

*Peacemaking:
The Believers' Calling*

**“Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall
be called the children of God.”**

**The United Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America**

Additional copies available at \$1.50 each from Distribution
Management Services (DMS), 100 Witherspoon Street,
Room 1A 1425, Louisville, KY 40202-1396, or by calling 1-800-524-2612
outside of Louisville; 502-569-5618 in Louisville.
Please specify DMS order #OGA-88-047.

**COPYRIGHT © 1980 BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1201 INTERCHURCH CENTER, 475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10115

Telephone 212-870-2005



William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk
Otto K. Finkbeiner, Associate Stated Clerk and Treasurer
Rev. Robert F. Stevenson, Associate Stated Clerk
Rev. Robert T. Newbold, Jr., Associate Stated Clerk

September 1980

TO: The Pastors and Congregations of All Particular Churches,
Stated Clerks and Executives of Presbyteries and Synods of
The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

Dear Friends:

The 192nd General Assembly (1980) centered its attention programmatically on the report Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling.

This report of the Advisory Council on Church and Society, requested by the 187th General Assembly (1975), was available for its consideration. Thirty overtures on issues of peace communicated to the commissioners of the Assembly the urgency of this concern at this time and the widespread commitment of our people to it. After careful deliberation, the General Assembly issued a Call to pastors, sessions, and people of the United Presbyterian Church for a special emphasis on peacemaking.

Included here in addition to the Call and the Recommendations adopted by the General Assembly, you will find the Background Paper and the Appendixes which the General Assembly received. Also included are a discussion guide, a glossary, suggested Biblical passages, and information about other materials available.

You will note that as a part of the churchwide emphasis on peacemaking, the General Assembly has requested in Recommendation 3 that "each session and congregation...engage in a program of study and action for peacemaking, drawing on the leadership of the congregational organizations--particularly leadership in the United Presbyterian Women--and employing the report 'Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling' as a resource for planning and implementation of this effort."

The General Assembly also approved Recommendation 6 which "requests each congregation on the occasion of World Communion Sunday each fall beginning in 1980, to celebrate our common life in the global bonds of Christ's peace-giving body and, as part of the celebration, to receive a special offering to support initiatives on peacemaking and peace education throughout the church." The World Communion Packet 1980 contains materials on peace, including a special offering envelope that may be ordered free in bulk from Presbyterian Distribution Service, 935 Interchurch Center, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115.

William P. Thompson

PEACEMAKING: THE BELIEVERS' CALLING

In response to the request of the 187th General Assembly (1975), the Advisory Council on Church and Society submits the following report on "Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling" to the 192nd General Assembly (1980) and *recommends* that the "Call to Peacemaking" (Part I) and the Recommendations (Part II) be adopted; and that the Introduction, Background Analysis (Part III), and Appendixes be received.

Introduction

The Advisory Council on Church and Society was commissioned by the 187th General Assembly (1975) to reassess the concept of peacemaking and the direction of our country's foreign policy in the light of our biblical and confessional faith and a markedly changed situation in the world today.

This request of the General Assembly was a product of its times:

- born in part from the United States' defeat in Southeast Asia and the loss of prestige and power in the changing world situation;
- born in part from the unwillingness of the emerging nations to accept the continued domination of the developed nations;
- born in part from the increasing insecurity over the perilous nuclear weapons stalemate in which any miscalculation could annihilate humanity;
- born in part from concern for the hungry and oppressed of the world.

The Advisory Council on Church and Society created a special task force to undertake this work. As that task force and the advisory council have struggled with these complex and urgent issues in the intervening years, world events have made them ever more complex and urgent. That urgency has been increasingly felt by the world Christian community. It is evident in a memorable statement, "Choose Life," produced in 1979 by a group of church representatives from the U.S.S.R. and the United States. This statement was endorsed by the 191st General Assembly (1979) and by United Presbyterian Women, who also declared peacemaking to be a mandate for United Presbyterian Women in the next triennium. In 1978 hundreds of Christians from churches in the United States gathered at The Riverside Church in New York City to consider Christian response to the arms race and have since stimulated numerous local and regional conferences.

This report then is a response to a growing sense of urgency and need among Christians of the United States and to the concern of churches all over the world. It differs from most recommendations coming from the Advisory Council on Church and Society. The report

does not contain extensive analysis of specific social policy issues nor does it recommend specific positional stances in relation to them. It instead asks the General Assembly to focus for the church a fundamental dimension of biblical faithfulness in a moment of great peril and to call the church to a new seriousness in obedience.

We United Presbyterians have had our peace pronouncements and advocacy programs, and we have been on the right track. But they have been inadequate as a response to the world's peril, our nation's policies, and God's promise. Indeed, among some people a privatized pietism has made such inroads that even disarmament is seen as a "secular" matter and not a proper concern of the church—surely a strange posture for the spiritual descendants of John Calvin, who was deeply involved in the public issues of his time. The Reformed tradition of Christian faith has been historically committed to world-transforming action. Reconciliation to God has included reconciliation to the neighbor and action in the social, political, and economic realms for the sake of just order and peace.

It is the hope and prayer of the Advisory Council on Church and Society and the task force that prepared the report that the affirmation and call of the 192nd General Assembly (1980) will challenge the United Presbyterian Church to precisely such obedience now, trusting in God that new commitment and action in peacemaking may bring an imperiled world closer to what God wills for its nations and peoples.

The report consists of:

- I. Call to Peacemaking—An Affirmation of Policy and Direction
- II. Recommendations
- III. Background Analysis
 - A. The New Global Reality
 - B. Theological and Ethical Bases for Peacemaking
 - C. Theological and Ethical Bases for Policymaking
- IV. Appendixes
 - A. Brief Summary of Existing General Assembly Positions
 - B. Outline of Potential Program Activities

The Advisory Council on Church and Society expresses deep appreciation to those who served on the task force that prepared this report. They were:

William H. Creevey, *Chairperson*; Pastor, St. Peters by the Sea, Rancho Palos Verdes, California

Henry Bucher, Pastor, Bryn Mawr Presbyterian Church, Cottage Grove, Wisconsin; Africa Studies Program Staff, University of Wisconsin—Madison

Dorothy Dodge, James Wallace Professor of Political Science, Macalester College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Vernon L. Ferwerda, Professor Emeritus, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Wardsboro, Vermont

L. Charles Gray, Pastor, Presbyterian Church of St. Albans, St. Albans, New York

Peter Johnson, former North American Secretary, World Student Christian Federation; Founder of Middle East Research and Information Project, Boston, Massachusetts

Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., Professor of Christian Ethics, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey

Anne A. Murphy, Professor of American Political Science, Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, Florida

Mary Pardee, Elder; former National President, United Presbyterian Women, Gibsonia, Pennsylvania

William W. Rogers, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Huntington, New York; former Director, Westminster Foundation, Cornell University

Ronald H. Stone, Professor of Social Ethics, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dana W. Wilbanks, Associate Professor of Christian Ethics, Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado

William J. Wiseman, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Resource Consultants:

Richard Barnet, Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.

Charles W. Yost, Career Diplomat; former United States Ambassador to the United Nations; Aspen Institute

Townsend Hoopes, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; President of the Association of American Publishers

Eugene Carson Blake, former Stated Clerk, The United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; former General Secretary, World Council of Churches

Resource Staff:

Dean H. Lewis, Director, Advisory Council on Church and Society

Robert F. Smylie, Associate for Peace and International Affairs, Program Agency

Edward M. Huenemann, Associate for Planning and Theological Studies, Program Agency

Consultant Staff Services:

Ralph N. Mould provided administrative service to the task force as a special consultant.

I. Call to Peacemaking—An Affirmation of Policy and Direction

Twenty centuries ago, “in the fullness of time,” God sent Jesus the Christ. Now there is a special time in history—a season (kairos)—summoning the faith and obedience of God’s people. For Christ has gathered and deployed his people around the earth, across political and economic lines, in places of powerfully protected affluence, and among the poorest of the poor. The body of Christ responds to the world’s pain with empathy and anguish, one part for another, in our time.

Ominous clouds hang over human history. There are frightening risks in the continuing arms race and looming conflicts over diminishing energy resources as centers of power struggle for control. Our fear for safety has led us to trust in the false security of arms; our sin of war has led us to take life; and now we are in danger of taking our own lives as well. Furthermore, economic systems fail to allow a quarter of the world’s population full participation in their societies, creating recurrent patterns of starvation and famine in Asia and Africa as in the 1970’s.

But we believe that these times, so full of peril and tragedy for the human family, present a special call for obedience to our Lord, the Prince of Peace. The Spirit is calling us to life out of death.

The church must discern the signs of the times in the light of what the Spirit is revealing. We see signs of resurrection as the Spirit moves the churches to call for peace. We are at a turning point. We are faced with the decision either to serve the Rule of God or to side with the powers of death through our complacency and silence.

In these days we know that Jesus was sent by God into all the world. As we break bread together, our eyes are opened and we recognize his living presence among us—Christ crucified by the tragic inequities on the earth—calling us together.

We are Christ’s people, compelled by the Spirit and guided by our creeds to listen to a gospel that is addressed to the whole world. We are gathered around the Lord’s Table with people from North and South and East and West. A new integrity is required of us: integrity in worship, integrity in secular life, integrity in relationship with Christ and Christians everywhere.

There is a new sense of the oneness of the world in our time. Humankind’s initial forays into space have created a new perspective, a dramatic sense of the earth—the whole earth—as home. The era of satellite communication systems and the migration of millions of people from continent to continent have produced a new awareness of conditions of life everywhere on the globe.

It is not possible, in such a time, to avoid awareness of the economic disparities and political oppression besetting the human family. It is not

possible to escape the knowledge of human suffering, and it is not possible to ignore the incongruous juxtaposition of affluence and arms on the one hand, and poverty and oppression on the other. The futility of nuclear war on a small planet as a solution to human problems is apparent.

We know that there can be no national security without global security and no global security without political and economic justice. As God's people, we will not cry "Peace, peace" without the fullness of God's shalom. As God's people, we will seek the security of the whole human family—all for whom Christ died. As God's people, we will celebrate the dignity of each of God's children.

We know that peace cannot be achieved simply by ending the arms race unless there is economic and political justice in the human family. Peace is more than the absence of war, more than a precarious balance of powers. Peace is the intended order of the world with life abundant for all God's children. Peacemaking, is the calling of the Christian church, for Christ is our peace who has made us one through his body on the cross.

How will peace be achieved? By disarmament? Certainly, but not only by disarmament. By global economic reform? Certainly, but not only by global economic reform. By the change of political structures? Basically, at the heart, it is a matter of the way we see the world through the eyes of Christ. It is a matter of praying and yearning. It is an inner response to God, who loves the whole world and whose Spirit calls for and empowers the making of peace.

With repentance and humility and the power of hope, let us tend to our task.

