

**“To Leaven the Lump”:
A Critical History of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship
in New Zealand**

By

Zane Mather

A Thesis

submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts
in Religious Studies

Victoria University of Wellington

2011

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an interpretation of the history and character of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in New Zealand (NZAPF). It focuses on accounting for the limited growth and influence of the Fellowship upon New Zealand's largest Christian denomination, and on the continuing marginality of the pacifist position. Throughout its history, the organisation has sought to convince others within the Anglican Church that an absolutist, politically engaged and non-anarchistic pacifism is the truest Christian response to the problem of modern warfare. This has been attempted primarily through efforts at education aimed at both clergy and laity. The thesis argues that the NZAPF has been characterised by a commitment to absolute doctrinaire pacifism, despite ongoing tensions between this position and more pragmatic considerations. Overall, the NZAPF attracted only a small group of members throughout its history, and it exerted a limited demonstrable influence on the Anglican Church. This thesis analyses the reasons for this, focusing especially on those factors which arose from the nature of the NZAPF itself, the character of its pacifism, and the relationship between the NZAPF and its primary target audience, the Anglican Church in New Zealand.

The research is based on literature and correspondence from the NZAPF as well as personal communication with extant members, where this was feasible. It additionally draws on a range of relevant secondary literature on Christian pacifism, and the history of the Anglican Church and the peace movement in New Zealand.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to briefly thank my two supervisors, Dr Geoff Troughton and Dr Michael Radich of Victoria University of Wellington, as well as the other staff and students of the Religious Studies department, for their criticism, guidance and support. Heartfelt thanks are also due for the crucial encouragement given by many friends and family, especially Mum for all her support, both moral and financial! And, finally, to LJ, Polly and Mondo, for that one day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: History of the NZAPF	11
Chapter Two: The Character of NZAPF Pacifism	39
Chapter Three: The NZAPF and the Anglican Church	64
Chapter Four: The NZAPF and Just War	86
Conclusion	99
Bibliography	104

INTRODUCTION

The horrors recounted in Archibald Baxter's account of his experiences as a conscientious objector, *We Will Not Cease*, came as a profound shock to me when I first read that book in 2009.¹ Growing up at the end of the twentieth century in nuclear-free New Zealand, I took the liberal and peaceful attitudes of my parents and peers for granted. Yet here was a very different New Zealand society; one bloody-minded enough to physically and mentally torture a man for his refusal to participate in war. Imagining myself in Baxter's position, I could only admire his courage and wonder at the internal reserves of strength upon which he drew. Baxter's pacifist ideal was grounded in a simple application of his understanding of Jesus' ethic and a strong sense of the incompatibility of loving one's neighbour while shooting at him from across a trench. In service of this ideal, Baxter was prepared to accept suffering rather than to inflict it.

This thesis examines the pacifism of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship (APF), with particular respect to the ideas and activities that have characterised the history of the organisation's New Zealand branch (NZAPF). Though Baxter's story is not directly related to that of the APF, it connects in significant ways. The pacifism of the APF issues from the same essential conviction as Baxter's—that the teachings of Christ and the practice of warfare are fundamentally incompatible. Moreover, the APF's history spans a period during which the illiberal society which imprisoned Baxter changed enormously to become the society in which I grew up. This thesis partly arises from a desire to understand the place of a principled Christian pacifism like Baxter's in this changing context.

¹ Archibald Baxter, *We Will Not Cease* (Christchurch: Caxton Press, 1965).

Throughout its history, the APF has sought to convince others within the Anglican Church that Christian discipleship and participation in warfare are incompatible. This thesis analyzes the NZAPF's efforts to engage with the Church and broader New Zealand society in an attempt to persuade others of the value of its pacifist position. It argues that the NZAPF has been characterised by a commitment to absolute doctrinaire pacifism, despite ongoing tensions between this position and more pragmatic considerations. Notwithstanding the emergence of an apparently more peaceful society, and an arguably more peace-oriented Church, the absolute pacifism of the NZAPF has remained a marginal influence. The NZAPF typically attracted only a small group of members throughout its history, and it exerted a limited demonstrable influence on the Anglican Church. In accounting for this marginality, a number of factors evidently contributed. This thesis assesses these factors, focusing especially on those that stem from the nature of the NZAPF itself, the character of its pacifism, and the relationship between the NZAPF and its target audience, the Anglican Church in New Zealand.

The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship was formed in England by the popular clergyman Dick Sheppard in 1937. It was intended to be an explicitly Anglican counterpart to Sheppard's own Peace Pledge Union (PPU).² Sheppard's aim for the Fellowship was for it to act as a pacifist voice within the Anglican Church, convincing others within the Church that pacifism was the most truly Christian response to the problem of modern warfare. The New Zealand branch of the APF was formed in Christchurch in 1948 and is extant today. Members are drawn from communicant members of the Anglican Church, both clergy and laity.

² Fuller details of the origins of the APF, and NZAPF, are addressed in Chapter One below.

By and large the NZAPF as a corporate entity has eschewed direct protest action. Members have preferred to persuade others within the Church that they are already called to pacifism by virtue of their faith. They have approached laity by organising debates, talks, and sending correspondence to church newspapers. Additionally, they have written directly to clergy and sponsored a missionary, English APF member Sidney Hinkes, to give sermons and interviews throughout New Zealand. Outside of the Church, the support of NZAPF members was important in setting up the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Otago, which also shows a commitment to education.

In many respects, the NZAPF represents a continuation of the liberal Protestant pacifist tradition. This is the name given to the predominant strain of pacifism within the Anglo-American Christian peace movement in the years between World War One and World War Two. It was characterised by the attempt to apply the principled pacifist ethic to the political realm. Consistent with the liberal theological tradition, it aimed to reconcile modern thinking with teachings of Christ and of the Church. Fundamentally, it was optimistic that war could be eliminated through education and moral persuasion. The NZAPF shares with liberal Protestant pacifism the tendency to advocate pacifism as a personal *and* political stance, and to see education as a transforming force. However, it has done this in the years after World War Two, in a context that has been much less favourable and receptive to these characteristic ideas. The outbreak of World War Two led to the almost total eclipse of the liberal Protestant pacifist tradition. Those who had supported the pacifist position primarily on practical grounds abandoned it in the face of the failure of peaceful efforts to restrain the aggression of the Axis powers. Those who remained pacifists tended to

be those for whom pacifism was a matter of absolute principle, usually religious, and untouched by the potential impotence of pacifism as a political strategy.

