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CHRISTIAN ACCORDS AND CONTENTIONS ON PEACE

THOMAS D. PAXSON, JR.

As an undergraduate I attended a Brethren college in the hills of central Pennsylvania. One year we were visited by a representative of the American Friends Service Committee. The visitor was challenged vigorously by a philosophy professor who demanded to know the theological foundations of Friends’ Peace Testimony. The representative of the AFSC rooted it in a conviction that there is that of God in every person. The unfortunate fellow was subjected to a withering barrage of questions: What is it that is of God in every person? That we are created by God? But so are mosquitoes, tapeworms, polio virus, etc. Is it actually a piece of God? Even if there were some way to make sense of this idea, surely, no part of God could be harmed by anything we could do! Isn’t death as much a part of God’s created order as life itself? The AFSC visitor was unable to answer the storm of questions. I, who often had heard the Peace Testimony explained by appeal to that of God in everyone, was left to reflect ruefully on the vague and inadequate accounts so frequently offered young Friends. The professor, a Calvinist, may have sensed my distress, for he later confided to me that a good justification of the Peace Testimony could be found in Barclay’s Apology. That summer, I devoured the Apology from beginning to end; it would have been a lot easier if Dean Freiday’s modern English edition had been out!

When roughly 25 years later Dean Freiday invited me to become involved, however peripherally, in a consultative process under the auspices of the Faith and Order Commission of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA to explore the centrality of peace witness to the Apostolic Faith I was delighted to accept. In what follows, I identify several of the issues that surfaced in the three consultations Dean Freiday mentioned.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ISSUE

Perhaps the very first issue that arises in seeking to initiate ecumenical dialogue on the centrality of peace witness to apostolic faith is why
it should be given significant attention. These last two decades of the twentieth century seem to be an especially opportune time to address this question. Among the many factors that contribute to this I shall mention just five: (1) The ecumenical movement, while it may have lost some of its momentum, is still alive; there is still concern regarding the brokenness of the body of Christ, the fragmentation of the Church. Many persons are interested in revisiting once church-dividing issues to see whether some healing may take place. Disagreements with respect to participation in warfare have been church dividing, especially in the sixteenth century during which Anabaptists were condemned explicitly on this ground, among others, for example by Lutherans in the Augsburg Confession. (2) During the twentieth century there have occurred remarkable and undeniable examples of the use of state violence to wreak unspeakable injustices on innocent peoples, causing churches to recognize the need to separate themselves from the state and to take a critical stance toward it. (3) The threat of nuclear annihilation, or short of that the unimaginable devastation of nuclear war, is seen to be so contrary to just war criteria that churches with just war traditions have used the language of nuclear pacifism. This consideration is especially evident in many of the church peace statements written in the 1980s, for example that of the United Methodist Council of Bishops.1 (4) During the twentieth century there have occurred remarkable and undeniable examples of the power of nonviolent direct action to gain some measure of justice through irenic means. Instead of the stark choice between a peace of submission and a violent justice, understanding is growing of a credible alternative of nonviolent popular direct action. (5) Changing perspectives within the different churches have opened up common ground, or at least convergences between traditions. For these reasons, ecumenical consideration of the centrality of peace witness to apostolic faith seems especially timely. The series of consultations held by Faith and Order has itself contributed to raising the visibility of peace witness as an issue bearing on the unity of the Church.

Complexities

It is not at all easy to map out the issues that arise in ecumenical dialogue regarding the centrality of peace witness to the apostolic faith, since differences are so enmeshed in systems of thought we call theologies, not to speak of their being enmeshed in associated practices,
that any one line of argument tends to lead to many, many more. Identifying some of these lines of argument was one of the tasks confronting those who organized the Faith and Order consultations.

In preparation for the 1990 Oak Brook consultation participants wrote short essays comparing the U.S. Roman Catholic Bishops’ Pastoral: The Challenge of Peace (1983), the HPC/FOR statement, A Declaration on Peace (available then only as an unpublished paper), and one more of nine other church peace statements composed during the 1980s. The discussion facilitated by this work contributed to the decision to publish an anthology, The Church’s Peace Witness, with Howard John Loewen writing a chapter on “The Use of Scripture in the Churches’ Documents on Peace.”