To that end the 192nd General Assembly (1980) affirms peacemaking as the responsibility of the United Presbyterian Church and declares:

1. *The church is faithful to Christ when it is engaged in peacemaking.* God wills shalom—justice and peace on earth. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God," said our Lord, the Prince of Peace. Those who follow our Lord have a special calling as peacemakers. In our confessions of faith the church has recognized this vocation, yet in our life we have been unfaithful to our Lord. We must repent. Our insensitivity to today's patterns of injustice, inequality, and oppression—indeed, our participation in them—denies the gospel. Christ alone is our peace. As part of his body in the whole church, we experience the brokenness of this world in our own life. Today we stand at a turning point in history. Our structures of military might, economic relations, political institutions, and cultural patterns fail to meet the needs of our time. At stake is our future and our integrity as God's people.

2. *The church is obedient to Christ when it nurtures and equips*

God's people as peacemakers. The church expects the gifts and guidance of the Holy Spirit in this task. (Eph. 4:1-16.) Where the church is obedient to Christ, congregations will come alive in peacemaking. In worship we recognize the presence of God with us in our poor fragile lives. We live by the faith that God alone has cosmic dominion, that Christ alone is the Lord of the church and history, that the Holy Spirit alone empowers us here and now. We realize afresh that we are engaged in spiritual struggle.

In the proclamation of God's word of judgment and promise we are freed from guilt and paralyzing fear; at the Lord's Table we discover our brothers and sisters around the world; in baptism we are united in solidarity with the whole body; in prayer we lift our concern for the victims of injustice, oppression, and warfare; in praise we celebrate the gift of life, the Prince of Peace; in study we focus on foreign policy subjects in light of biblical and theological considerations.

The General Assembly has established positions on many subjects related to peace and justice, providing directions to facilitate the study and action necessary to equip God's people for the ordering of the church's life and the establishment of public policies in support of peacemaking. (A brief summary of some of these is shown in the Appendix.) The report on "Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling" is a logical and even essential place to start in study and equipment for witnessing. Interaction at the congregational level on the issues discussed in that report and in past actions of the General Assembly raises consciousness and transforms sensitivities about other peoples and their needs, about justice, and about the directions of United States foreign policy. Contact with other members of the worldwide Christian community enhances our growth as peacemakers.

Through worship and study we are miraculously strengthened by God's grace, and find new energy for action and a new sense of vocation crucial to peacemaking and the buoyant Christian life.

3. *The church bears witness to Christ when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace in our world.* The church's faithful obedience to its calling means active participation in the formation of the values and beliefs of our society. It means seeking peace in the personal and social relationships of our culture and exercising our citizenship in the body politic to shape foreign policy. It is of strategic importance for us to nurture changes in public attitude and to raise public consciousness.

By God's grace we are members of a world community and can bring our global insights and peacemaking to our particular settings. By God's grace we are freed to work with all people who strive for peace and justice and to serve as signposts for God's love in our broken world. To deny our calling is a disservice to the church and the world. To affirm our calling is to act in "faith, hope and love." The love of Christ

constrains us. The choices may be difficult, but there is no substitute for acting as a church on the specific foreign policy problems affecting peace in our world today. Our "strength is in [our] confidence that God's purpose rather than [human] schemes will finally prevail." (Confession of 1967 (9.25).)

In such assurance all United Presbyterians are challenged to worship, study, and live boldly in Christ, as expressed in this Psalm of Peacemaking:

A Psalm of Peacemaking

We live in a time of kairós*
 when humanity stands on the border of a promised time,
 when God's people are summoned to obedience and faithfulness
 to preserve God's creation,
 to stand with the poor and oppressed everywhere, and
 to stand together as the people of the earth;
 when with confession and with humility we repent of
 our blindness to the division and war in our own hearts and in our own land,
 our obsession with money and our pursuit of power,
 our irrational belief in security through weaponry, and
 our worship of secular gods.

We are called
 to be obedient to Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace,
 who loves the whole world and
 who invites us to be stewards of the earth and servants of his people,
 to be co-workers in the new Creation.

Let us be peacemakers.
 Let us be called the children of God,
 speaking boldly with moral conviction to the nation and to the world,
 building, with God's grace, a new moral order in the world community; and
 acting now for world peace, an enterprise of justice, an outcome of love.

II. Recommendations

The new global reality and our faith call us to recognize the task of peacemaking at the center of our church's mission in this critical time. We must begin to match our confession of the Lordship of Christ as the Prince of Peace with the practice of our church in its ministry as a gathered and dispersed community. The church urgently needs to mobilize at every level for maximum involvement and influence in peacemaking.

To that end, the 192nd General Assembly (1980), having considered the report of the Advisory Council on Church and Society, and in response to overtures from thirty-one presbyteries†:

*Awareness of God's purpose breaking in.

†Baltimore, Cayuga-Syracuse, Des Moines, Detroit, Donegal, East Iowa, Eastminster, Genesee Valley, Geneva, Grand Canyon, Hudson River, Lake Michigan, Long Island, Los Ranchos, Louisville (Union), Maumee Valley, Missouri Union, Monmouth, Muskingum Valley, New Brunswick, New York City, North Puget Sound, Olympia, Philadelphia, Scioto Valley, Southern New England, South Florida, Susquehanna Valley, Utica, Wabash Valley, Western Reserve.

1. Calls The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to undertake a special emphasis on “Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling” for an initial period of four years, beginning immediately.

2. *Recommends* that the churchwide peacemaking emphasis include elements of worship, study, consciousness-raising, witness, advocacy, leadership development and training, research, advanced study opportunities, service, continuing education for ministers, ecumenical and coalition cooperation, and linkage with other areas of mission activity, in order to strengthen the commitment and practice of United Presbyterians to the vocation of peacemaking through efforts that will:

a. Increase the witness, advocacy, and legislative action efforts of the United Presbyterian Church on issues of peacemaking, disarmament, international economics, foreign policy, and international justice, with particular attention to the concerns of those who struggle for liberation, human rights, and social justice. Also, particular attention should be given to promoting participation in IMPACT (the legislative action network supported by the United Presbyterian Church) in presbyteries and congregations or to initiating a separate legislative information network on issues related to slowing, stopping, and reversing the worldwide arms race.

b. Develop leadership at all levels of church life for a peacemaking ministry in the community of the church universal and in the secular occupations of United Presbyterians.

c. Engage seminarians and young people in their academic or social growth in order to deepen awareness of global issues and to enrich their conception of vocation as peacemakers and participants in the formation of foreign policy.

d. Develop liturgical materials that encourage a sense of global interdependence and a ministry of peacemaking among United Presbyterians.

e. Help persons understand critical world issues in the light of biblical-confessional faith, using existing study and interpretation materials and, where necessary, developing new materials.

f. Support and enrich research and analysis of war/peace issues and peacemaking, with particular attention to conversion of the economy from military to civilian production.

g. Recognize and affirm the witness of other churches and ecumenical bodies, including the contributions of secular bodies, already at work in the area of peacemaking in our global community and continue our historic support of such churches and ecumenical bodies through the involvement of persons and provision of financial resources.

h. Support specific programs already underway—such as those on hunger, self-development, and world relief—whose activities support the broad objective of peacemaking.

i. Support creative local initiatives to serve the ministry of peacemaking in church and community.

j. Encourage presbyteries and sessions to establish cooperative relationships with local church peace fellowships and other community peace groups, sharing resources and experiences.

3. Requests each session and congregation to engage in a program of study and action for peacemaking, drawing on the leadership of congregational organizations—particularly leadership in the United Presbyterian Women—and employing the report “Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling” as a resource for planning and implementation of this effort.

4. Requests synods and presbyteries to establish task forces or committees on peacemaking to:

a. Provide guidelines, training, and resources for congregations for engaging in peacemaking efforts.

b. Develop proposals whereby the synods and presbyteries may themselves develop and initiate appropriate peacemaking efforts, seeking ecumenical channels for all such efforts if possible.

To aid these efforts, synods and presbyteries are encouraged to explore the appointment of peacemaking advocates or enablers on a volunteer, part-time, or full-time basis.

5. Requests all agencies of the General Assembly, seminaries, colleges, and other institutions related to the United Presbyterian Church to examine all areas of current work and explore how they might more effectively support the peacemaking emphasis and to consider new efforts to advance the objectives suggested by the General Assembly for the special peacemaking emphasis.

6. Requests each congregation, on the occasion of World Communion Sunday each fall beginning in 1980, to celebrate our common life in the global bonds of Christ’s peace-giving body and, as part of the celebration, to receive a special offering to support initiatives on peacemaking and peace education throughout the church. The 192nd General Assembly (1980) further *recommends* that each session retain 25 percent of the proceeds of such offering to support the peacemaking efforts of the congregation, designate 25 percent for use by the synod and constituent presbyteries as determined by processes appropriate to each synod, and designate 50 percent for use by the General Assembly to provide resources for the whole church and support the corporate peacemaking efforts of the United Presbyterian Church.

7. Directs the Program Agency to begin preparation of resources for the church and initiate peacemaking efforts to support the special

emphasis on “Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling” to the maximum degree possible with existing personnel and financial capacities or with those that might be redeployed temporarily without jeopardizing other essential mission commitments.

8. Directs the Program Agency to use the General Assembly share of the proceeds of the special offering to establish a program of resourcing, stimulating, advocating, and educating for peacemaking that will provide for:

a. Additional resources, in cooperation with United Presbyterian Women and the Support Agency, that might be available for supporting the peacemaking emphasis.

b. The establishment and filling of a permanent, new full-time staff position for peacemaking and consideration of additional personnel needs as the peacemaking emphasis develops and resources are made available from special sources or from the Peacemaking Offering.

c. The appointment of an Advisory Committee on Peacemaking, including broad representation from the church-at-large, from groups such as United Presbyterian Women, United Presbyterian Men, faculty and students of seminaries, youth, and churches in other countries.

9. Directs the Stated Clerk to distribute the full report entitled “Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling” to pastors and congregations in a form convenient for study and to make additional copies available for sale in order to facilitate the earliest consideration of the General Assembly’s call for a special emphasis on peacemaking by the pastors, sessions, and people of the United Presbyterian Church.

10. Directs the Stated Clerk to send copies of the full report “Peacemaking: the Believers’ Calling” to the President of the United States, each member of Congress, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary General of the United Nations.

III. Background Analysis

A. *The New Global Reality*

We are the people of the promise, a church, part of the global community in Jesus Christ. The thinking we do about the world reflects to a large extent this faith assumption. Our first loyalty is to the Lord of the nations. The commandment tells us we can serve no other God. (Exod. 20:3.) The prophets tell us we cannot slide over our sin and call it security. (Jer. 6:13, 14; Ezek. 13:1–16.) The suffering servant brings peace to all the nations. (Isa. 53:5.) Christ, by his sacrifice on the cross, reconciled enemies and thereby created a new community transcending boundaries. (Col. 1:19–22.) We are bidden

to “pursue what makes for peace and for mutual upbuilding.” (Rom. 14:19.)

The analysis of the new global reality that follows is not intended to lay blame but to assess the crisis of our time. Many factors described below are not in themselves new, but their configuration and urgency do represent a new threat. Taken together they pose the imminent possibility of a nuclear holocaust or the disruption of the ecological system.