New Zealand society in general has become less militaristic over the time of the NZAPF's existence. However the peace movement which exerted pressure over issues like the Vietnam War and, most successfully, nuclear weapons, was fundamentally different from the Christian pacifist movement. It was much more diverse in its motivations, and tended to focus more on specific issues without defending an absolute claim. Essentially, it was less ambitious. NZAPF members often co-operated with other peace groups on an individual level and there was some small corporate presence at particular protests. However, the primary purpose and thrust of activity in the Fellowship was always to persuade other Anglicans of the value of the pacifist position. In this respect, they have been marginal. The number of members has always remained small, never growing far beyond one hundred individuals.

The group's influence within and without the Church has also been slight, as a result of a combination of factors, which this thesis will unpack. In balancing purity of message with the desire for growth, the NZAPF has consistently declined to compromise on their original absolute pacifism, despite the unpopularity of the position. The Fellowship also retained a commitment to mid-twentieth century conceptions of pacifism and its political ramifications which became less relevant in more recent years. By focusing on the Anglican Church in particular, the NZAPF ran into difficulties due to traditions of Anglican conservatism and alignment with the State, and a marked lack of inclination within the Church to consider issues of war and peace in theological terms.

However, considered as a witness rather than as a strategy, NZAPF pacifism has shown considerable endurance and integrity. Through the medium of regular conferences and retreats, NZAPF members have sought to refine their conceptions of Christian pacifism and the areas of its application.

Prior Literature

Most of the attention that Christian pacifism in New Zealand has received has focused on earlier periods than that in which the NZAPF has been active. *We Will Not Cease* is an important piece of work drawing attention to the pacifist experience in World War One. David Grant has written extensively on the experiences of Christian conscientious objectors during both World Wars and the activities of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society (CPS), which began in 1936.³ Ernest Crane has also written a biography of Ormond Burton, the founder of the CPS.⁴ With respect to the post-World War Two context, there is less material. Yet the post-War years have been crucial in the development of the New Zealand peace movement. Additionally, it has been a time of increasing secularisation. This and other pressures led to a waning of vitality within the CPS. J.L. Stone's 2003 BA Honours research exercise in History for Massey University examines the challenges that the Vietnam War era posed for the CPS, much of which is applicable to the NZAPF as well.⁵

³ David Grant, *A Question of Faith: A History of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society* (Wellington: Philip Garside Publishing, 2004); David Grant, *Field Punishment No. 1: Archibald Baxter, Mark Briggs & New Zealand's Anti-Militarist Tradition* (Wellington: Steele Roberts, 2008); David Grant, *Out in the Cold: Pacifists and Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand During World War II* (Auckland: Reed Methuen, 1986).

⁴ Ernest Crane, *I Can Do No Other: A Biography of the Reverend Ormond Burton* (Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton, 1986).

⁵ J. L. Stone, "A Dwindling Elderly Group Faithfully Preparing for the Last War Instead of the Next?": The New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society in the Vietnam War Period (1963-1973)" (BA Hons research exercise in History, Massey University, 2003).

The NZAPF is located within a broader Christian pacifist tradition. For context and comparison with the history of Christian responses to war most generally, this thesis draws on the wide existing literature, and particularly on the work of John Howard Yoder⁶ and Roland Bainton.⁷ Martin Ceadel,⁸ Peter Brock,⁹ and Alan Wilkinson¹⁰ have all written extensively on issues relating specifically to the British inter-war context which gave rise to the umbrella APF. Reinhold Niebuhr's¹¹ critique of liberal Protestant pacifism is also enormously significant, as the most significant theological and philosophical rejoinder to an optimistic, politically engaged Christian pacifism.

As well as being part of the Christian pacifist tradition, the NZAPF was part of the religious and social milieu of later twentieth century New Zealand. Allan Davidson,¹² Laurie Guy,¹³ John Cookson¹⁴ and Peter Lineham¹⁵ have each fleshed out crucial

⁶ John Howard Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, ed. Theodore J. Koontz & Andy Alexis-Baker (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009).

⁷ Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960).

⁸ Martin Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980); Martin Ceadel, "Ten Distinctions for Peace Historians," In *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, ed. Harvey L. Dyck (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

⁹ Peter Brock, *Twentieth-Century Pacifism* (New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970); Peter Brock, *Varieties of Pacifism: A Survey from Antiquity to the Outset of the Twentieth Century* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998 (1981)).

¹⁰ Alan Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945* (London: SCM Press, 1986).

¹¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001 (1932)); Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1969).

¹² Allan K. Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa* (Wellington: Education for Ministry, 1991); Allan K. Davidson & Peter Lineham, *Transplanted Christianity: Documents illustrating aspects of New Zealand Church History* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1987); Allan K. Davidson, "Peace and Pacifism: New Zealand Presbyterians 1901-45," In *Reforming the Reformation: Essays in Honour of Principal Peter Matheson*, ed. Ian Breward (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly, 2004); Allan K. Davidson, ed., *Living Legacy: A History of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland* (Auckland: Anglican Diocese of Auckland, 2011).

¹³ Laurie Guy, *Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011).

¹⁴ J. E. Cookson, "Appeal Boards and Conscientious Objectors," In *Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War*, ed. John Crawford (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2000);

J. E. Cookson, "Illiberal New Zealand: The Formation of Government Policy on Conscientious Objection, 1940-1," *New Zealand Journal of History* 17, no. 2 (1983): 120-143; J. E. Cookson, "Pacifism and Conscientious Objection in New Zealand," In *Challenge to Mars: Essays on Pacifism from 1914-1945*, eds. Peter Brock & Thomas P. Socknat (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

¹⁵ Peter Lineham, "The Religious Face of Patriotism: New Zealand Churches in the Second World War," In *Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War*, ed. John Crawford (Auckland: Oxford

aspects of the specific New Zealand context in which the NZAPF operated. Elsie Locke¹⁶ and Kevin Clements¹⁷ have also written key works on the history of the peace movement in New Zealand.