Howard John Loewen classified each of the eleven church peace statements according to the following considerations: whether a statement’s appeals to scripture are primarily narrative, conceptual, or expressive; whether the theological arguments developed are primarily biblical, ecclesial, or practical; and whether the ethical orientation is primarily characterological, deontological, or teleological. It is a fascinating study, though I am sure Loewen would caution that the picture is painted with very broad strokes vastly oversimplifying the character of the various statements.

I have been reflecting on several dimensions within which churches’ disagreements shape their differing appraisals of the centrality of peace witness to apostolic faith. It is a bit overwhelming. The arguments regarding peace witness cut across at least three levels: sources, theological categories, and philosophical presuppositions. At the Oak Brook consultation we looked explicitly at just one source of authority, one foundation for the theological arguments developed in the church peace statements: the appeal to scripture. There seem to be at least four more: church tradition and practice (whether of the “primitive” church only or of the church’s whole history), human reason, science and general knowledge, and direct instruction by the divine. First, a word of explanation regarding “human reason.” This is intended to cover claims that human reason is itself a source of knowledge, a claim typical of eighteenth-century rationalists. Perhaps the most conspicuous example is the Roman Catholic appeal to natural law, understood as moral law embedded in the cosmos that can be apprehended by reason on its own, as opposed to revealed law that can be known only through divine revelation, as for example in the scriptures. I see the pastoral letter of the Roman Catholic bishops as
appealing to at least the first four of these, and I don’t rule out an implicit appeal to the fifth. On the other hand, the HPC/FOR statement appeals principally, if not entirely, to scripture; there is no appeal to either human reason or to science.

Among the basic and interconnected areas of theology that can lead to different appraisals of the centrality of peace witness are, in alphabetic order, Christology, ecclesiology, eschatology, and the theology of peace/shalom. I shall not discuss Christology in this paper. Paul Anderson’s chapter, “Jesus and Peace,” in The Church’s Peace Witness presents compellingly a Friend’s perspective which will serve us very well in ecumenical dialogue. In the course of these remarks, I will touch on each of the other three theological categories.

A third level at which difference in appraisals of peace witness may originate is that of the underlying philosophical orientation presupposed, and here principally in three broad interconnected areas: epistemology (or theory of knowledge), ethics, and metaphysics. Howard John Loewen looked at ethics, and forced the different ethical orientations into three categories, as we’ve seen. With respect to metaphysics, we find here disputes about whether there is such a thing as a fixed, essential human nature, and if so, its character. Much Roman Catholic theology is rooted in a Thomistic metaphysics of human nature, though there are Catholic theologians, for example some influenced by existentialism or later philosophical theories, who would deny there is any such thing, preferring to speak instead about the human condition. Some Friends speak of “that of God in every person.” But remember the questions of the philosopher. Is this a metaphysical claim? If so, what is it that is of God in every person? Is the claim one we would expect our interlocutors in ecumenical dialogue to accept? Why or why not? If it is not a metaphysical claim, is it an ethical one, that is, one that is meant to assert the moral value of each human life? If so, how is it supposed to do this? What is its warrant?

The arguments may be devised to serve different purposes as well: ecumenical dialogue, apologetics, moral formation, evangelical outreach, etc. So we have, as a start, identified five sources, four theological categories, three broad areas of philosophical presuppositions, and four dialectical purposes, each of which comprises an indefinitely large range of options. There seems to be no practical limitation to the number of issues that may be involved with regard to seeking unity on the centrality of peace witness to apostolic faith. At the Oak Brook consultation, John Burkholder, a Mennonite, asked whether
those present found anything wrong in the HPC/FOR’s *A Declaration on Peace*. I have a bit more sympathy now with James Will’s dismissive reply, “It isn’t our hermeneutic.” Sometimes one wonders where to begin! For Friends, concern for peace is not a simple, discrete addition to standard Christianity but derives from our whole theological outlook, rooted in the experience of the inward Christ. Seeing peace witness as central to apostolic faith yields a radically different theology than is traditional in churches that have historically accepted just war theories. Most of the elements are the same, but the connections are different. The experience of discovering how differently Christ appears after nonviolence has become central to one’s faith and practice is powerfully expressed by *The God of Peace,* written by the Jesuit, John Dear, apparently with scant knowledge of Friends. After being awakened to the nonviolence of Christ by the martyrs of El Salvador, he felt compelled to rework his whole theology.

