he developed a set of criteria by which the permissibility of war can be weighed.

JUST WAR CRITERIA:

Some of these criteria have to do with the origins of war: Is there a just cause? Has every reasonable attempt been made to get redress without bloodshed? Will war be declared by a legitimate authority?

Other criteria concern the way in which the war is fought: Is it to be waged solely by legitimate and moral means? Is the damage which is likely to be incurred by the war less grievous than the prior injury? Is success likely?

These are taxing questions. Certainly one of the criticisms of the theory is the difficulty of applying its precisions to the complexity of war.

THEOLOGY:

The shortcomings of the theology supporting this doctrine are dealt with exhaustively in 'The Just War in Aquinas and Grotius' by Joan Tooke. Her conclusion is that there exists an imperfect harmony between the principles of Natural Law and Christianity: The Natural Law dictate of acting in accordance with reason, which provides a legitimation for a resort to force in self defence, is opposed to some essential aspects of Jesus' teaching. The disharmony is nowhere greater than in the reasonableness of the Cross; Christ in refusing to call on the twelve legions of angels at his arrest sets a higher vocation for Christians than self-preservation.

CONFLICTING VERSIONS:

A further difficulty with the theory is that successive contributors have now produced a number of conflicting versions. Two examples from James Moulder's paper on 'Conscientious Objection in South Africa' make the point:

- a) John Rawls insists that a war is just only if it is being waged in self defence and only if the nation concerned has just institutions which it wants to preserve. John Calvin, however, argues that nations may wage a just war not only 'to preserve the tranquillity of their dominion' but also to 'help those forcibly oppressed.'
- b) Thomas Aquinas requires a war to be waged by a legitimating authority before it can count as a just war. But Jacques Ellul does not insist on this test. And so he allows for the possibility that a civil war may be just. (11)

The conflicting versions must generate confusion in the mind of a believer sincerely searching for consistency in the theological tradition of his church. But perhaps of greater consequence is that the conflicting versions allow for the development of a theology of the just revolution.



### THE 'JUST WAR' BECOMES THE 'JUST REVOLUTION':

In Liberation theology, the just war becomes the just revolution. Davis writes, "If Christians, who accept the possibility that some wars may be just, are to be consistent, they must also admit that the use of force, including killing, may be right in relation to revolution." (12) This is surely valid; if it is right to resist a foreign invader, then it is equally right to resist by force one's own government if it is intent on oppressing the people.

God certainly has taken an option on the oppressed (13) but to believe that this legitimises violent revolution is perhaps to overlook the dialectical character of God, who is both Love and Justice. It is doubtful whether the Just War and just revolution adequately stand the scrutiny of this dialectical tension.

### A DENIAL OF LOVE:

Augustine justified killing in a 'just war' because he could kill while still loving the enemy. At least Davis does not make the same claim for Liberation theology. He recognises that when his revolutionary requites the oppressor, there is a denial of love. Instead, Davis' thesis is that in a revolutionary situation there is no response whereby the Christian can be justified.

He illustrates this point using a three-fold reference of love in a revolutionary situation. "There is, first, love to the oppressed which may lead us to defend them by force. There is, second, love for the oppressor which may lead us to remove him from power as a step towards his own liberation and greater humanization. There is, third, a denial of love if I have to kill an oppressor". (14)

Davis claims that there is no way out of this dilemma whereby a Christian can be justified; every response entails a partial denial of love and there is no "cheap grace".

### THE WAY OF CHRIST:

Davis' thesis presents a challenge to Christians who believe that Christ never intended them to practise a denial of love. The challenge is to follow the example of Jesus.

Patterning oneself on the life of Jesus has always provided justification for Christian action. For instance, St. Paul urges Christians to "walk in the same way as He (Jesus) walked".

In conflict Christ's walk was to lead him to the cross. He lived in a political environment every bit as revolutionary as is found today. Palestine of the first century was an occupied country, restively submitting to a none-too-benevolent Roman rule. In his ministry he was continually challenged with the Zealot alternative which was to liberate Israel by military force. (16)

This alternative Jesus rejected for the way of the cross; he did not come to be a military messiah but the suffering servant. In this he was obedient to a higher calling, witnessing to the truth that before the oppressor and oppressed could be liberated from each other, they needed to be liberated from themselves.