No history of the NZAPF proper has been published, though aspects of its history have been addressed in two previous works. Geoffrey Haworth's account of the New Zealand Anglican Church during World War Two contains a chapter on Anglican pacifism, which details the wartime activities of soon-to-be NZAPF members.¹⁸

Kenneth Stead, in an MA thesis in Religious Studies for Massey University in 1999, wrote about the involvement of Auckland diocesan members in the peace movement.¹⁹ Stead's work covers the activities of several important NZAPF members in the Auckland branch, but does not include an account of NZAPF activity in other parts of the country. The main source for the history of the NZAPF has been archived correspondence, published work, meeting minutes and assorted other material. Several boxes of material from between the years 1948 and 1989 are held at the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington. A considerable array of more recent material from 1990 onwards is held by Chris Barfoot, the current NZAPF secretary, in Auckland.²⁰ Another source has been through direct communication with selected members, where this has been feasible.

University Press, 2000); Peter Lineham, "Social Policy and the Churches in the 1990's and Beyond," In *The Future of Christianity*, eds. John Stenhouse & Brett Knowles (Adelaide: Australian Theological Forum Press, 2004).

¹⁶ Elsie Locke, *Peace People: A History of Peace Activities in New Zealand* (Christchurch: Hazard Press, 1992).

¹⁷ Kevin Clements, *Back from the Brink: The Creation of a Nuclear-Free New Zealand* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1988); Kevin Clements, "New Zealand's Role in Promoting a Nuclear-Free Pacific," *Journal of Peace Research* 25, no. 4 (1988): 395-410.

¹⁸ Geoffrey Haworth, *Marching As To War: The Anglican Church in New Zealand during World War II* (Christchurch: Wily Publications, 2008).

¹⁹ Kenneth Stead, "Involvement of Members of the Auckland Diocese of the Anglican Church in the Peace Movement since 1945" (MA thesis in Religious Studies, Massey University, 1999).

²⁰ Hereinafter referred to as "Barfoot Papers".

Thesis Outline

This thesis addresses the fundamental tension for the group, which has been the effort to retain the purity of the pacifist position while presenting it as a plausible position for the Anglican Church as a whole. The challenges of balancing these competing imperatives are considered with respect to the history of the NZAPF, the nature and development of their style of pacifism, their relationship with the Anglican Church, and engagement with Just War theory.

The Introduction has discussed the stimulus for the writing of this thesis, provided an account of the prior literature and sources and gives an outline of the structure of the remaining chapters.

Chapter One analyses the history of the Fellowship, highlighting ways in which the central tension between purity of message and broad appeal was experienced. The chapter begins by detailing the background to the APF's formation, both in England and in New Zealand. It goes on to examine the involvement of key members, the growth of the group throughout its history and how they have responded to significant developments in New Zealand's political and social context.

Chapter Two concerns the character of NZAPF pacifism and how this has influenced the group's activities and prospects. Opponents of pacifism tend to conflate pacifism *qua* rejection of war with a strict and consistent refusal to employ any level of force, even in a potentially life-threatening situation. While this characterisation holds for some varieties of pacifism, it is not true of the NZAPF, which has consistently upheld the distinction between anarchistic pacifism and the rejection of warfare. This chapter analyses the NZAPF position with respect to a typology suggested by a leading scholar of pacifism, Martin Ceadel. It then goes on to explain how this

characterisation illuminates a tension regarding efficacy within the NZAPF position, and the importance of conscientious objection as the primary political manifestation of this kind of pacifism.

Chapter Three examines how the NZAPF attempted to bear witness within the Anglican Church, and the difficulties they encountered in doing so. It builds upon the general overview of the NZAPF's history in Chapter One by providing a more focused account of the various Anglican-directed activities of the Fellowship, and an analysis of the reasons for their lack of substantial success. As with broader New Zealand society, the Anglican Church has largely turned away from any overt militarism, but the shape of this attitude is far from pacifist. Additionally, Anglican social concern has tended to focus increasingly on domestic issues, interpreting these through a social justice lens. Thus, concern about issues of poverty in New Zealand has been more prominent than the debate about international conflict.

Chapter Four examines the NZAPF's engagement with Just War theory, which has ostensibly been the main competitor to pacifism within the Anglican Church. This short chapter tackles central characteristics and deficiencies in the NZAPF's criticism of Just War theory. It argues that the NZAPF's approach has been misplaced, since it borrows the criteria of the theory but then draws the unwarranted conclusion that the theory must be rejected. The weakness of this engagement has also contributed to the NZAPF's marginality in terms of its ability to persuade the Church of its position.

The Conclusion ties together these strands and describes the tensions and difficulties that the group faced while also acknowledging the importance of the

group itself to individual members and gives an account of the place of the NZAPF in the contemporary context.

Overall, the history of the NZAPF has showed a sustained commitment to a form of pacifism distinctively shaped by the inter-war period, and the Anglican Church's erstwhile support of Christian participation in war. While the NZAPF has periodically re-assessed such distinctive elements as the denominational focus, and the importance of conscientious objection, the corporate line has remained conservative. In the absence of the conditions that shaped the original APF message, the NZAPF has struggled to remain relevant.

Chapter One

HISTORY OF THE NZAPF

This chapter examines the formation and growth of the NZAPF. The central argument will be that the NZAPF's history has been marked by a fundamental tension: the attempt to balance the competing imperatives of purity of message, political relevance and membership growth. This tension has been resolved in continued adherence to absolute doctrinaire pacifism and a specific denominational focus at the expense of growth – particularly with respect to attracting members from the more situationalist peace groups which concentrated on specific issues such as nuclear weapons or the Vietnam War.

The following discussion begins by examining the background to the formation of the NZAPF's parent body, the APF in England, which was distinctively shaped by the inter-war context. It goes on to assess the formation and expansion of the NZAPF in the context of the post-World War Two years. Initially, the NZAPF was strong in Christchurch, but throughout the 1950s and 1960s its centre of gravity shifted north, with the Auckland branch providing much of the impetus for a greater level of engagement during the 1960s. Although many members were involved in the broader peace movement, as a corporate entity, the NZAPF was not inclined to direct action, preferring instead to educate and persuade. The NZAPF slipped into a decline in activity throughout most of the 1970s and upon a return to comparatively greater engagement in the 1980s, sought to broaden their mandate to include more social justice concerns. However, the ageing nature of the Fellowship and the lack of easily identifiable pacifist issues for New Zealanders in recent years has resulted in negligible growth and a lack of visibility.