**COMMON GROUND**

Before getting into the church-dividing issues, it is well to rehearse common ground. The eleven peace statements evince general agreement that the human condition is best understood as rooted in the beneficent, peaceable, created order, but that it became “broken,” “scarred,” or “disfigured” by human sin. Christ brought a new order of peace, love, and community that is present in Christ but has not yet reached fulfillment in the world. The Old Testament *shalom* is conceived as inclusive of all creation, a gift of God, and inseparable from justice. Christ has already brought the peace of reconciliation with God, and God does indeed reign now, though not in the fullness of the *shalom* of the Kingdom to come. It is the duty of the faithful community to manifest God’s peace, to witness to a new creation, and to be ministers of reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:18-20). Mutual recognition of this common ground provides, and has provided, a useful starting point for ecumenical discussions of the centrality of peace witness to the apostolic faith.
CONTINUITY/DISCONTINUITY

In the three consultations sponsored by Faith and Order, there was general agreement that Jesus did not teach war or the resort to war, that he did not encourage the people of Judah to rise up and by force of arms expel the Romans. Instead, to quote from the summary statement issued after the Douglaston consultation, “We acknowledged that the New Testament unambiguously calls the church to accept and proclaim the gospel of peace, to follow the way of Jesus in loving enemies and rejecting violence, to carry out a ministry of peacemaking and reconciliation, and to practice the justice of God’s reign.” While recent scholarship has shown the witness of the early church to be more ambiguous than pictured by Cadoux and Bainton, it remains nonetheless clear that there was in the early church a strong witness against participation in military activity. This witness and the teachings of Jesus lead to a number of issues, not least being the relevance of New Testament injunctions and early Christian practices to today’s world. What Loewen called the biblical arguments, that is, those that appealed primarily to Scripture, seek to establish scripturally based knowledge of God’s will. Such knowledge (presumably) depends for its relevance on significant continuity between the human condition in biblical times and in our own. This points to a major complex of issues in contention, which complex includes concerns with the authority of church tradition and of the importance of the social sciences. Permit me to unpack this a bit. Radical reformation churches (like the Mennonites, Brethren, and Friends) have historically sought to reclaim primitive Christianity, seeing the early Church as a model for today and all times.

If there is a deep and essential continuity underlying the obvious social and historical differences, then it makes sense to “translate” Jesus’ teachings and example straightforwardly and directly to Christians of the late twentieth century, as is done in the HPC/FOR A Declaration on Peace. In opposition to this stance, it might be wondered why teachings offered to a small group from an oppressed minority within the mighty Roman Empire should be assumed appropriate to members of an established state church, let alone to citizens of a twentieth-century democratic republic in North America. Against the view that the Bible has little to say to us today, the United Methodist Council of Bishops warned,
We believe it is a serious error to give extreme emphasis to the historic differences between biblical generations and our own. Such an emphasis can make scriptural imperatives seem irrelevant to the nuclear crisis and the pursuit of peace. Too much Christian discussion of war and peace over the intervening centuries has lost the breadth and depth of scriptural understanding of creation, God’s action in history, the world of nations, and human destiny.\(^1\)

The bishops saw themselves as following a middle way between “an extreme emphasis” on historic differences and a failure to take due account of them. While the Catholic bishops also sought a middle way, they asserted that “even a brief examination of war and peace in the scriptures makes it clear that they do not provide us with detailed answers to the specifics of the questions we face today.”\(^2\) What is required, they hold, is an ongoing revelation of God’s will.

Friends are challenged in ecumenical dialogue to take due account of historical change. While we seek to meet this challenge in terms of our belief in continuing revelation of God’s will concerning the application of fundamental principles revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus, this is only part of the story, for differences over continuity and discontinuity penetrate the themes of peace, eschatology, and ecclesiology as well.

**Peace**

The church peace statements agree that Christ is our peace, as Paul says (Eph. 2:14-16). But what is the nature of the peace that is proclaimed? The Roman Catholic statement carefully distinguishes four senses of “peace”: right relationship with God, eschatological peace, an individual’s sense of well-being or security, and the cessation of armed hostility, with the first two predominating in the scriptures and giving direction for the latter two. One disagreement concerns the interconnectedness of the four senses. For example, the Orthodox representatives tended to insist that the Church’s principal responsibility to the peace of Christ is to bring it about sacramentally in holy communion. It is in communion that the faithful Christian can most fully experience God’s blessed peace. This is the foretaste of the peace that is to come with the Eschaton. War itself, they hold, is always evil and participation in war is always participation in sin. The warrior...
needs to repent and to pray for purification. Just war theory is not part of their tradition, though it is part of their tradition that evil war is sometimes thrust upon Christians by circumstance.