For more than a century the people of the United States felt protected from international complexities by oceans and geographical distances. The nation could choose its involvements in the affairs of the world according to its own sense of interest. It also assumed that its cherished values of freedom, opportunity, and political justice were inspirational to the peoples of the world. These operating assumptions allowed Americans a comfortable and reassuring self-image. They permitted actions to be made on seemingly open geographical and technological frontiers that enabled us to avoid rather than resolve conflicts.

These assumptions have been challenged drastically. This challenge has affected Americans' self-confidence and sense of control over events, even their courage for coping with crises. America can no longer choose to be involved in selected aspects of world affairs as a means of escaping dilemmas. It is thrust into every interchange and entangling conflict that occurs in any portion of the globe with an increasing sense of the impotence of military might to cope with these challenges and the ineffectiveness of traditional diplomacy in face of them.

The world has become so interdependent that no nation can unilaterally pursue self-sufficiency. Perceptions of time and space have shrunk. Events are known almost instantly and their impact quickly felt. Americans are impacted by a coup, a terrorist assault with sophisticated weapons, a seizure of hostages, the death or deposition of a prominent leader, a famine, a flood of refugees, an arms sale, a delicate negotiation, a grain sale, a currency plunge, a gold boom, or a resource shortage, wherever these occur. Such events send tremors to all parts of the earth, yet the ability to respond creatively is often limited.

Despite awareness of this fact, nations find it difficult to accept limits to their sovereignty or their economic growth. Whether in the effort to obtain or protect fishing rights or to bid for scarce resources, nations need to recognize the necessity of global sharing and cooperation.

The world's population is rapidly increasing. The basic needs of all the world's peoples must be met from the finite resources of the planet. The use of these resources is often attended by ecological abuse and

dislocations that cannot be ignored. Although some resources like food are renewable, other resources such as coal and oil are not. Problems of scarcity create new pressures for justice and point out the inadequacy of the production and distribution patterns that remain with us from the past.

Many have begun to sense that the traditional American definition of progress and trust in continual economic growth may be inappropriate. We cannot expand our economic system or raise our standard of living without suffering the consequences of using up the earth's nonrenewable resources. Heedless productive styles have already revealed destructive ecological potentials. The economy of the United States experiences inflation, dollar decline, soaring interest rates, trade imbalance, chronic high unemployment, and energy deficits. The nation has been unable to resolve these conditions because it does not comprehend that their resolution depends upon more equitable distribution of world resources.

Some economic forces are outside the control of any national structures. Multinational corporations are one such phenomenon. Multinationals can and do shape the course of world economic conditions by trade policies and styles of production. Their relative lack of accountability often exacerbates the problems of nation-states and, more particularly, the lives of developing peoples.

With half the world struggling just to keep alive, most third world countries face enormous problems in achieving economic independence that would allow them to participate fully in the benefits of modern science, technology, and industry. In comparative terms, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. No easy formula—economic or ideological—is sufficient to overcome the legacies of colonial history and limitations of capital, resources, energy, and know-how. Often these countries face debt levels that appear unmanageable, population problems that defy solution, bondage to one-crop or one-resource systems, and the problems created by multinationals. They also frequently face inflation, unemployment, currency instability, trade deficits, and, too often, their own burden of armaments.

Poor countries typically need resources for education, technical training, health services, and modern agricultural methods. In response to third world needs, grants of aid by developed states have been inadequate and often intermixed with military aid programs. Such aid can produce continued economic dependency instead of viable economic health.

To treat people inhumanely is to attack a nation's spirit. Freedom and human rights for each and every individual face difficulty in much of the world. In some countries, with varying degrees of autocracy, power is held only by force of arms, some of which the United States

government and private companies sell to third world elites. Fear of arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, military tribunals, torture, or death at the point of a gun serve to keep the lid on revolution. Sometimes there may be an appearance of stability that obscures severe oppression. Hunger, poverty, disease, and inequality continue while human rights are suppressed. Different forms of tyranny are maintained in the name of stability benefiting only the elite.

Both developed and developing states in pursuit of increased growth produce more "goods" but also "evils." Oil spills, nuclear waste, polluted water and air and landscapes, raped lands and forests are by-products of heedless growth patterns as they exist in all economic systems.

In the context of global interdependence, unsolved economic and human problems cry for attention and solution. A major factor of the new global reality is accurately described in a statement of the World Council of Churches Conference on Disarmament at Glion, Switzerland, April 9-15, 1978:

We are now living in the shadow of an arms race more intense, more costly, more widespread and more dangerous than the world has ever known. Never before has the human race been as close as it is now to total self-destruction. Today's arms race is an unparalleled waste of human and material resources; it threatens to turn the whole world into an armed camp; it aids repression and violates human rights; it promotes violence and insecurity in place of the security in whose name it is undertaken; it frustrates humanity's aspirations for justice and peace; it has no part in God's design for the world; it is demonic.

There is not so much an arms race as an arms stampede. At the beginning of 1980 seven nations had tested nuclear weapons. Experts say that the nuclear club may grow to over thirty by the end of this decade. The world now spends \$450 billion a year for military purposes. The United States represents one third of the total and continues to escalate its defense budget. With current inflation and estimated escalations, the accumulated amount of U.S. expenditures will reach \$2 trillion in this decade. The major powers manufacture more deadly and sophisticated weapons and delivery systems: the SS-20, the Backfire bomber, Trident II, the MX mobile missile system, and the cruise missile. The key point in this new generation of weapons is that planning has moved from deterrence to preemptive first strike capability. This is so annihilative in its possibilities that even if a nation managed to "defend" itself by striking the first blow, a retaliatory strike could come from a reserve of the opponent's capability. Moreover, any survival would be meaningless that left a people without neighbors. SALT treaties propose limits to nuclear escalation in managing and maintaining parity, but they miss the chief issue, which is looking toward disarmament. An ironic fact is that the Hiroshima-size bomb is too small now to be included in the SALT agreements. We have to ask what it means to be ahead in the arms race.

Some Americans support escalating the arms race because of what they perceive as a Soviet threat. The Soviet Union has exerted strong efforts to catch up with the United States and now has a massive military establishment. The United States has been a primary initiator of nuclear weapons and steadily improves the efficiency of its delivery systems. The Soviet threat has been used by the Pentagon to boost its budget or as justification for further arms development. Obviously, such escalation makes the Soviet Union increasingly fearful of the United States, and the deadly cycle continues to feed upon itself.

Another factor in the new global situation is that most industrial nations—with the United States chief among them—have become arms merchants in a new sense. While cautious in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, America is reckless in the sale of conventional weapons as well as the most sophisticated new nonnuclear devices, paying relatively little attention to the impact of sales on balances of power. Sales are fostered for many reasons: for adjusting trade imbalances, for the creation of military surrogates, for profit, and for helping in the distribution of costs for weapons systems development. Regardless of the reasons, these sales frequently serve to heighten tensions, reinforce chauvinistic nationalism, and lessen possibilities of negotiation in the conduct of international affairs. Military action has even less chance of achieving political ends, although the levels of destruction involved in military action have increased.

Peacemaking entails far more than a narrow focus on military might in defense of “national security” and “vital interests.” Too much emphasis has been given to geopolitical and military factors in a balance of power framework. The classical patterns of the past thought of power as military with an internal support system. Traditional foreign policy strategy has been focused upon the nation-state as the primary international actor. The nation-state has been seen as the base for providing physical security from attack and war, for affording economic justice for its citizens, and for the protection of fundamental human rights of its citizens. In the new global reality the nation-state is no longer the only actor in foreign policy. Multilateral proliferation of nuclear weapons has ended the ability of one state acting alone or in alliance to guarantee security for its people. Now economic processes are predominant and conflicts are waged with economic tools and threats.

In addition to these familiar elements, long-standing and often-suppressed racial, ethnic, and religious conflicts over identity, loyalty, and justice have simply been ignored as forces shaping world events. They have been relegated to the periphery of consideration in decision-making processes. The search for identity and the fulfillment of the claims of justice by people of the world cannot continue to be ignored without catastrophe.

More and more people have begun to realize that the main problems of the world will not yield to military solutions, and that whatever new solutions can be found must be global. Believing there must be a better way than now prevails, numerous citizens are finding the grace to abandon obsolete attitudes that now work against peacemaking.

Important signs of new awareness reveal the need of fresh conviction and direction for the 1980's. More people are reading God's signs of the times, reappreciating the nature and place of peace in the Christian faith, sensing the "kairos" in these days, and looking for a new way of serving God's will.

Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, former Secretary of Defense, and a Presbyterian elder, speaking at the University of Chicago on May 22, 1979, asserted that the concept of security has become dangerously oversimplified. McNamara said:

... a society can reach a point at which additional military expenditure no longer provides additional security.

Indeed, to the extent that such expenditure severely reduces the resources available for other essential sectors and social services—and fuels a futile and reactive arms race—excessive military spending can erode security rather than enhance it . . .

Global defense expenditures have grown so large that it is difficult to grasp their full dimensions. The overall total is now in excess of \$400 billion a year. An estimated 36 million men are under arms in the world's active regular and paramilitary forces, with another 25 million in the reserves, and some 30 million civilians in military-related occupations.

On the other hand, McNamara addressed our responsibility to the more than one billion human beings living in developing countries in absolute poverty, in conditions of inhuman degradation. Stressing that "we cannot build a secure world upon a foundation of human misery," he stated:

... the fundamental case is, I believe, the moral one. The whole of human history has recognized the principle that the rich and powerful have a moral obligation to assist the poor and the weak. That is what the sense of community is all about—any community: the community of the family, the community of the nation, the community of nations itself.

Pope John Paul II, on his trip to the United States in 1979, stressed the urgency of justice, peace, and human rights. He said that "wars can be prevented not by arms but by getting beyond the 'symptoms' of war to the causes of hunger, poverty, inequality . . ." Everything will depend on whether these differences and contrasts in the sphere of the possession of goods will be systematically reduced through truly effective means. In his speech to the United Nations, he said:

The continual preparations for war demonstrated by the production of ever more numerous, powerful, and sophisticated weapons in various countries show that there is a desire to be ready for war, and being ready means being able to start it; it also means taking the risk that sometime, somewhere, someone can set in motion the terrible mechanism of general destruction.

The spirit of war, in its basic primordial meaning, springs up and grows to maturity where the inalienable rights of man are violated.

This is a new and deeply relevant vision of the cause of peace, one that goes deeper and is more radical. It is a vision that sees the genesis, and in a sense the

substance, of war in the more complex forms emanating from injustice viewed in all its various aspects: this injustice first attacks human rights and thereby destroys the organic unity of the social order and it then affects the whole system of international relations . . . Any violation of them, even in a "peace situation," is a form of warfare against humanity.

Are the children to receive the arms race from us as a necessary inheritance? . . . can our age still really believe that the breathtaking spiral of armaments is at the service of world peace?

Billy Graham, once a seemingly uncritical supporter of United States military policy, now warns:

The present insanity of the global arms race, if continued will lead inevitably to a conflagration so great that Auschwitz will seem like a minor rehearsal . . . Is a nuclear holocaust inevitable if the arms race is not stopped? Frankly, the answer is almost certainly yes . . . The nuclear issue is not just a political issue—it is a moral and spiritual issue as well . . . I believe that the Christian especially has a responsibility to work for peace in our world . . . We must seek the good of the whole human race, and not just the good of any one nation or race. (*Sojourners Magazine*, August, 1979.)