The APF formed in England towards the end of the inter-war period, at a relatively high point for pacifism in terms of intellectual support and mass appeal. The New Zealand branch, on the other hand, formed in 1948, a post-World War Two environment in which the optimistic liberal Protestant pacifism of the 1920s and 1930s had suffered a drastic decline in popularity. At the time of the NZAPF's formation, New Zealand society, both within and without the Anglican Church, was largely hostile to pacifist ideas; pacifism was the preserve of a tiny minority, who were usually motivated by either a Christian faith, or a Communist political persuasion.

New Zealand society changed dramatically over the course of the NZAPF's history. Indeed, by 2010, New Zealand was ranked as the most peaceful nation on earth in the Global Peace Index published by the Institute for Economics and Peace.²¹ Such a change would, at first glance, seem to be good news for pacifist organisations. However, a more peaceable New Zealand did not translate into increased support for the NZAPF. Four key factors contributed to this apparently paradoxical result. First, the NZAPF had to contend with a rapidly secularising society, which lessened the appeal of Christian pacifism. Second, the increasingly influential New Zealand peace movement was heterogeneous in its principles and less absolute than traditional pacifism in its anti-war stance. Third, New Zealand has had no major involvement in international conflict to match the World Wars, which has led to issues of war and peace becoming less immediately applicable. These three factors, combined with a fourth – the NZAPF tendency to maintain the absolutism of its initial

²¹ Institute for Economics and Peace, Economics Intelligence Unit, "Global Peace Index: 2010 Methodology, Results & Findings," accessed August 11, 2010, [http://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/PDF/2010/2010 GPI Results Report.pdf](http://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/PDF/2010/2010_GPI_Results_Report.pdf).

formulation – ensured that the influence of NZAPF style pacifism on the wider peace movement, and NZAPF membership growth, was minimal.

Background in England

The years between World War One and World War Two saw a marked increase in anti-war sentiment within the Churches of the English-speaking world. Many were horrified by the human cost of the First World War, and concerned with preventing a repetition. A number of avowedly pacifistic organisations were founded in the inter-war period, including the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) in 1919 and War Resisters International (WRI), the British section of which was the No More War Movement (NMWM), in 1921. These post-war groups were explicitly formed as a reaction to World War One. The APF was rather late to the scene. Founded in 1937 by Dick Sheppard, it was part of what Martin Ceadel has termed “new” pacifism,²² which Ceadel argues was animated less by reaction to World War One than by concern about the likely consequences of another war. In Ceadel’s terms, they “owed more to the bomber than to Passchendale.”²³

Sheppard was a popular preacher. Born in 1880, he had become vicar of St Martin-in-the-Fields in 1914. He maintained a close friendship with Cosmo Lang, the Archbishop of York (1908-28) and then Canterbury (1928-42), having served as his secretary while Lang was Bishop of Stepney. Sheppard gained nationwide fame with his pioneering radio broadcasts beginning in 1924.²⁴ He had also been the driving force behind the Peace Pledge. This was a 1934 initiative wherein he had invited men in England to send him postcards containing a pledge to renounce war and never to support another. More than a hundred thousand men responded, and this

²² Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain*, 173-192.

²³ Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain*, 60.

²⁴ Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform*, 112-125.

group formed the basis for the Peace Pledge Union (PPU). Membership of the PPU was initially for men only, but was opened to women in 1936. The only requirement for membership was the signing of the pledge, and the movement required no profession of religious faith.²⁵ The “new” pacifist movements began to supersede the old; in 1937 the NMWM was incorporated into the PPU.²⁶

The founding of the APF was intended to provide a specifically Anglican organisation, based on the same absolute refusal of military service and war preparation as the PPU but with a focus on the Anglican Church. Sheppard was a charismatic orator, and did much to raise the public profile of pacifism. He declared his position in a 1927 book entitled *The Impatience of a Parson*, which attacked the Anglican Church for its failure to apply the non-violent ethic of Jesus to the issue of war. Sheppard saw the message of the gospel as essentially simple, and imitation of Christ as the meaning of discipleship.²⁷ For Sheppard, the Church, in its complexity, had lost sight of this basic requirement. In 1930, the Lambeth Conference had declared that “war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ”.²⁸ Yet, as David Branford has pointed out, “in reality, there was no common mind amongst the bishops, the clergy or the laity on issues of war and peace.”²⁹ There was certainly no unanimous acceptance of the pacifist position. Archbishop William Temple, to name one particularly influential figure, was stridently opposed to pacifism as a creed suitable for the whole Church. When war was again declared in 1939, the optimism which had driven the PPU largely collapsed.

²⁵ “Peace Pledge Union Website,” accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.ppu.org.uk/ppu/history.html>.

²⁶ Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain*, 268.

²⁷ Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform?*, 114.

²⁸ “Lambeth Conference Archives,” accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-25.cfm>.

²⁹ David Branford, “From Pacifism to Just War: Changing Attitudes in the Church of England 1930 to 1940,” *Modern Believing* 49, no. 2 (2008): 14.

World War Two had an extremely damaging effect on the pacifist position. The failure of the League of Nations and the policy of appeasement to deal with Fascist aggression had also done much to diminish the attractiveness of pacifism as a viable political stance. Sheppard had died in 1937, the same year in which the APF was formed. The movement survived, however, through the leadership of other important members, such as the clergyman Charles Raven, the novelist Vera Brittain and Labour leader George Lansbury. These helped the APF to maintain a level of activity throughout World War Two, supporting conscientious objectors, promoting a negotiated peace and protesting saturation bombing by the Royal Air Force over Germany.

Background in New Zealand

In New Zealand, tolerance for pacifism, particularly in the form of conscientious objection, was not at all high during World War Two. The most visible manifestation of Christian pacifism during the war came from the CPS, particularly the uncompromising Ormond Burton, who spoke publically against the war, and was eventually imprisoned for doing so.³⁰ During World War One, the New Zealand authorities had dealt extremely harshly with conscientious objectors.³¹ Treatment of conscientious objectors was more humane during World War Two, although New Zealand's appeal boards for those refusing military service were less accommodating than those of other Allied countries.³² Merv Browne, a CPS member, gives some indication of the social censure that came along with the more tangible sanctions like imprisonment and removal of voting rights employed against conscientious objectors in wartime:

³⁰ Crane, *I Can Do No Other*, 108-136.

³¹ See, for instance: Grant, *Field Punishment No. 1*; Baxter, *We Will Not Cease*.

³² Cookson, "Appeal Boards and Conscientious Objectors," 179.