Jesus in taking the way of the cross, rather than adopting the methods of revolutionary violence to free the oppressed, practised no denial of love. Instead his sacrifice is the perfection of love. And this is the escape provided the disciple. By opposing violence with non-violence while working for peace the Christian fulfills his calling.



Christ himself commanded this response, "If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up his cross and follow me". (17)

#### NON-VIOLENT ACTION:

The way of non-violence is conceivably the only response consistent with Jesus' commands to love one's enemies and to take up the cross in a situation of violence. Yet non-violence is criticized for its passivity. This need not be true when the principles of non-violent action are followed.

Non-violent action makes an assumption regarding the source of power on which is built a challenging new theory of man's potential to resist injustice. The assumption made is that power is given to the rulers and can therefore be withheld. This is not a new insight but what is new are the methods by which ordinary people can withhold that power. Some of these have been successfully tested by movements instructed by Ghandi and Martin Luther King and in situations in Nazi occupied Europe. But the methods of non-violent action are largely untried because of the high cost of commitment; instead of a remote high command sending out some less remote troops to resist a would-be-oppressor, non-violent action requires the involvement of individuals, all laying themselves on the line. This is difficult, and yet for Christians disillusioned with the ambivalence of the Just War, non-violent action promises a new beginning.



## STATEMENT

### 1. CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO WAR:

- 1.1 As a confirmed member of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa (Anglican), I am obliged to translate its teaching to my life.
- 1.2 The 1978 Lambeth Conference resolution on war and violence urges all Christians to re-examine as a matter of urgency their own attitude towards, and their complicity with, violence in its many forms.
- 1.3 Article thirty-seven (37) of the Anglican Church allows Christians to participate in a "Just War". While Protestants have on the whole abandoned the precisions of the Just War Doctrine, the article remains the subject of controversy in the Anglican Communion.
- 1.4 The example of Jesus in His healing ministry, the way of the Cross as Jesus' response to conflict and my reservations about Just War theory convict me not to serve as a combatant in any war.
- 1.5 I do therefore subscribe to the charter of the international Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. The pledge of the fellowship is to 'renounce war and all preparation to wage war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world'.

### 2. NON-COMBATANT SERVICE:

- 2.1 I nevertheless think it helpful to make a rough distinction between wars which appear to be avoidable by means of a negotiated settlement, and those which do not. In wars where a negotiated settlement is clearly not possible, I would be prepared to serve as a non-combatant in the medical corps. In this capacity and in such a war it would be possible to identify with Christ's healing ministry without fear that one was directly contributing to the suffering of war.
- 2.2 In South Africa it appears possible to avert war by involving representative Black leaders in a political settlement. My pledge to renounce all preparation to wage war must in this instance cause me to refuse a non-combatant posting in the Defence Force. This refusal is in my view consistent with working towards the construction of Christian peace in South Africa.

### 3. NON-MILITARY NATIONAL SERVICE:

- 3.1 Rather than languish idly in detention barracks, which is the penalty for refusal, conscientious objectors should be employed in alternative service. I therefore request non-military national service.



REFERENCES:

1. In Alan Paton, Apartheid and the Archbishop: p. 267
2. Bishop Phillip Russell, July Newsletter of the Diocese of Natal.
3. Fr. Oswil Magrath, Catholic Position on Conscientious Objection in General: p. 3
4. Ven. Percy Harthill, Article XXXVII and War: p. 2
5. In Alan Kreider and John Yoder, Christians and War: p. 25 of the Lion History of Christianity.
6. James Moulder, Conscientious Objection in South Africa: p. 8
7. 1 Corinthians 1: 18
8. Michael Ramsay, The Christian Priest Today: p. 30
9. Francis Wilson, War, Peace and Conscience, S.A. Outlook 104. p. 118 - 120
10. Hansard, 1972: Column 2234
11. James Moulder, Conscientious Objection in South Africa: p. 5
12. J.G. Davis, Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution: p. 149
13. Luke 4: 18
14. J.G. Davis, Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution: p. 158
15. 1 John 2: 6
16. Alan Kreider, The Way of Christ: p. 49 of Is Revolution Change, ed. Brian Griffiths
17. Mark: 8 v 34



**Collection Number: AG1977**

**END CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN (ECC)**

**PUBLISHER:**

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©2013

**LEGAL NOTICES:**

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.