The gospel brings freedom from false values, false security, chauvinism, and paranoia and empowers a new global vision of the human order that God intends. This is God's moral universe where no individual or nation can sow seeds of violence without reaping the whirlwind.

As Christians we must decide what we are called to be and do in the light of new awareness. We are not doomed to be imprisoned in fear, insecurity, greed, pride, and cynicism that reflect the past. Our Christian faith can free us from such chains. A truly new age and quality of life for all peoples on this globe are possible. Such a new age we believe to be the will of God now. We have the opportunity to serve God in its creation.

B. *Theological and Ethical Bases for Peacemaking*

Peacemaking, biblically understood, involves the love of neighbor flowing from the love of God rather than the simple absence of armed conflict. The dangerous signs of the times raised up around us may prompt many to seek peace because of fear.

While fear may lead to the timid avoidance of conflict resulting in the acceptance of injustice, faith enables Christians to perceive God's will and find the courage to grasp the opportunity of new situations.

We pursue peace not because we are afraid of the new global reality but because God wills it. Peacemaking is a mandate for the church because the Prince of Peace is its Lord. The church cannot remain the church without serving Christ. Nor can it pursue peace without being guided by Christ. A theological perspective is absolutely essential if the church's effort is to be faithful. Christ is the peacemaker, and all believers are called to be instruments for peacemaking.

The world has always known ways to make peace, but more often than not it has been an enforced peace—the armed truce of oppression and of the sword. There have been intervals in which powerful

individuals or nations have been able to cry “peace, peace” while injustice ravaged the lives of masses of people who paid the price for such surface peace. (Jer. 6:14.)

But the Christ did not come to give peace as the world gives peace. In fact, he came to declare war on the world’s unjust peace. “I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.” (Matt. 10:34.) The true peacemaker is the enemy of all false peace. Risks must be taken. Peacemaking therefore means entering the struggle in which Christ is engaged and in which his spirit guides every effort.

God wills peace, “shalom”: total well-being, wholeness, fulfillment, health, joyous harmony. The biblical word for peace is “shalom,” which comes from the same root as the term wholeness. Peacemaking involves the utilization of political processes for social healing more than merely the assignment of political priorities. The biblical grounding of these truths is very extensive: see Psalm 85:8, “for he will speak peace to his people”; Psalm 37:11; Zechariah 8:12; Colossians 1:19–22, which speaks of restoration of the whole creation; Psalm 85:10 says that “righteousness and peace will kiss each other”; nor can we forget the proclamation in Luke 2:14, “glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among those with whom God is pleased.” Peace is a by-product of doing the right, of remaining faithful to God in covenantal obligation: see James 3:16f, where peace is spoken of as the seed from which righteousness grows, Isaiah 54:10–17, which has to do with “my covenant of peace”; and we cannot fail to recall, “For every boot of the tramping warrior in battle tumult and every garment rolled in blood will be burned as fuel for the fire. For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called ‘Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.’ ” (Isa. 9:5–6.) Peacemaking involves concern for political matters and attention to the way we manage relationships to other persons and to other groups. It also involves attention to the aspirations and agendas of other peoples and a radical openness to the surprising grace of God.

God’s call to peacemaking is absolute. God is not a god of destruction, abandonment, or death, but a god of life, peace, and joy, who is jealous for a dynamic and full response from Christians called to be peacemakers in a warring world. See Hebrews 13:20f, which speaks of the “God of peace,” and especially Ephesians 2:14–17, which speaks of Christ as “our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility.” The ministry of Jesus Christ leaves no doubt about the central purpose of God in either human society or creation as a whole.

The church regards this as a matter of conviction, not a pious sentiment. As a vision of ultimate reality, it amounts to a confessional stance. The pursuit of peace is the pursuit of what is right and just,

what is good and conducive to human well-being. "Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it." (Ps. 34:14.) The church must struggle against the cynicism that regards such a pursuit as idealistic rather than realistic. It must find a central purpose in the intention to make peace. Peacemaking is an indispensable ingredient of the church's mission. It is not peripheral or secondary but essential to the church's faithfulness to Christ in our time. As it reads in Romans 8:6, "to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace."

The loss of that central purpose threatens the nature of the church and opens doors to the idolatrous service of lesser gods, such as the special interests and purposes of nations, of social and economic systems, of ethnic and racial groups, and of cultural traditions that are of lesser claim than the end to which all creation is directed. Not peace, but strife, is the fruit of idolatrous fanaticism. Allegiance to lesser gods blocks the church's vision of the "peace which passes understanding." A limited vision tempts us to find peace in the security of these lesser gods which claim our allegiance, in false confidence in culture, race, economic system, power, or nation.

The quest for peace is easily confused with the quest for security. Fear of what lies around us in the world or ahead of us in time tempts us to exercise power to hold what we have. Our trust runs to the security of false gods rather than to the power that moves creation. We resist the pilgrimage to the promised land of new and broader options. Instead of experiencing life in the freedom and joy of God's creation, we know life as self-defense and resistance to its promise. Instead of the life associated with God we are tempted to choose the death associated with the powers and vested concerns of the world.

Since temptation so easily besets us, the church must count the cost of engaging in peacemaking—both confession and courage are required—confession because we who belong to the church have practiced the kind of injustice that has bred strife and war. We approach the task with unclean hands. Courage will be required because we live in a fallen world where the pursuit of justice for the sake of true peace has many enemies. Peacemaking is the crucial struggle in which our own sinfulness is judged and the evil in the world resisted. To be peacemakers we shall have to take up the cross and follow the Christ. (Mk. 8:34.)

Knowledge of today's crisis and the problems of peacemaking is made real through involvement. It is the doing of the faith that completes understanding. The followers of Christ are by faith committed to respond to the Lord's initiative in the mission of peacemaking. Peacemaking is not merely one activity among many that believers may choose to ignore. At this critical moment in history, peacemaking is the central activity of all believers individually and corporately. It is

at the heart of our life in Christ and a compelling responsibility of the church.

The United Presbyterian Church has affirmed this centrality of peacemaking in an explicit and serious way by incorporating it in our most recent confessional statement, the Confession of 1967:

God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ is the ground of the peace, justice, and freedom among nations which all powers of government are called to serve and defend. The church, in its own life, is called to practice the forgiveness of enemies and to commend to the nations as practical politics the search for cooperation and peace. This search requires that nations pursue fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict, even at risk to national security, to reduce areas of strife and to broaden international understanding. Reconciliation among nations becomes peculiarly urgent as countries develop nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, diverting their manpower and resources from constructive uses and risking the annihilation of mankind. Although nations may serve God's purposes in history, the church which identifies the sovereignty of any one nation or any one way of life with the cause of God denies the Lordship of Christ and betrays its calling. (9.45.)

There is powerful biblical warrant for this notable statement about reconciliation and peacemaking: Colossians 1:20 reads, "and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross"; and II Corinthians 5:18f, which says, "all this is from God, who through Christ, reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation."

The classical biblical image for peacemaking is the turning of swords into plowshares, as found in the words of Isaiah 2:4:

God shall judge between the nations,
and shall decide for many peoples;
and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.

The making of swords and the making of plowshares are two distinct functions and imply different lifestyles. Swordmaking is for purposes of defense or aggression. It is activity directed against the enemy, real or imagined. Plowmaking is for nurture, for new growth, and ultimately harvest. It is the essential creative activity that makes sustenance of life possible. It also is that activity which through productivity makes possible the inclusion of other people in new community, potential and promising. Faith, hope, and love enable believers to give plowmaking priority over swordmaking, not because such a strategy is more "successful" but because believers are called to be peacemakers in the presence of enemies. Swordmaking easily assumes and sometimes creates enemies and at best ought to be a last, not a first, recourse. Peacemaking seeks neighbors and must be the church's primary agenda and constant effort.

Peacemakers will find "neighbors" all over the world, but they will also discover that these neighbors will not always see the requirements of peacemaking as they see them. Many of the poor of the world see themselves not simply as men and women who are "behind" the

industrial nations, but as nations and classes who are oppressed by the power of the industrialized nations and their institutions. It is essential that North American Christians not dismiss these different viewpoints, but learn to listen and to engage in mutually respectful dialogue with those who stand on different ground and respond to the promise of the gospel in different ways than we do. Serious commitment requires hard thought. In the history of the church much Christian thinking has addressed the moral issues concerning the legitimacy of participation in war. These concerns, which have engaged much time and dedication, have by no means been useless and can be reviewed in the action of past General Assemblies.

Christian thinking about peace and peacemaking has had a different history from Christian thinking about participation in war. Peace has been extolled as a goal, yearned for as a condition, and cited as the ultimate objective sought by all the different positions to which Christians have been led by conscience in the moral evaluation of what to do after war breaks out. Everybody has been for peace even while arriving at different judgments about what to do when peace no longer reigns in the social order.

While all Christians have been united in regret of war generally and have professed the importance of peacemaking, an adequate tradition of the conviction, processes, and styles of life that must underlie the positive task of peacemaking has not yet been developed. For example, in the *Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* there is no entry under "peace." In other dictionaries the entry is relatively brief. Articulated positions concerning what it means to make peace are decidedly fewer and less clearly spelled out than are the positions dealing with the morality of participation in war. Christ, who wept over Jerusalem because it did not know the things that made for peace (Lk. 19:41), might equally weep over a world—yes, even over a church—that seems not yet to be clear about the things that make for our peace.

Can United Presbyterians become as clear and as articulate about the spiritual-moral urgency of peacemaking as they have been articulate (even if not agreed) about the ethical issues related to war? This question is particularly poignant since disillusionment with unsuccessful efforts to secure peace in distant parts of the world is still fresh on our minds, and the seeming inability to conclude cooperative agreements to reduce armaments between overly strong major powers stares us starkly in the face.

We shall find the clarity we need only as we engage in peacemaking under God's guidance. Then will the word of God come alive for us and we will find the faith and courage to lose our life in order to find it. Only such a costly pursuit of peace can be in conformity with the peace Christ offers. ("Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you." (Jn. 14:27.)) It is Christ's perspective that must guide us, it is his

purpose we are called to serve, and it is in his peace that we will find life.

C. Theological and Ethical Bases for Policymaking

The contribution of Christian faith to a perspective on foreign policy is particularly founded on its understanding of the human condition. Humanity is regarded as the bearer of the image of God, as the instrument of the redemption of the world in Christ, as the species that responds to the Creator in awe and worship, as the focus of the peacemaking activity by which God seeks to culminate the purpose and meaning of Creation. The value of humanity must be measured not primarily in terms of political factors but in terms of its relationship to God, the Creator, Sustainer, and Fulfiller of the universe.

Humanity's relative freedom and self-asserted independence from the divine source of its life has resulted in human alienation from the Creator. The structures of political life, not the least of which are those in the international arena, are often broken and alienated from God, but are also avenues through which the redeeming purposes of God are significantly served. In the human possibilities of peacemaking, we see the Creator of the universe at work in humanity trying to restore the unity of the original intention. In Christ the divine-human unity is exemplified, and in the power of the community flowing from Christ new opportunities mitigating selfishness and pride are realized. Christians view the realm of international affairs, therefore, as an arena characterized by struggle for national advantage, motivated by deep fears and passions, but one in which healing is not only necessary but possible.