Knowing my position on the war, some of my work mates petitioned the manager with a demand for my dismissal. A parishioner abused me publicly in church, calling me a coward and a traitor. A favourite uncle of mine said, "I won't condemn you Merv, I'll leave that up to God." I had until then been an acceptable citizen, church member, athlete, and work mate; suddenly, I was a criminal, an outsider who needed to be ostracized and punished for thinking differently than the majority.³³

If committed pacifists during wartime were rare on the whole, they were even rarer within the Anglican Church in New Zealand. Of the 592 military defaulters being held in prisons at the time of a special committee report prepared for the War Cabinet in October 1944, only 32 were Anglicans. This was less than half the number of Methodists being held, and fewer than the number of Jehovah's Witnesses and non-religious objectors. Anglicanism was numerically the largest denomination in New Zealand at this time, with 37.27% of census respondents in 1945 claiming to be Anglican adherents.³⁴ This weak representation provides a clear measure of the lack of strongly held pacifist conviction among Anglicans during the war years.³⁵ In his study of the Anglican Church in New Zealand during World War Two, Geoffrey Haworth notes that:

Most Anglicans found pacifist beliefs unpatriotic, ultra-idealistic or simply insane ... Anglican pacifism was saved from total obscurity and irrelevance by the intellectual ability, high principles and publishing skills of the small groups and individuals who were its advocates.³⁶

These advocates, the core of what became the NZAPF, were a relatively small group of pacifist supporters: the Taylor family, Kathleen and Thurlow Thompson, and Charles Chandler. Thurlow Thompson, an Anglican layman, had founded the New

³³ Merv Browne, "The Courage of a Conscientious Objector," *Peace Review* 18, no. 2 (2006): 221.

³⁴ See Davidson and Lineham, *Transplanted Christianity*.

³⁵ Haworth, *Marching as to War?*, 184.

³⁶ Haworth, *Marching as to War?*, 186.

Zealand section of the PPU in 1938. The Taylors were a family of pacifist priests, headed by Archdeacon Frederick Taylor, along with his sons Roger, David and Humphrey. The Taylors had joined the PPU and the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society (CPS) before World War Two began,³⁷ and spoke out against the war while it was in progress. Chandler used his position as editor of the Waikato diocesan magazine as a platform for espousing his pacifist views.³⁸ The Taylors and the Thompsons were both present at an anti-war rally in Christchurch which provoked the ire of the Returned Servicemen's Association (RSA) in January 1940.³⁹

Formation of the NZAPF

There was no great surge in Christian pacifist or peace-movement activity comparable to that of the inter-war years during the period immediately after World War Two. Another strand of war resistance, based around socialist principles, was evident in the activity of the New Zealand Peace Council (NZPC), affiliated with the World Peace Council (WPC), though there was an understandable tension between the Christian pacifists and the atheistic Communists. It was in this difficult context that the NZAPF was formed.

The inaugural meeting of the NZAPF took place on 27 January 1948 in Christchurch, and was chaired by Roger Taylor, who became the branch's first chairman.⁴⁰ At this early stage, the NZAPF was fundamentally reliant on the parent organisation, paying subscriptions and sending completed membership forms to the APF in England and receiving the *Anglican Pacifist*, the English APF magazine, as well as various pamphlets. The original membership was largely based in the South Island,

³⁷ Roger Taylor, Letter to Chris Barfoot, December 7th 1965, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship New Zealand Branch: Records, MS Group 0129: 91-134, Folder 6. Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL).

³⁸ Haworth, *Marching as to War?*, 173.

³⁹ Haworth, *Marching as to War?*, 176.

⁴⁰ Meeting Minutes for January 27th 1948, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

Christchurch in particular; by August 1951, there were 35 NZAPF members, of whom 21 were based in Christchurch.⁴¹

The CPS welcomed the formation of the NZAPF with some relief. As a non-denominational group, the CPS had always anticipated becoming supplanted by denominational peace fellowships, but the growth of such societies had not occurred. However, they “felt that it [the NZAPF] was one Peace Group with which [they] could really feel united and this was a happy thought after the care [they] had to exercise in [their] consideration of joint activity with the Peace Council.”⁴² Co-operation between the CPS and the NZAPF ran deeper than between the NZAPF and any other New Zealand peace organisation. Ormond Burton was particularly fond of the Anglican Church, having spent some time attending St Peter’s in Wellington following his dismissal from the Methodist ministry.⁴³

With respect to the NZPC, opinions were divided within the NZAPF. Roger Taylor noted in a letter to members dating from August 1951 that “some members have joined in the work of the N.Z. Peace Council, others have believed they could not support the Council because many of its supporters are communists.”⁴⁴ Here, the NZAPF, or at least Roger Taylor and Charles Chandler, parted company somewhat with the English APF. On the occasion of the Stockholm Petition organised by the WPC, which called for a ban on nuclear weapons, the APF had written to Roger Taylor querying his conciliatory attitude to the WPC, saying: “It is a metter [sic] for the individual but we cannot officially ally Christian pacifism with [Marxism] or Stalinism. They are absolutely Godless and anti-religious.”⁴⁵

⁴¹ Roger Taylor, Circular Letter to NZAPF Members, August 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

⁴² CPS, Letter to Roger Taylor, November 13th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

⁴³ Crane, *I Can Do No Other*, 229.

⁴⁴ Roger Taylor, Circular Letter to NZAPF Members, August 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

⁴⁵ APF, Letter to Roger Taylor, April 17th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

The Australian-born priest, and future Bishop of Auckland Eric Gowing, raised similar concerns when he declined an invitation to join the NZAPF soon after his arrival in New Zealand. Gowing's response to Roger Taylor noted that "there is no mention, for instance, in the statement you sent me that we recognise that evil doctrines are on the march – that we, as followers of Jesus Christ, are diametrically opposed to the dialectical materialism of the Communists."⁴⁶

Pacifists could scarcely draw an irreconcilable boundary between Christians and Communists without doing violence to their own central tenets, inasmuch as love of one's enemies was held to be normative. For his part, Roger Taylor believed that "if Christians or anyone else really means peace, they must at present mean some degree of understanding and peace with communists."⁴⁷ Chandler held a similar view. He noted the Communist bias of the WPC (of which he was a member) and the NZPC but believed that Christians who were opposed to war should nevertheless act in solidarity with those behind the Iron Curtain, as they were, after all, not merely mouthpieces for their regimes.