The issues to which I direct your attention here are first, the connection between the peace of Christ, understood as right relationship with God, and the other three senses of “peace”: the eschatological, the individual, and the sociopolitical; and second, the extent to which eschatology is realized or realizable. What I mean by this latter is expressed by Howard John Loewen as follows:

The [church peace] statements display a growing recognition that the reign of God and this world are not simply mixed together in the present, but are distinguished aeonically, with God’s reign being already realized but not yet fully so. The question is whether the already is too contaminated by the not yet to prevent our living out of the new reality.\(^{13}\)

**ESCHATOLOGY**

Some hold that we are too contaminated, that there is no reason to suppose God’s grace will lift us out of our depravity sufficiently that we could genuinely love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to those who hate us, and pray for those who persecute us. Since we are not obliged to do what we cannot do, we are not obligated to live the irenic life of the Sermon on the Mount. Friends have insisted, historically, that through divine guidance and assistance it is possible to live in the life of that spirit which takes away the occasion of war. Notice that it is implicit in this claim that the peace of right relationship to God leads to a measure of eschatological peace now, in this world, and through it to individual and sociopolitical peace. They are inextricably connected, with the latter two dependent on (not just being given direction by) the former. Friends today would benefit from giving more attention to eschatology, as Doug Gwyn has urged.\(^{14}\)

Mennonite Dr. Lois Barrett argued at the Notre Dame consultation in 1995 that a theology that supports peacemaking must hold both that God’s reign will be established on earth in the future and, second, embrace an ethic by which the faithful live now in that life of the reign to come. Without the latter there would be no peacemaking; without the former, there would be no sustaining hope.
Liberal Friends today, insofar as they give any consideration to eschatology, are likely to conceive a benign, nonviolent eschatology without stern judgment. Prof. Miroslav Volf, at the same consultation, argued that this is inadequate. He told of returning to his native Croatia and joining a gathering of friends from years past. As he listened to their stories of murdered parents, raped and tortured spouses, slaughtered children, injustice heaped upon injustice, he found himself unable to speak to them of an eschaton in which the brutal butchers of humanity would be received as lovingly as their innocent victims. We human beings demand justice and so, Prof. Volf suggested, “the certainty of God’s just judgment at the end of history is the presupposition for renunciation of violence in the middle of the history.”

While Dr. Barrett’s hope may be in the eventual enjoyment of God’s peace—understood as shalom, Prof. Volf’s hope is in the eventual triumph of justice. He invoked, but rejected himself, the argument that the Christian ethic of nonviolence is at heart an ethic of cosmic violence: the poor and meek, who suffer impotently and non-resistingly the violence wreaked upon them, dream of a vengeance that will bring the whole world to infernal destruction. Evidence that this is the underlying logic of Christian nonresistance is found by at least one European theologian in the Revelation of John of Patmos. Here, the argument goes, we find the flip side of the self-sacrificing Jesus of Nazareth in the rider on the white horse who brings cataclysmic destruction. Jesus gives his love indiscriminately and unconditionally; he is cruelly executed as a criminal while the evil survive and appear to triumph over him, the sacrificial lamb. But then the resurrected lamb becomes an avenger, a rider on the white horse who ruthlessly and unconditionally, if not indiscriminately, wreaks vengeance on those who find no favor in his eyes. Prof. Volf argued that these texts assume that human beings can willfully and completely spurn God’s redeeming love and that such people must be excluded finally and irrevocably from the blessed kingdom. If we do not accept this exclusion of irredeemable human monsters from the blessed presence of God, believing rather in a “God who refuses to judge” then our human demand for justice will lead us to assume the responsibility of scourging the evil, he argued, and we will become ensnared in the familiar cycle of violence. Those of us who believe in Christian nonviolence, he continued, must believe that vengeance is
truly the Lord’s, that in the fullness of time justice, not merely peace, will reign. Do Friends agree?