Christians understand that only God is absolute. No political order has an absolute claim upon people, nor does any political order so entirely lack aspects of God's purpose as to make its complete annihilation all that is called for. All nations are judged, as Amos suggested, by the standards of divine justice. Weak and dispossessed nations are used, as Isaiah indicated, to clarify the purposes of God and to enrich and broaden the universal knowledge of God's purposes, even to call the covenant community to original fidelity. Christian faith is faith in a God who is the Ruler of the nations, and not just the companion of individuals or the house servant to any one national group.

We believe that God is most fully revealed in Jesus Christ. Since we have a norm in Christ that controls our understanding of God, we should not distort God to our own purposes. The knowledge of God made known in Jesus Christ renders private and national agendas qualified, pretensions barren, and fanatical strivings exposed to condemnation.

Jesus made love central to his teaching. "Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it, Love your neighbor as yourself." (Matt. 22:37-39.)

The early followers of Jesus, seeking to encapsulate his message, likewise taught the centrality of love: "In a word, there are three things that last forever: faith, hope, and love; but the greatest of them all is love." (I Cor. 13:13.) "If God thus loved us, dear friends, we in turn are bound to love one another . . . and indeed this command comes to us from Christ himself; that he who loves God must also love his brother." (I Jn. 4:11,21.)

For ethical reflection, this means that the meaning of love is given from the perspectives of the whole Christian understanding of humanity and nature in relationship to God. Love cannot be separated from hope or from faith. It cannot be separated from radical service for the good of the neighbor. Matthew 25:31-46 interprets the meaning of love as the nations giving of food to the hungry and water to the thirsty, the welcoming of the stranger, the clothing of the naked, and the visiting of the prisoners. The moral pressure on Christians is to aid the suffering world and to comfort those who need comforting. We are to be measured by how we serve the poor of the world, not the powerful. The interpretation of love drives us to affirm a bias in favor of the poor, an openness toward the enemy, negotiation for resolution of conflicts, the avoidance of war, and the protection of the weak. The meaning of love for Christians is discovered in cooperation for peace, in working for the fulfillment of life, and in striving for the increase of freedom and equality among people.

We act in politics (as in the rest of our lives) only by the grace and power of God. If we are to act without illusions, we need forgiveness. The ambiguity of human action is never resolved except by God's grace and power. If we accept God's grace, we are freed from some of our defensiveness. We live by forgiveness, not merit, and we are freed to act even when we acknowledge our contributions to the suffering of others, in mixed consequences of our behavior, and the inadequacies of even the finest service to the crying needs of the moment.

These considerations outline the framework of our decision-making, but we must still inquire as to possible guidelines. We must consider both the assumptions that have determined the formation of foreign policy and those which might more adequately shape policy in light of the new global reality and the theological imperatives for peacemaking.

Three such value assumptions have guided the foreign policy of the United States for many years, particularly since the nation became a world power. Accepting the nation-state system as a reality, policy considerations have been couched in terms of interest, security and

power. International affairs conducted according to these criteria emphasize “realism” and seek to avoid “moral judgment,” doing whatever is necessary to secure the nation’s interests or safety within the tough world of international affairs—a world in which other nations use similar criteria for foreign policy.

“National interest” is based on the premise that each nation-state should formulate its actions according to that which best serves its self-interest, broadly defined. This is not necessarily self-serving cynicism, because the concept of national interest can very well include the realization that a nation must so act as to maintain credibility among its neighbors. Properly employed, the concept of national interest does provide a check upon unrestrained nationalism. Those who insist that we should do whatever national pride requires, regardless of what other nations may think, regardless of what moral judgments may suggest, are not using the concept of interest in its broader meaning. But even the broad use of interest as a touchstone of foreign policy does place the primary focus on the implications of a particular policy for our own welfare and accepts self-centeredness as the basis for policy.

A second criterion for foreign policy has been “national security.” The invocation of national security often serves to place issues beyond debate. In the name of national security major emphasis is placed upon the capacity to insure that other nations respect our will. In its crudest form such strength depends upon the military capacity to inflict damage on others so quickly and so decisively as never to be challenged or resisted. Security in this sense is the root of all arms races, even in the situation where mutual capacity for annihilation threatens the world.

Power, which is the third criterion of the traditional formulation of policy, has been taken as crucial to all national action. Power has been a concept of concern in the political life and theory of the United States from the beginning. Since the time of the creation of the Republic, discussion has occurred about the abuses of power and the safeguards necessary to prevent its concentrations in the wrong hands. Americans have been ambivalent about power—both fascinated by it and fearful of it—and have been testing and revising their ideas about power through all their history. While American thinking about power has tended to be suspicious of its domestic political forms, particularly of governmental regulation of common life within our borders, Americans have been increasingly prone to affirm the significance of power in foreign affairs.

If power is understood as a “thing” or as an “object” that a nation has, or can obtain, and is further understood as something that assures us protection merely because we have enough of it, then power is viewed in the “realpolitik” sense of the greatest clout. Power in this

sense has no inherent relationship to morality and purpose but rather expresses the ability to damage those who do not follow our bidding, either through direct military intervention or the allotment of our material resources.

These criteria for foreign policy were arguably adequate in other times—times of geographical separation between nations and boundary conditions that provided forewarnings against surprise attack. Indeed, most nations made deliberate declarations of war after assessing prospects and counting costs. The meaning of security has been undergoing radical transformation with the development of delivery systems for nuclear warheads. The comparison of strike forces between nations is no longer a matter of levels of destruction but a matter of symbolic differences in degrees of overkill. Never have we been as open to the unleashing, even accidentally, of such unprecedented destructiveness.

Moreover, there have been times when economic relationships between nations were such as to make separable destinies thinkable. But today interdependence has become so apparent that it is less and less possible to isolate interests according to national destinies. The intertwining of interests has become as crucial as the interests of nations themselves and indeed constitutes new and vital “national interest” in itself.

A new and different set of criteria is recommended for guiding the formation of future policy, both because of Christian morality and because of the situational factors characterizing “the new global reality.” These rubrics or rules of conduct do not contradict the others, but they set a mode so different in overall contour as to be considered new.

Instead of concentrating exclusively on interest, security, and power, Christians should move, and urge the nation to move, to consideration of justice, freedom, and compassionate order. In such a mode, understandings of interest, security, and power are transformed and a new basis is established for United States foreign policy. Then, instead of being protectionist in international attitudes, we and the nation can learn to facilitate movements, aspirations, and accomplishments throughout the world, bringing about new conditions that promise a more just and peaceful world society. These conditions, which in theory and profession we once cherished for ourselves on a domestic scale, are now applicable globally. The reference for this new orientation is not the national state as such but the concern of peoples, both our concern as a people and the aspirations of other groups. We must learn to relate constructively to the ground swell around the world that demands justice, seeks freedom, and aspires to conditions of community made possible by compassionate means of maintaining order.

The concept of power can be reinterpreted as the ability to get others to do what is best for both of us, not because others fear our clout but because we respect one another's intentions. Perhaps power can be separated from too close identification with interest and security and thought of as empowerment—as the capacity to enable others to become what they in their best intentions would choose to become. Power in this sense could not be purchased and stockpiled, but would have to be used for creative political purposes.

Peace and justice are yoked in the very nature of things. There can be no enduring relationships between persons if exploitation, unchecked and arbitrary exercise of authority, or excessive disproportions of access to the fruits of the created order are prevalent. The relationship between peace and justice can be understood even in general humanitarian terms, but it is underscored especially in theological thinking. In the biblical record those who cry "peace" before justice is achieved are denounced by the prophets. (Jer. 6:14.) The very life and death of Jesus is a constant reminder that piety does not abolish the mandate to do justly.

Contemporary voices emphasize that peace is inextricably linked with doing justice. The Second Vatican Council rightly observed:

Peace is not merely the absence of war, nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies; nor is it brought about by dictatorship. Instead it is rightly and appropriately called an enterprise of justice.

An ecumenical church gathering that met in Baden in 1970 declared:

Peace is inseparable from the achievement of justice in human life, provided that justice be understood in the biblical sense, not as the administration of a set system of laws but as the activity of God, raising up the poor and the outcast, vindicating the victims of oppression and saving men from their sins for a new life with each other and with him. Justice means the establishment of the disadvantaged in the full rights and possibilities of their humanity. (See John 10:10.)

Justice in this sense is closely related to liberation, to the achievement of freedom by all peoples and nations. That freedom involves release from conditions of subservience and subjugation. It implies the right to pursue life and happiness—those very things that are so dear to Americans and central in their heritage. Human rights, including but not limited to freedom from coercive oppression, the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of economic initiative, and the conditions for enriched personal and social existence, are the marrow of justice. If these rights are to be safe for any they must be made safe for all. International arrangements that disadvantage many for the sake of a few can no longer be "safely" maintained. Peace, therefore, involves economic justice as well as political fairness.

The criterion of justice compels the continual reexamination of personal and national policies and actions. The first question changes from "What is its consequence for us?" to "What are the conse-

quences of this set of actions upon others and upon our relationships to others?" Justice does not require the abject negation of self-interest, but it does require that the legitimacy of that interest be weighed in relationship to the claims of others. No greater disproportion of benefits can be tolerated than can be warranted in terms of the good of the whole family of people in the world. Strength is justified if that strength is directed to the world's greater benefit and the conditions of maintaining the strength are compatible with the welfare of those beyond, as well as within, our borders. We cannot expect to have a peaceful world if the enormous disproportions of wealth and opportunity that now exist in the world are not brought under judgment and significantly modified.

Concern about freedom and justice may well call for policies that side with the dispossessed and that, upon first perusal, may seem to be against our personal and national interests or the special interests of groups within this nation. That instinct must be tempered by the recognition that revolutionary change is desperately needed in many places in the world if the peoples who legitimately aspire to freedom, whether as release from political tyranny or from economic exploitation, are to be met in a genuinely human and peaceful way.

The importance of structured orderliness must not be overlooked in considering the importance of freedom and justice. Peace will be possible only if the conditions of freedom and justice are assured by structural and systematic instruments. They must be of the kind that are likely to endure for a reasonable period of time and are able to maintain continuity and dependability in social and economic interchange, both within and between nations. Too often structures of order (government) that are immediately available are incompatible with the goals of freedom and justice and we have chosen to back tyrannies rather than to insist on justice.

To pursue a politics of conservative defense of unjust orders in a revolutionary world is foolhardy. Theologically such politics attempt to shut the new out of history and must be abandoned. This means that a policy that critically evaluates revolutionary movements and makes hard judgments as to their potential must replace what has been a de facto United States policy of commitment to counterrevolution. We need a sober and mature ordering of societal conditions, and one in which compassionate concern for the welfare of peoples in every situation and circumstance is uppermost.