The early years of the NZAPF show a concern with building membership and orientation with respect to other peace groups. As the Fellowship began to expand, they became more involved in working out their responses to contemporary issues of war and peace.

Expansion of the NZAPF

While many of the early members of the NZAPF had been resident in Christchurch, as the group expanded, branches opened in Wellington in 1952 and Auckland in 1960. In the years immediately following the formation of the NZAPF, Roger Taylor

⁴⁶ Eric Gowing, Letter to Roger Taylor, April 24th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

⁴⁷ Roger Taylor, Letter to Neil Mountier, August 10th 1954, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 2.

was by far the most active member. As chairman, he was responsible for correspondence with the English APF, and advertising and promoting the views of the Fellowship in diocesan newspapers. He also sent semi-regular circular letters to NZAPF members, which gave updates on membership, recommended literature and his own views on the task of the Fellowship. In 1952, the NZAPF expanded, adding a sub-branch in Wellington, as a result of interest expressed by Lance Robinson.⁴⁸ The actual increase in numbers was quite small, but several of the new Wellington members became important figures in the NZPAF's subsequent history. In particular, these included Lance Robinson himself, Neil and Barbara Mountier, Dudley and Margaret Mander and, at least for a time, Paul Oestreicher.

One of the first initiatives that Lance Robinson proposed was a national conference, which took place in late August 1954, in Lower Hutt. This event was considered to be a success, being relatively well attended, given the small size of the Fellowship and the difficulties involved in organising travel with members spread sparsely over the country. Fifteen of the NZAPF's sixty members were present.⁴⁹ Roger Taylor gave a talk on the growth of the APF in New Zealand and Paul Oestreicher, who was studying in Wellington at this time, gave a talk which emphasised the political, economic and social bases of peace, exhorting the Fellowship to be more active in offering concrete proposals both to the Church and to the government.⁵⁰

Conferences such as this became an important locus for NZAPF corporate activity, and provided opportunities for NZAPF members to "meet, worship together and discuss ... responsibilities."⁵¹ Typically, they included prayer, presentations and panel discussions, most commonly given by members of the NZAPF or CPS,

⁴⁸ Lance Robinson, Letter to Roger Taylor, April 4th 1952, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

⁴⁹ Report on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Conference 1954, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁵⁰ Report on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Conference 1954, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁵¹ Report on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Conference 1954, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

although speakers from outside either organisation were often invited as well.

General Meetings were held at the same time as conferences, to decide which group of members would serve as the executive, including the election of a Chairman and Secretary. The executive had the responsibility to manage finances and to liaise with the English APF, as well as other peace groups.

By 1956, however, many of the Wellington members had moved away, leading to a decline in activity in the late 1950s.⁵² This decline was arrested with the formation of the Auckland branch in November 1960. That development led to substantial growth, since it furnished 20 new members along with another ten or so who remained on the fringe as sympathisers.⁵³ It also represented a significant shift in the centre of gravity for the NZAPF. By June 1964, there were 69 members of the NZAPF.⁵⁴ The Auckland branch was large enough to have its own executive and officers: Charles Chandler served as the first Auckland chairman,⁵⁵ with secretarial duties being shared initially between Ian Beattie and Margaret Bowater. Another important member was Chris Barfoot, who became secretary of the Auckland branch in early 1963. With this infusion of relative youth and membership, the NZAPF became much more active during the 1960s. The Auckland members were optimistic about the prospect of working with other Christian and non-Christian peace groups in the area.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, they retained the distinctive emphasis on witness within the Anglican Church – partly in order to distinguish themselves from the CPS, to which many NZAPF members also belonged.⁵⁷ In June 1964, Auckland members took over the role of national executive. Throughout the 1960s, the Auckland branch stepped

⁵² Barbara Mountier, Letter to Roger Taylor, March 25th 1956, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 3.

⁵³ Margaret Bowater, Letter to Wellington Branch Secretary, March 2nd 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁵⁴ NZAPF Roll, June 21st 1964, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

⁵⁵ Occasionally, this office was referred to as President.

⁵⁶ Ian Beattie, Letter to Neil Mountier, June 3rd 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁵⁷ Charles Chandler, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Newsletter, 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

up the efforts of the NZAPF to engage with others, both within and without the Anglican Church, including writing letters to the press and the government, and by maintaining a corporate presence at peace events and demonstrations.

NZAPF Involvement in Issues

The main focus of activity for peace groups in New Zealand during the embryonic period of the NZAPF was on a national referendum on compulsory military training.

The referendum was held on 3 August 1949, and was supported by an overall majority though a substantial minority of around 20% of votes were cast against it.⁵⁸

The CPS had been active in the struggle against compulsory military training, to the extent that, during some of their demonstrations, they had incurred the wrath of passers-by. In one case, in Nelson, Archibald Barrington, a leading CPS member, and others he was with, were quite seriously assaulted. To add insult to injury, it was Barrington who was consequently charged and convicted with disturbing the peace.⁵⁹

As the peace movement grew and became more mainstream, the NZAPF became more involved in the issues of the day. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, the most significant focus was the issue of nuclear weapons. From 1965, opposition to the Vietnam War loomed large within the peace movement. However, there was a fundamental contrast between the absolute and principled pacifism of the NZAPF, and the single-issue peace groups that were more focused and less all-encompassing.

The context in which the NZAPF was formed was one in which significant peace activism was largely carried out by committed Christian pacifists, or Communists.

⁵⁸ "Referenda: Elections New Zealand," accessed December 3, 2010, <http://www.elections.org.nz/elections/referendum/referendums.html>.

⁵⁹ Locke, *Peace People*, 131.

Motivated by specific concerns, and not necessarily *pacifist*, new peace groups came to enjoy a much greater level of public acceptance than strictly pacifist groups ever did. Indeed, support for this new approach was ultimately a key factor in the establishment of New Zealand's nuclear free policy in the 1980s. Writing in 1988, Kevin Clements noted that the peace movement at that time was "qualitatively and quantitatively different from the pacifist movements of the First and Second World Wars."⁶⁰

NZAPF members considered the peace movement as an encouraging development in itself, but also that it presented an opportunity to bring more attention to their own pacifist witness. However, the growing significance of the broader peace movement did not translate into any great increase in membership for the NZAPF. This was because the fundamental character of the broader peace movement was not as absolutist, and was largely humanitarian in its motivations rather than Christian. The NZAPF aimed for a middle ground – co-operating with other peace groups on a limited basis while maintaining the purity of their absolute renunciation of all war, and the denominational focus on the Anglican Church.