ETHICS

Consideration of New Testament teachings led us to questions of eschatology, and these to the very human concern for justice. But justice isn’t merely a human concern; it is also God’s covenantal concern. The prophetic voice cries out for justice. The demand for justice is one of the major issues brought against gospel nonviolence. From Augustine to Niebuhr, the arguments pour forth that violence is necessary to protect the innocent.

Nonpacifists sometimes assume that Friends and others conscientiously opposed to participation in war engage in a naive pretense that there is no evil. Friends, and Brethren and Mennonites as well, do not deny that people act in evil ways. Unlike the Ranters, who denied sin on the ground that God created all, Friends were very much aware of the evil which we know from our own experience, not just in suffering evil but in our own struggles to live in the Light. Early Friends insisted on the reality of evil, having suffered both temptations and brutal persecution. But they also insisted on the possibility of discipleship, on the possibility of acting, with divine assistance, as Christ would have us act.

All three historic peace churches in their formative periods adopted nonresistance as the Christ-willed response to the evils others maliciously inflicted upon them. The principal emphasis in early Quakerism was on the immediate presence of Christ; human beings can attend the holy Master who makes himself available as teacher, and what he taught (they believed) was, inter alia, nonresistance, or rather (as it came to be called) passive resistance. They resisted what they took to be unjust or idolatrous laws or practices by not conforming to them, but they did so openly and nonviolently. Among Mennonites and Brethren there seems to be a clear understanding of the difference between this stance and that of active nonviolent intervention to bring about peace and justice. This may be because until a century or century and a half ago, Mennonites and Brethren regarded participation in civil governance to be contrary to the spirit of Christ. We should live in the Kingdom of God rather than in the kingdoms of this world, with their idolatrous claims on our very
persons and our consciences, let alone their tendency to implicate us in violence. Since Friends were never proscribed by their own precepts from participating in civil governance (as opposed to military organizations) Friends have not been as concerned to mark the difference between nonresistance and nonviolent direct action. This should not mask the significance of the distinction. Nonresistance regards as hubris, as playing God, if you will, human attempts to exact justice upon others against their will. Rather than do this, the nonresister speaks prophetically but humbly leaves consequences in God’s hands. Nonviolent direct action, on the other hand, marshals more tangible force in the pursuit of justice; it can be coercive. It reminds us there are always alternatives to submission on the one hand or perpetrating violence on the other. But even the redemptive suffering and the prophetic voice of the nonresister do have power, do exercise some measure of force.

It might be supposed that the difference is principally that nonviolent direct action is capable of marshaling greater force. There is a difference in kind, though, not merely a difference in degree, between nonresistance and nonviolent direct action. Nonviolent direct action campaigns, as developed by Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. among others, are conducted with thorough calculation of consequences. There is long-range planning with deliberate attempts to control outcomes. The shift to nonviolent direct action is a shift toward consequentialist ethics and as such is much closer to that of just war theory than is nonresistance. The concern for power, control, and consequences legitimates dialogue with respect to the effectiveness of alternatives to violence in achieving the ostensibly common goal of peace with justice. But (just war advocates suppose) then it also necessitates dialogue regarding the effectiveness of violence in achieving this goal. Indeed, Gene Sharp has pointed out that many, if not most, of the major nonviolent campaigns carried out in this century have been carried out by persons who chose nonviolence not for moral but for practical reasons.

The ecumenical dialogue is facilitated by the clear demonstrations in this century of the power of concerted nonviolent campaigns. It is my experience that this development is welcomed by churches with just war traditions. There appears to them to be common ground, but I submit there is less common ground than they suppose, for the issue remains whether violent means are ever appropriate. The Orthodox notion of synergy might be useful to Friends here in tying means and
ends: the faithful are called to work with the Spirit, which involves working under the guidance of the Spirit to fulfill the Spirit’s purposes.\textsuperscript{16} It has been our testimony that this precludes resort to violence.

**Ecclesiology**

Faith and Order conducted the three consultations within the context of its concern for church unity. The easiest and most straightforward ecclesiological issue is the condemnation of pacifists for heresy, one of the reasons the magisterial reformers declared Anabaptists heretical (Augsburg, the Thirty-Nine Articles, Westminster). Marlin Miller reported in Chapter 9 of *The Church’s Peace Witness* that in recent discussions between Lutherans and Mennonites in Germany the Lutheran participants said that today the condemnation language would not be used by Lutherans against Anabaptists and that they now ask forgiveness for the ancient persecutions. This is an important step in the healing of the church.