Christians should not really be surprised by this approach. We know that throughout the Old Testament God manifests a special concern for the oppressed, often in ways that must have seemed disadvantageous to the interests of the chosen people. We know that Jesus identified with the dispossessed and the outcasts. We also know that it is difficult to take the risks involved with this understanding and not to

succumb to confusion and fear. Yet we also know that naked national interest, security, and power fall short of God's will and are increasingly counterproductive and obsolete in the current global situation. We recognize that justice, freedom, and compassionate order, as rubrics of foreign policy, come far closer to what God expects of us. We and the nation must seek the good of all humanity and not just of ourselves.

There are no quick or easy answers to the ambiguities and paradoxes of entangled good and evil in which we find ourselves. Fear must be overcome with faith, hate with trust, enmity with reconciliation, injustice with justice. In accepting this challenge we rely not in our own strength or shrewdness but in the surprising grace of God and are buoyed by the vision: "and people will come from east to west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God." (Lk. 13:29.)

The promise of the Kingdom of God fulfills our hopes beyond the secular expectations of history. Our hope is in the Kingdom of God and not in any particular political system or solution. That hope, however, invigorates us for the particular political struggles in which approximations of justice can be achieved. By trusting in the Kingdom of God, we know that the final fulfillment is not ours to realize. We also know, however, that the displacement of those arrangements and institutions that are antithetical to the realization of God's Kingdom is part of the historical process over which God is sovereign and that we are called to serve God in it. God redeems history; we do not. We must act as consistently with that redemption as our light and our power permit.

Appendix I

BRIEF SUMMARY OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY POLICY DIRECTIONS RELATED TO PEACEMAKING

The four divisions and their specific calls are not all-inclusive or exhaustive. They are given here as illustrative of existing commitments on the part of our church. A comprehensive index to General Assembly social policy actions is being printed in index card form. Further elaboration and texts of the policy areas outlined below will be available from the Office of Peace and International Affairs of the Program Agency.

A. *Concerning Arms Control and Disarmament*

Committed to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament, we are called upon to work for:

1. The reduction and elimination of weapons of mass destruction (1956, 1960, 1963, 1971).
2. The end of nuclear weapons testing, including a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (1963, 1964, 1967, 1971, 1978).
3. The nonproliferation of nuclear weapons supported by international treaties (1963, 1967, 1971).

4. The conclusion and ratification of the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty II (1978, 1979).

5. The ending of all United States biological and chemical warfare programs, including ratification of the Chemical Test Ban Treaty (1971, 1978).

6. The reduction of United States military expenditures and a reordering of our priorities (1971, 1979, 1980).

7. The reduction and curtailment of sales, grants, and other forms of military aid to developing countries (1971).

8. The prevention of the use of outer space and the seabed for nuclear weapons (1971).

9. United States actions and unilateral decisions that may impact the arms race, encouraging and leading toward arms control and reduction (1971, 1978).

10. The strengthening of the United Nations in its peacekeeping role and in its efforts for arms control and disarmament (1956, 1963, 1967, 1978).

B. *Concerning Economic Justice and Development*

Committed to the achievement of justice, self-determination, and the modernization of developing countries, we are called upon to work for:

1. The sharing of knowledge through programs (bilateral and multilateral) of technical cooperation and assistance, including technology transfer (1954, 1955, 1960, 1964, 1979).

2. The extension of economic aid, with long-term commitments, preferably through United Nations channels (1956, 1960, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1974).

3. The separation of technical and economic aid activities from military aid (1954, 1955).

4. The promotion and expansion of world trade, especially through tariff reductions, extensions of credit, and the establishment of equitable commodity trade agreements (1954, 1956, 1962, 1964, 1967, 1974).

5. The prevention of exploitation in aid or trade programs that impoverishes the people (1950).

C. *Concerning the United Nations*

Committed to the creation of and strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument of peacemaking and peacekeeping, as an agent of change in the achievement of justice, as an instrument for the resolution of social, economic, global problems, and as a focal point for the protection of human rights, we are called upon to:

1. Support the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, particularly in the areas of arms control, economic development, and human welfare (1947, 1950).

2. Encourage strong United States participation and financial support (1946, 1947, 1950, 1954, 1962, 1965, 1979, 1980).

3. Educate our constituency about the need for world cooperation and adequate intergovernmental institutions like the United Nations (1965).

D. *Concerning Human Rights*

Committed to the promotion of social justice and righteousness and inspired by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we are called upon to work for:

1. The rights of all as they are reflected in the concerns for disarmament, economic development, and institutional protections (cf. A, B, C above).

2. Policies and practices on the part of the United States government that foster human rights at home and throughout the world (1974, 1978).

3. The ratification of the major international instruments on human rights, including the Genocide Convention and the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1974, 1978).

4. Greater use of the United Nations as a vehicle to defend and promote human rights (1974, 1978).

5. Legislation guaranteeing that United States financial and military assistance will not be used in the denial of human rights by repressive governments (1974, 1978).

Appendix II

POTENTIAL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Both the task force that prepared the report and the Advisory Council on Church and Society desire that "Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling" be affirmed as a deepened dimension in the life of the church and not viewed simply as "a program." Genuine life manifests itself in activity, of course, and out of renewed commitment, new "program" will result. That program should reflect the commitment and creativity of our life in faith at every level of the church through individual witness, in congregations and communities, through presbytery and synod, and in General Assembly agencies acting in the national and international context.

The following ideas for activity have emerged as the task force study proceeded. They are listed here as a stimulus to the church's response, not as an official prescription for it.

A. Leadership development at all levels of the life of church and community for peacemaking witness in the church and for leadership through secular occupations in business and government.

1. Continuing education courses in seminaries for pastors.
2. Training or conference programs for synod and presbytery executives and designated coordinators at synod and presbytery schools, the General Assembly, the Churchwide Coordinating Cabinet, etc.
3. Seminars and conferences for laity either for general introduction to peacemaker issues or for professional expressions of involvement (e.g., physicians and problems of world health).
4. Encouragement of seminary and college faculty in their teaching, research, and service capacities by (a) providing development opportunities, scholarships, etc., (b) utilizing appropriate research in the life of the church's mission, (c) developing a resource bank, specialists who can respond to need.
5. Enabling exchange, dialogue, study opportunities for fraternal and sororal colleagues from around the world.
6. Enabling of select pastors and laity for preparation for public service through peace studies or foreign service institutes.
7. Conducting annual legislative conferences or UN conferences for Presbyterians serving as legislators, staff persons, foreign service personnel, etc.
8. Building a "peacemaking" dimension into all Interpretation Through Travel events.
9. Providing volunteer programs that can utilize the service of retirees with particular skills, "professional volunteers," or persons willing to volunteer for short-term assignments in the U.S. or abroad.

B. Engagement of students and young people in ways to deepen commitment to peacemaking and broaden awareness of community and global issues, interdependence, issues of conflict, so as to equip them for peacemaking service in church and society.

1. Offer "peace-international affairs study programs" in colleges and universities both as alternatives to ROTC and as necessary in their own right.
2. Offer various "January" terms: Washington, New York, overseas.
3. Offer intern programs (United Nations, Washington, local, overseas) in the areas of peacemaking, justice, human rights, etc.
4. Encourage expansion of peace studies and international relations activities on college campus: course offerings, speakers, teams.
5. Encourage community programming by colleges and seminaries, e.g., with corporations involved in arms manufacture or overseas projects.
6. Sponsor masters or doctoral dissertation studies with themes coordinated for maximum input into understanding of international issues.
7. Facilitate United Nations and Washington study groups from churches and schools.

8. Include peacemaking understanding in ordination exams for seminary students.

9. Facilitate annual "peace-international affairs" seminar or conference at every college and seminary.

10. Encourage every seminary to develop an "area" specialty (for tours, study abroad, etc.) to ensure worldwide coverage and exchange basis with other seminaries.

11. Seek to establish peace events and materials in elementary and secondary school activities.

12. Incorporate peacemaking concern in church school and youth activities in congregations.

13. Create a Peacemaking Corps for community activity and service by youth of the congregation.

14. Get session sponsorship of Peacemaking Scholarships for youth of the congregation.

C. *Preparation, selection, and distribution availability of quality educational, liturgical, and data resourcing on global peace issues for all levels and contexts of the church's life.*

1. Encourage through the Joint Office of Worship the preparation and distribution of hymns, anthems, and liturgical models, drawing on the experience of congregations.

2. Encourage development and utilization of art—poster work with peace themes.

3. Prepare films and filmstrips dealing with peace issues and insure adequate availability and distribution of these and other sources.

4. Facilitate better use of Friendship Press materials.

5. Build peace issues into all levels of Shared Approaches curriculum.

6. Build a cooperative approach to peace—international affairs issues among all United Presbyterian Church media outlets, and provide material for congregational newsletters and judicatory publications.

7. Tap college chaplains and foundation staff for ideas growing out of campus ferment.

8. Increase preparation, distribution, and advertising of specialized materials, including preparation of guides for study and action for congregational use.

9. Develop an inexpensive newsletter for implementing communications.

D. *Research and analysis of international issues as a basis for witness and advocacy.*

1. Select special topics for task force study.

2. Assign interns at various locations to special research projects.

3. Utilize college, seminary faculty in issue analysis.

4. Develop peace research institutes in select colleges.

5. Develop a foreign service institution, like Georgetown.

6. Sponsor community research projects, e.g., the impact of military conversion on ten select communities.

E. *Development of a witness and advocacy network for study and action capable of speedy mobilization for response at community or national level.*

1. Identify those persons in the local church, presbytery, and synod willing and able to serve as a core group for church action.

2. Build a network (coordination, supplement) utilizing the existing points in the United Presbyterian Church where concerns exist, e.g., United Presbyterian Women, IMPACT membership, Witherspoon Society, Bi-National Servants, Advisory Council on Church and Society, church and society chairpersons in judicatories, United Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, etc.

3. Establish set of priorities for concentrated action, e.g., SALT III, ratification of the Human Rights Covenant, 1 percent of budget for development, etc.

4. Develop computerized inventory of skills available among clergy and laity.

5. Establish human rights-advocacy-justice fund.

6. Congregations take initiative to develop community peacemaking coalitions to plan and implement community programs of study and action on local, national, and international concerns.

F. *Active participation in cooperative, coalitional, ecumenical endeavors in peacemaking for maximization of effort and effect.*

1. Increase the ability to provide financial support for ecumenical action at local, regional, and national levels.

2. Facilitate availability of United Presbyterian Church personnel for leadership in ecumenical efforts.

3. Stimulate meaningful linkages between organizations interested in similar issues to avoid competition and to insure maximum coordination.

4. Begin by strengthening role in major organizations already involved in peace issues: e.g., World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches, World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Christian Peace Conference, SODEPAX, World Conference on Religion and Peace.

5. Congregations take initiative to plan and carry out ecumenical peace fairs in communities.

STUDY GUIDE PEACEMAKING: THE BELIEVERS' CALLING

Organizing the Discussion

The General Assembly wishes to encourage dialogue at every level of the church. It is hoped that there will be many groups brought together because of common geography, mission responsibility, and professional interests.

No one format can meet the needs of such diverse groups. Thirty minutes or one hour on the agenda of a session, presbytery, or committee meeting is helpful, but there are other useful models.