Anti-Nuclear Movement

Involvement in the anti-nuclear movement provoked a more active approach for the NZAPF than they had previously exhibited. The growth of nuclear peace organisations was an opportunity for the NZAPF to reach a sympathetic audience with their message of absolute pacifism. This approach treated nuclear weapons as a "gateway" issue. For the NZAPF, there were competing imperatives. On the one hand, the history of the group and the nature of the membership declaration demanded an absolute, principled pacifism. On the other hand, the NZAPF was

⁶⁰ Clements, *Back From the Brink*, 122.

concerned to grow its membership and bring more of an influence to bear upon the Church and wider society. Faced with this tension, and these competing demands, the NZAPF opted to maintain the purity of message which was fundamental to the group at its outset, rather than to make concessions in order to gain more members. Individual members could be – and were – involved in the broader peace movement, but the NZAPF as a corporate entity held firmly onto its message of opposition to *all* war. The chairman in 1958, Walter Arnold, wrote of nuclear disarmament groups:

We as pacifists believe that *all* warfare is contrary to the mind and teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Our love for God and for our fellowmen leads us in our Fellowship to urge the use of peaceful methods only in the settling of differences between nations. The difference is, therefore, more than a difference of emphasis: it is fundamental. But the end they work for is the end we wish, and Pacifists have found that they can with profit combine with men and women of all opinions in this common cause. I therefore do urge you all to be *active* in the affairs of these committees.⁶¹

In a similar vein, Lance Robinson, as national chairman, wrote in 1960 that:

from a pacifist point of view the most noteworthy thing in NZ during the last year has been the continued growth in support (and even respectability!) of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Many of our members are taking an active and often leading part in this movement and this is very good.... While such a movement is a step in the right direction let us use our membership in it as an opportunity not only to forward the cause of peace in this particular way, but also to proclaim our purpose as one based not on fear, but on love; not on the desperate desire to preserve our own lives, but on the humble attempt to make our lives compatible with the teaching and example of our Lord.⁶²

⁶¹ Walter Arnold, Letter to NZAPF Members, Undated 1958, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 3.

⁶² Lance Robinson, Letter to NZAPF Members, Undated 1960, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

The Auckland branch of the NZAPF spoke out repeatedly against nuclear weapons, engaging in correspondence with the American Consulate and Prime Minister Keith Holyoake, as well as in the press.⁶³ Holyoake sent a reply which stressed the role of nuclear weapons in deterring Sino-Soviet aggression.⁶⁴ The New Zealand branch of CND invited a corporate presence from the Auckland NZAPF branch at Hiroshima Day protests in 1961 and 1962,⁶⁵ which was approved and supported by Eric Gowing, who was by this time Bishop of Auckland.⁶⁶

The Auckland branch members stepped up their engagement with the Anglican Church, too. They approached Gowing for “guidance as to how we should orientate ourselves in relation to the Church as a whole”, going on to say that “though we have met with some support in certain quarters, we have encountered difficulties in our approach to clergy and laity.”⁶⁷ Gowing, despite his initial reluctance when the NZAPF had contacted him upon his arrival in New Zealand, was warm toward the NZAPF in Auckland. The NZAPF tendency to quiet witness was more acceptable to Gowing than the more up-front direct action favoured by George Armstrong. Thus, despite being personally opposed to the Vietnam War, when St John’s College students used the 1968 Good Friday march of witness as a forum for an anti-Vietnam War protest, Gowing had the police stop them.⁶⁸ By contrast, Gowing’s sympathetic attitude to the NZAPF provided the organisation with opportunities. At the second NZAPF conference in 1955, members had floated the idea of sending

⁶³ Chris Barfoot, Letter to American Consulate, February 4th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁶⁴ Keith Holyoake, Letter to Ian Beattie, March 19th 1962, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁶⁵ Ian Beattie, Letter to Neil Mountier, October 8th 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4; New Zealand CND, Letter to Auckland Branch of NZAPF, April 28th 1962, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁶⁶ Ian Beattie, Letter to Neil Mountier, October 8th 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

⁶⁷ Auckland Branch of NZAPF, Letter to Eric Gowing, March 20th 1964, APFNZ Branch Records Folder 5.

⁶⁸ Peter Lineham, “The Church Facing Challenges, 1960-85,” in *Living Legacy: A History of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland*, ed. Allan Davidson (Auckland: Anglican Diocese of Auckland, 2011), 256.

peace literature out to clergy to bring pacifist ideas to the attention of the diocese,⁶⁹ but this did not bear fruit until 1964. Between July 1964 and July 1965, the Auckland branch mailed copies of the APF magazine *The Anglican Pacifist* (renamed *Challenge* during this period), before sending out a questionnaire aimed at stimulating discussion within the Church. The results of this initiative will be discussed in detail in Chapter Three.

By the mid-1960s, the nuclear issue temporarily lost ground to the Vietnam War as a particular focus of NZAPF concern. This development served to bring the contrast between the absolute pacifism of the NZAPF and the more specifically issue-oriented peace activism of other groups into sharper focus.

The Anti-Vietnam War Movement

Doctrinaire Christian pacifist groups like the NZAPF and the CPS were by no means the only organisations to oppose the Vietnam War. Protest against the war came from a wide cross-section of society. The Labour Party adopted an anti-war stance, breaking bi-partisan consensus on national security issues for the first time in New Zealand's history.⁷⁰ Protest against the Vietnam War was seen by NZAPF members as an opportunity to persuade people of the value of pacifism. However, this met with little success. Most of the opposition, both within and without the Church was more situationalist. It focused on why *this* war was particularly amoral and did not stem from or lead to an absolute rejection of war. Arguing against the Vietnam War was much easier than coming up with a defence of pacifism in the face of any and all aggression. The question of how to deal with an implacably aggressive adversary like Hitler continued to be the most difficult question for pacifists to answer. There

⁶⁹ Report on Second APF Conference, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 2.

⁷⁰ Roberto Rabel, *New Zealand and the Vietnam War: Politics and Diplomacy* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2005).

was little appetite among the broader peace movement to engage with this problem, as they were concerned with making opposition to the Vietnam War as broadly appealing as possible. This aim was not served by defending the absolute position. Neither was the broader peace movement predominantly Christian. The International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam (ICCV), which organised many of the protests, was pluralistic and un-dogmatic in its motivations.