A different appeal to ecclesiology I found initially more difficult to follow. At the Notre Dame consultation, Ted Koontz (reviving an argument raised decades earlier by M.R. Ziegler) challenged the high church just war theorists to agree that Christians should not kill other Christians. I am grateful to John Howard Yoder’s patient explanation for the following interpretation: the so-called “high churches” were established under the presumption that the entire nation (Sweden, England, Scotland,...) was the church. They regard themselves as “inclusive” churches, as opposed to “believers” churches, like the Anabaptists. The Church of Sweden and the Church of England see themselves as different churches, albeit also part of the one church universal. It is in this context that the argument is posed. One formulation of it is found in the 1953 HPC/IFOR statement, “Peace is the Will of God”:

For Christians to allow themselves to be drawn into taking sides in war is a denial of the unity of the body of Christ. The Christian church is not provincial or national, it is universal. Therefore every war in which churches on each side condone or support the national effort becomes a civil war within the church. Is not this state of affairs where Christian kills Christian an even greater breach of ecumenical fellowship than the deplorable confessional differences that have rent our unity?
Indeed, can we Christians expect the Lord to restore our unity in worship as long as we put one another to death on the field of battle?¹⁷

Closely aligned with this argument is the somewhat different but related argument that Christians who support their nation-state’s war against another nation of Christians give higher allegiance to the state than to the body of Christ, the universal church, and that this amounts to idolatry. The concern to avoid idolatry has always been a significant part of Christian pacifism, from the early church to the Anabaptists and Mennonites of the sixteenth century, seventeenth-century Friends, and eighteenth-century Brethren.

CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to highlight several issues that were raised in the course of the last several years of ecumenical dialogue on the centrality of peace witness to apostolic faith. There is some hope in ecumenical circles that we can move beyond the old pacifism/just war dichotomy as a result of the growth of theologies of nonviolence, as seen in the work of such persons as Walter Wink¹⁸ and John Dear. The hope is that there will be a convergence toward just-peace-making and, indeed, there does appear to be modest movement in this direction within both just war and historic peace church traditions.

Change is never without stress, however, and stresses within the historic peace church tradition are exemplified by the consultation held at Nyack, New York, in 1993 under the auspices of the Historic Peace Churches/Fellowship of Reconciliation Consultative Committee. It was called to assess how religious peacemakers might best respond in this evolving post Cold War world in which (1) violent conflicts are more commonly arising within nation-states than between them, (2) the United Nations has been called on to use armed forces to “make” peace and not merely “keep” peace, and (3) the use of active nonviolence strategies during this century offers “new insights into more creative ways of dealing with conflict and violence.”¹⁹ The consultation provided an opportunity for persons in the forefront of peace work to consult with others working for peace at very different sociopolitical levels and with those who have been reflecting on the spiritual foundations of peace witness. The stresses to which I referred arose in the struggle to discern how best we might
promote peace with justice at all socio-political levels in this new world order and how existing social institutions, including military ones, might be used, if at all, in support of these efforts. (It was noted that in some developing countries military institutions have performed a wide range of nonmilitary functions.)

Among Friends there is perennial reconsideration of our peace testimony. Readers of Friends Journal, for example, may remember Alfred F. Andersen’s article, “Peace or Justice? Continuing Revelation and Structural Change,” advocating the substitution of a justice testimony for the peace testimony. I suggest that as we struggle to discern God’s will for us today, while learning a deeper appreciation and understanding of the power of nonviolent direct action, Friends’ peace testimony is evolving into a just peace testimony. I hope and trust that it will be grounded in our experience of divine guidance, our experience of faithful community, and the synergy of realized eschatology with both its prophetic and icoenic dimensions.
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7. The Church’s Peace Witness, p. 212.
12. The Challenge of Peace, section 55; see also section 28.
16. I am indebted to Terry Coutret for bringing this to my attention.
17. Reprinted in *A Declaration on Peace*, p. 70.
19. From the “Mission Statement” for the HPC/FOR Consultation at Shadowcliff (Nyack, NY December 3-4, 1993).