A residential conference where discussion of the study document can be interspersed with input from speakers, readings, recordings, films, simulations, charts, graphs, etc. Such a format would be ideal for conference centers and synod schools. The twenty-four to forty-eight hour conference/retreat model, familiar to many churches, also provides an excellent opportunity for background study and extended dialogue.

A day-long conference of eight to ten hours in which serious discussion can be sustained for a long enough period to get past preconceptions and become deeply involved in the issues. In such a format, care should be taken not to indulge in information-overload and thus deprive people of the opportunity of genuine dialogue. Thus, in a day-long session, it would probably be well to have no more than one or two major presentations (speakers, films, simulations, etc.) in addition to the detailed discussion of the study document and associated readings.

A series of discussions spread over several weeks or months, each focusing on different aspects of the study document. If the series is sufficiently open-ended, entire meetings can be given over to seeking background information on specific topics, or to hearing from persons representing perspectives not included among the group's regular participants. As with all such series, the difficulty will lie in maintaining momentum and continuity over a long period.

Whichever format is adopted, it is well to remember that the purpose is to stimulate dialogue on Christian responsibility for peacemaking and to encourage Christian commitment to the realization of peace in our personal relations, our communities, our nation, and the world.

Discussion Questions

Call to Peacemaking

1. The "Call to Peacemaking" refers to the "fullness of time" and the "oneness of the world."

- What dynamics are present in our world to justify the sense of urgency conveyed in the biblical concept, “the fullness of time”?

- What biblical concepts and images shed light on this idea?
- What is the nature of the “oneness of the world”?
- What are the positive and negative features of this oneness?
- Are we prepared, as individuals or as a nation, to accept the consequences implied in the concepts of “fullness” and “oneness”?
- What factors tend to inhibit our adjustments to the changing world in which we live?
- Is our tendency to divide the world into “we” and “they” compatible with our growing sense of the oneness of the world?
- How do we cope with the barriers, prejudices, stereotypes, and discriminations that perpetuate “we”–“they” thinking?

2. The call links three tasks to the achievement of peace: disarmament, global economic reform, and changed political structures.

- Why are these three of specific importance?
- How are they related to each other?
- What is required to accomplish each?
- Can one be fully accomplished without significant movement in the other two arenas?
- Granting that these cannot be accomplished by unilateral action on the part of one nation, what positive steps can one nation take to begin the processes?
- How does “seeing the world through the eyes of Christ” shape our understanding of these tasks?

3. The call makes three assertions about the mission of the church: that the church is faithful when it is engaged in peacemaking; that the church is obedient when it nurtures and equips God’s people as peacemakers; and that the church bears witness when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace.

- How are these roles to be translated into action in the life of each individual, in the life of the local church and community, in the life of the nation, in the life of the world?

- How does the church relate its peacemaking role to its traditional pastoral and prophetic roles?

4. The circumstances of our time elicit various emotions: fear, anxiety, frustration, hopelessness.

- How do we prevent these from being channeled into hostility and destructive patterns of behavior?
- How can we convert these into positive action capable of addressing the sources of the fears and frustrations?

Background Analysis: The New Global Reality

1. The “Background Analysis” identifies numerous aspects of the “new global reality” in a descriptive fashion.

- Are some of these more significant or urgent than others, and if so, what makes them such?

- Are the various aspects related to each other, and if so, how?

- What can be done in the public policy arena to try to solve the problems that are identified?

- Are there significant concerns that have not been addressed in the analysis?

- Do you agree that conditions warrant describing the situation as “new”?

- Do all of these aspects have a dual dynamic, i.e., being both the result of complex forces and at the same time being causal of other problems?

- What is the effect of each of these factors on your local community?

- What is the significance of the convergence of the testimony of Robert McNamara, Billy Graham, and Pope John Paul II?

2. The “Background Analysis” does not attempt to assess blame for the varying problems confronting our world, yet we all have theories about them.

- How would you respond to the following propositions?

- a. The military-industrial complex is created by capitalism and is necessary for its survival.

- b. The communist goal of world domination is the gravest threat to world peace.

- c. Transnational corporations are the prime factor in global injustice.

- d. Soviet expansionism endangers the free world.

- e. The industrialized countries of the North are neo-colonial powers exploiting the “third-world” without regard for basic rights of self-determination and self-development.

- f. Religious fanaticism is the cause of our basic problems.

- g. The struggle for power, including the control of energy and raw materials, is inherent in the nation-state system and is amoral by its nature.

- h. Racism, sexism, and classism are the causes of all forms of exploitation.

- What other propositions do we hear with regularity in our conversations or do we read in the press?

- How do we evaluate such conflicting assertions?
- How do we acknowledge the elements of truth each might contain and yet keep a balanced view of the whole?
- How do we separate the emotional rhetoric, the distorted propaganda, and the ideological claims from reality?
- How can we avoid simplisms that lead either to ineffectual solutions or disastrous decisions?

3. The “new global reality” obviously includes a changed position of the United States in the world.

- What can we learn from American history about the nature of change or the nature of institutions?
- How has our history and experience shaped our perceptions of the world and its problems?
- Does our experience make it impossible for us to put ourselves in others’ circumstances or to view ourselves as others see us?

Background Analysis: Theological and Ethical Basis for Peacemaking

1. Peacemaking is grounded in God’s love for the creation and our response to that love as expressed in our relations with our neighbors.

- How do our fears and concerns for security keep us from fulfilling the commands of love?
- How is injustice incompatible with love and peace?
- What makes reconciliation both necessary and possible as part of peacemaking?

2. The Hebrew word *shalom* means more than simply peace.

- What is its full meaning?
- How many different ways is it used?
- Does the Greek word for peace, *eirene*, have a different significance?

3. The biblical image “swords into plowshares” is cited as a classical description of peacemaking.

- What are the spiritual and material, the symbolic and literal elements that give this image its importance?
- In material terms what could “conversion” of our military budget mean in addressing other domestic and world problems?
- What other biblical images are there that describe or characterize the concept of peace, and what is the significance of each?
- Do the images describe a vision, a present reality, an attainable goal, or only something that is to be fulfilled in some final day?

4. Old Testament history is a violent history, wars following wars.

- What significance did this have for the historian, the psalmist, and the prophet, as each dealt with the concept of peace, the cause of war and its justification, the identification of the enemy, the relationship of ends and means, their understanding of God?

- How does the Bible deal with the history of the Hebrew people in reconciling their tribalness and their role as bearers of a universal message?

- How have biblical concepts like the New Jerusalem, the Chosen People, and the Messianic Destiny been used in American history?

5. Traditional views of pacifism and just war are not discussed in this document. Neither view is endorsed.

- Are these terms relevant to the contemporary scene?

- What factors make the concepts of nuclear war and just war incompatible?

- Has the just war concept been discredited only to be replaced by a concept of just liberation?

- Is war the result of the sinful nature of the human species, the nature of society, or simply a form of conflict that can be checked?

- Is pacifism best described as a lifestyle, a technique, or a philosophy?

- Does pacifism mean the acceptance or tolerance of injustice?

Background Analysis: Theological and Ethical Bases for Policymaking

1. Interest, security, and power are identified as driving forces in the nation-state system.

- What is the origin and history of the nation-state system?

- Given the oneness of our world, is the nation-state system still an adequate or even viable means of political organization.

- What do we understand about the nature of interest, security, and power, and their relationships?

- Does concern for these ever create conflict with other values, either of our democratic society or our Christian tradition?

- Is the nation-state system inherently unstable, inevitably resulting in conflict of interests and power?

- If conflict is inherent in our system, does it follow that war is inherent or inevitable?

- Does the nature of our present political system preclude meaningful disarmament?

- Can the international instruments available be effective in resolving conflict, preserving world security, and checking the abuse of power?

- What other political models are possible?

- What are the popular concepts of power that prevail in the United States?

- What forms does national power take and what are their limits?

- How do we relate short-term and long-term interests in the United States and determine between vital and nonvital interests?

2. Freedom, justice, and compassionate order are identified as values that need to be stressed.

- What is the relationship of these values to the major forces at work in the nation-state system?

- Are these values seen as replacing, supplementing, or moderating the dominant concerns of our people?

- How are freedom, justice, and compassionate order related to each other?

- Is justice a precondition of peace both biblically and practically?

- Are there concepts of peace that prevent the possibility of achieving justice?

- Does the quest for justice and liberation presuppose either conflict or just revolution?

- Why is order, which is unqualified, an insufficient goal for Christians?

- How can Christians and the church elevate these values in the life of our nation?

- Are the major causes of injustice rooted in our human nature, the nature of society, the nature of our systems, or scarcities found in nature?

Policy Directions of the General Assembly

Four directions are cited as related to peacemaking: arms control and disarmament, economic justice and development, adequate international structures, and human rights.

- How are each of these related to peace?

- How do we best work toward fulfilling the objectives that have been established by the General Assembly?

Glossary

AGGRESSION—hostile, injurious, or destructive action, especially when intended to dominate or master.

AUTOCRACY—government in which one person possesses unlimited power.

ARMS RACE—the competition between nations to gain superiority over each other in their quantity and quality of weapons—both nuclear and conventional.

CHAUVINISM—blind or excessive patriotism.

COLONIALISM—control by one power over a dependent area or people, especially used

to refer to economic control by Western industrialized countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries over resource-rich but powerless countries.

COMMUNISM—a political, economic, and social theory based on a collectivistic society in which all land and capital are socially owned and political power is exercised by the masses.

ECOLOGY—relating to the totality or pattern of relations between organisms and their environment.

EXPLOITATION—an unjust or improper use of another person, group, or nation for one's own profit or advantage.

FREEDOM—the absence of necessity, coercion, or constraint in choice or action.

HOLOCAUST—the systematic extermination of Jews by Nazi Germany during World War II. Used to refer to any current or future genocide, either by nuclear or other means.

IDOLATRY—immoderate attachment or devotion to something; the worship of a false god.

IMPERIALISM—the policy, practice, or advocacy of extending the power and dominion of a nation by direct territorial acquisition or by gaining indirect control over the political or economic life of other areas.

INTERDEPENDENCE—the dependence of groups and nations upon each other and upon international institutions to meet basic needs in the realms of economic, technical, social, political, and ecological concerns.

JUSTICE—the establishment or determination of rights according to the rules of equity and fairness.

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION—a corporation that has production branches or subsidiaries in more than one country.

NATIONAL SECURITY—the concept of adequate national military power to meet objectives of a policy of security and to defend national interests.

NATIONALISM—a sense of national consciousness exalting one nation above all others and placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other nations or supranational groups.

PARANOIA—a tendency on the part of an individual or group toward excessive or irrational suspiciousness or distrustfulness of others.

POWER—a possession of control, authority, or influence over others sufficient to produce desired results or actions.

REVOLUTION—a fundamental change in political organization or institutions.

SECURITY—freedom from fear or anxiety, want or deprivation.

SOCIALISM—any of various economic and political theories advocating collective or governmental ownership and administration of the means of production and the distribution of goods.

SOVEREIGNTY—the supreme power of a state, exercised within its boundaries and free from external interference.

SYSTEMIC—conditions stemming from or related to the nature of a particular economic, political, or social system or structure.

TERRORISM—the systematic use of terror as a means of coercion.

THIRD WORLD—the developing nations of the world, comprising most of Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East.

VITAL INTERESTS—any interest considered necessary for the long-term security and survival of a people or state, assuring the preservation of basic human rights.

Bible Study Suggestions Concerning Peacemaking

Genesis 1:26–31 . . . God created man in his own image . . .

Genesis 11:1–9 . . . let us build ourselves a city . . . and . . . make a name . . .

Exodus 20:1–17 . . . you shall not kill . . .

Leviticus 26 . . . I will give peace in the land . . .

Deuteronomy 30 . . . choose life, that you and your descendents may live . . .

Joshua 23:14-16 . . . the Lord will bring upon you all the evil things . . .
 I Kings 3:3-15 . . . discern between good and evil . . .
 Psalm 46 . . . God is our refuge and strength . . .
 Psalm 72 . . . May he judge the people with righteousness . . .
 Psalm 85 . . . righteousness and peace will kiss each other . . .
 Isaiah 2:2-4 . . . they shall beat their swords into plowshares . . .
 Isaiah 9:2-7 . . . of his government and of peace there will be no end . . .
 Isaiah 11:1-9 . . . the wolf shall dwell with the lamb . . .
 Isaiah 52:7-53:12 . . . surely he has borne our griefs . . .
 Isaiah 58 . . . Is not this the fast that I choose . . .
 Isaiah 59 . . . The way of peace they know not . . .
 Jeremiah 25 . . . the Lord has an indictment against the nations . . .
 Ezekiel 13:8-16 . . . visions of peace . . . when there was no peace . . .
 Ezekiel 34 . . . I myself will judge between the fat sheep and the lean sheep . . .
 Zechariah 8 . . . render . . . judgments that are true and make for peace . . .
 Matthew 5:2-16, 38-48 . . . Blessed are the peacemakers . . .
 Matthew 7:1-14 . . . Judge not that you be not judged . . .
 Matthew 25:21-46 . . . Lord, when did we see thee . . .
 Luke 1:67-79 . . . to guide our feet into the way of peace . . .
 Luke 4:1-19 . . . the spirit of the Lord is on me . . .
 Luke 10:29-37 . . . who is my neighbor? . . .
 Luke 19:37-44 . . . would that . . . you knew the things that make for peace . . .
 John 18:33-38 . . . My kingdom is not of this world . . .
 Romans 5:1-11 . . . we have peace with God . . .
 Romans 12:1-21 . . . live peaceably with all . . .
 II Corinthians 5:16-21 . . . ambassadors for Christ . . .
 Galatians 5 . . . the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace . . .
 Ephesians 2:11-22 . . . he is our peace . . . and has broken down the dividing wall
 Ephesians 4:1-16 . . . there is one body and one spirit . . .
 Ephesians 6:10-20 . . . be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might . . .
 Colossians 1:9-29 . . . making peace by the blood of his cross . . .
 I Thessalonians 5:1-23 . . . Be at peace among yourselves . . .
 James 3:13-4:12 . . . the harvest of righteousness is sown in peace . . .
 I John 3 . . . this is the message . . . we should love one another . . .
 Revelations 21:1-22:5 . . . I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . .

Resources for Local Church Use

- Arnett, Ronald C. *Dwell in Peace*. Elgin, Illinois: The Brethren Press, 1980.
 Cosby, Gordon and Bill Price. *Handbook for World Peacemaker Groups*. Washington: World Peacemakers, n.d.
 Foreign Policy Association. *Great Decisions*. New York: Foreign Policy Association. (An annual study guide on eight key international issues.)
 Hadley, Noral (ed.). *New Call to Peacemaking: A Challenge to Friends*. Plainfield, Indiana: Friends World Committee of Consultation, 1976.
 Hessel, Dieter T. *A Social Action Primer*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
 Hessel, Dieter T. (ed.). *Rethinking Social Ministry*. New York: United Presbyterian Program Agency, 1980.
 Holverson, Loren. *Peace on Earth Handbook*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.
 Hunsinger, George (ed.). *The Riverside Disarmament Reader*. New York: Riverside Church, 1979.

- Hunter, Barton and Dorothy. *Building Peace: Suggestions for Church and Community*. New York: Friendship Press, 1976.
- Jack, Homer. *Disarmament Workbook*. New York: World Conference on Religion and Peace, 1978.
- Lamont, Victor. *Hungry for Peace*. New York: Friendship Press, 1976.
- McIntyre, Michael, Sister Luke Tobin, and Hazel Johns. *Peaceworld*. New York: Friendship Press, 1976.
- Shelly, Maynard. *New Call for Peacemakers: A New Call to Peacemaking Study Guide*. Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1976.
- Shoemaker, Dennis E. *The Global Connection: Local Action for World Peace*. New York: Friendship Press, 1977.
- Task Force on Christian Education for World Peace. *Teaching Towards a Faithful Vision*. Nashville: Disciples Resources, 1977.
- United Presbyterian Women. *A New Community for Peace*. New York: United Presbyterian Church, 1980.
- Woito, Robert (ed.). *World Disarmament Kit*. Chicago: World Without War Council, 1977.

Organizations with Peace Concerns

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE (AFSC)

1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
215/241-7000
Publications: Occasional

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, USA

304 West 58 Street
New York, NY 10019
212/582-4440
Publications: MATCHBOX, AMNESTY ACTION, AI NEWS RELEASE

ARMS CONTROL ASSOCIATION

11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/797-6450
Publications: ARMS CONTROL TODAY

BREAD FOR THE WORLD

32 Union Square East
New York, NY 10003
212/260-7000
Publications: BREAD FOR THE WORLD NEWSLETTER

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION

122 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
202/543-0400
Publications: DEFENSE MONITOR

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL POLICY

120 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
202/544-4666
Publications: CURRENT ISSUES, INTERNATIONAL POLICY REPORTS

CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES

The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
216/375-7008
Publications: INTERNATIONAL PEACE STUDIES NEWSLETTER

CENTER FOR THEOLOGY AND PUBLIC POLICY

4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016
202/363-3088
Publications: Occasional

CENTRAL COMMITTEE FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS (CCCO)

P.O. Box 15796, 2208 South Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/545-4626
Publications: CCCO NEWS NOTED, CCCO COUNSELOR'S NEWSLETTER/DRAFT

CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED (CALC)

198 Broadway
New York, New York 10038
212/964-6730
Publications: CALC REPORT

COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY

120 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002
202/546-8400
Publications: Occasional

CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT (COPRED)

Center for Peaceful Change
Stopher Hall, Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242
216/672-3143
Publications: Occasional

COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC PRIORITIES

84 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10011
212/691-8550
Publications: CEP STUDY, CEP REPORT, CEP NEWSLETTER

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

58 East 68 Street
New York, NY 10021
212/734-0400
Publications: FOREIGN AFFAIRS

COUNCIL ON RELIGION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (CRIA)

170 East 64 Street
New York, NY 10021
212/838-4120
Publications: WORLDVIEW

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION (FOR)

Box 271, 523 North Broadway
Nyack, NY 10960
914/358-4601
Publications: FELLOWSHIP

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

205 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10016
212/481-8450
Publications: HEADLINE SERIES

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION (FCNL)

245 Second Street, NE
 Washington, DC 20002
 202/547-4343

Publications: WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

GLOBAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATES

552 Park Avenue
 East Orange, New Jersey 07017
 201/675-1409

Publications: THE WHOLE EARTH PAPERS

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, INC.

218 East 18th Street
 New York, New York 10003
 212/228-2470

Publications: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

IMPACT

100 Maryland Avenue, NE
 Washington, DC 20002
 202/544-8636

Publications: UPDATE, PREPARE, HUNGER, ACTION

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES

1901 Q Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20009
 202/234-9382

Publications: IPS TRANSNATIONAL LINK

INSTITUTE OF WORLD ORDER

777 United Nations Plaza
 New York, NY 10017
 212/490-0010

Publications: TRANSITION, ALTERNATIVES, MACROSCOPE

INTERFAITH CENTER ON CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY (ICCR)

475 Riverside Drive, Room 566
 New York, NY 10115
 212/870-2936

Publications: CORPORATE EXAMINER

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

1730 M Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20036
 202/296-1770

Publications: CURRENT FOCUS

MOBILIZATION FOR SURVIVAL

3601 Locust Walk
 Philadelphia, PA 19104
 215/386-4875

Publications: Occasional

NARMIC—NATIONAL ACTION/RESEARCH ON THE MILITARY INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

1501 Cherry Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19102
 215/241-7175

Publications: Occasional

**NISBCO—NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS SERVICE BOARD FOR CON-
SCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS**

550 Washington Building
15th Street and New York Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20005
202/393-4868

Publications: **THE REPORTER FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE**

OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/234-8701

Publications: Occasional

RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE ON SALT

110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Room 108
Washington, DC 20002
202/544-2350

Publications: Occasional

RIVERSIDE CHURCH DISARMAMENT PROGRAM

490 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10027
212/749-7000

Publications: **DISARMING NOTES**

SANE: A Citizens' Organization for a Sane World

514 C Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
202/546-7100

Publications: **SANE WORLD**

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION, USA (UNA-USA)

300 East 42 Street
New York, NY 10017
212/697-3232

Publications: Occasional

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

1213 Race Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
215/LO3-7110

Publications: **PEACE & FREEDOM**

WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE (WCRP)

777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
212/687-2163

Publications: **RELIGION FOR PEACE**

WORLD FEDERALISTS ASSOCIATION

1011 Arlington Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209
703/524-2141

Publications: Occasional

WORLD PEACEMAKERS

2852 Ontario Road, NW
Washington, DC 20009
202/265-7582

Publications: **WORLD PEACEMAKERS NEWSLETTER**

WORLD PRIORITIES

Box 1003

Leesburg, Virginia 22075

202/337-4218

Publications: **WORLD MILITARY AND SOCIAL EXPENDITURES**

(Annual)

WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL

Suite 601

175 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10010

212/674-2085

Publications: Occasional

Christian/Citizen Action**LETTERS**

1. **PRESIDENT**
The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
Very respectfully yours,
2. **SENATOR**
The Honorable _____
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510
Dear Senator: _____
Sincerely yours,
3. **REPRESENTATIVE**
The Honorable _____
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515
Dear Mr./Ms. -
Sincerely yours,
4. **MEMBER OF THE CABINET**
The Honorable -
The Secretary of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
Dear Mr. Secretary:
Sincerely yours,

TELEPHONE MESSAGES

1. The White House Switchboard: 202-456-1414
2. The Capitol Switchboard: 202-224-3121
3. The Department of State: 202-655-4000

TELEGRAMS

1. Public Opinion Message (P.O.M) to the President or Member of Congress. \$2.00 for 15 words, name and address not counted.
2. Mailgram. \$2.95 for 100 words including name and address.

RESOURCES

1. **REGISTER CITIZEN OPINION** (Published Annually—34pp.)
Washington Office, United Presbyterian Church USA
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
2. **TELL IT TO WASHINGTON:**
A GUIDE FOR CITIZEN ACTION (35¢ per copy)
League of Women Voters of the United States
1730 M Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036