As with the anti-nuclear movement, the NZAPF followed a strategy of letter writing and occasional presence at demonstrations in protesting against the war in Vietnam, and New Zealand's participation in it. Again, this led to an in-depth reply from the Prime Minister's office.⁷¹ The 1965 NZAPF Conference included a panel discussion on Vietnam and the Just War. Walter Arnold presented the pacifist position, but of the three other clergy who participated, only one supported the government's 'domino' theory of Communist expansion. The other speakers opposed the war, but not on pacifist grounds, instead seeing it as an example of an unjust war, or because it was unwinnable.

When Prime Minister Keith Holyoake announced the deployment of New Zealand combat troops in mid-1965, the conflict acquired a new dimension; the potential consequences of the war became more immediate and tangible for young New Zealand men. This development informed the main manifestation of NZAPF concern about Vietnam, which came in the form of a renewed focus on stating and disseminating their interpretation of the appropriate Christian response to military service. NZAPF members participated in wider protests, though the tenor of these protests caused some concern. Harry Richardson, a lay member of the NZAPF in Wellington, wrote that at the protest against Field Marshall Ky of South Vietnam, he

⁷¹ Keith Holyoake, "New Zealand and the War in Indo-China", APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 6.

and other Christian pacifists, including Ormond Burton, had retreated to a position on their own, away from protesters who had been chanting “Sieg Heil”, feeling that “as Christians [they] should not be associated with this.”⁷² Chris Barfoot, writing about the protests held in Auckland at around the same time, regretted that some violence had occurred and that much was made of it in the media.⁷³ In an annual report for 1967, Charles Chandler noted with satisfaction that “regarding the war in Vietnam, our light has not been hidden under a bushel.”⁷⁴ However, despite the greater involvement and visibility afforded by the peace movement, the NZAPF saw no substantial increase in membership.

Comparative Inactivity in the 1970s

Both the NZAPF and the CPS, organisations with relatively similar ideological commitments, were faced with the choice between purity of witness and growth. The venerable CPS was struggling with the changed context. One study of the CPS during the Vietnam War period points out that “the nature of ... [the CPS] was essentially unchanged from WW2 and its absolutist stance remained. Yet, the Christian pacifist message was preached at an increasingly secular society and it failed to make ground.”⁷⁵ Some NZAPF members were also CPS members, including Shaun Pennycook, Read Mason and Margaret Bowater, and they took part in the debate about how the CPS should orient itself with respect to the broader peace movement. Margaret Bowater, in particular, wanted to change the name and basis of the CPS, citing the negative attitudes attached to the word “pacifist”.⁷⁶ Ormond Burton on the other hand, was committed to the doctrinaire pacifism that

⁷² Harry Richardson, Letter to Chris Barfoot, February 16th 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

⁷³ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Harry Richardson, January 28th 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

⁷⁴ Charles Chandler, Annual Report, 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

⁷⁵ Stone, “A Dwindling Elderly Group Faithfully Preparing for the Last War Instead of the Next?,” 19.

⁷⁶ Stone, “A Dwindling Elderly Group Faithfully Preparing for the Last War Instead of the Next?,” 45.

characterised the CPS throughout its history, intolerant of non-Christian pacifists and peace-activists,⁷⁷ and opposed to co-operation with secular peace groups.⁷⁸

Although no-one within the NZAPF stated their views as uncompromisingly as Burton – the NZAPF was happy to co-operate on a limited basis with non-Christian peace groups – the corporate line was still conservative. Charles Chandler, writing as chairman in 1965, affirmed that the “main purpose ... [was] to ‘leaven the lump’ ... to build up a growing body of opinion ... which is absolutist – prepared to take a stand in the midst of a difficult situation for the uncompromising standard on the question of peace and war.”⁷⁹ However this led to continued marginality. Having opted for purity of message rather than growth, the NZAPF lost ground even as the peace movement in New Zealand became increasingly mainstream.

The 1970s loomed as a crucial time for the NZAPF. A sense of opportunity seemed evident, as the broader peace movement in New Zealand gathered momentum. Concerns about Vietnam pushed some members of the Church to reconsider their attitudes to war, and the number of avowed pacifist bishops in New Zealand doubled with the election of Walter Robinson as Bishop of Dunedin in 1969. NZAPF members were being led to consider the “‘big’ issues of under-development, racialism, grinding poverty and international hatred”.⁸⁰

The opportunities of this period, that the NZAPF recognised, passed unfulfilled. Far from “challenging the citadel,” as Chris Barfoot had hoped,⁸¹ the NZAPF lapsed into a period of sustained inactivity. The death of Charles Chandler in January 1971 was a major setback, for his influence and inspiration had been enormously significant.

⁷⁷ Crane, *I Can Do No Other*, 277.

⁷⁸ Stone, “A Dwindling Elderly Group Faithfully Preparing for the Last War Instead of the Next?,” 34-37.

⁷⁹ Charles Chandler, Letter to NZAPF Members, October 1965, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

⁸⁰ Kevin Clements, NZAPF Newsletter, December 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

⁸¹ Chris Barfoot, Annual Report for 1968, April 24th 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

Much of the greater activity of the 1960s came from the Auckland branch rather than the comparatively older NZAPF centres in Christchurch and Wellington. When the national executive shifted from the Auckland to the Wellington in April 1969, it precipitated a steep decline in overall activity which lasted throughout the 1970s. The NZAPF settled back into a quieter role, reminiscent of their early years. This did not preclude all activity, but it was certainly a lessening of intensity compared to the 1960s. Following a combined conference held with the CPS in Wellington in June 1970,⁸² no further meetings were held for two and a half years. When, in January 1974, the Wellington branch met once again, the prospect of going into recess was considered but rejected. Letters from Chris Barfoot and Neil Mountier indicated a similar lack of activity in Auckland and Christchurch respectively. The Wellington branch decided to maintain a skeleton group, though no further activities were planned.⁸³ One Wellington member, Read Mason, wrote to express his gladness that the organisation had been maintained. In his view, the “mere existence of an organisation with a declared object is of some propaganda value ... it can come to life like an apparently dead seed when the conditions are favourable.”⁸⁴

Conditions did not become favourable again until 1980. The 1970s passed with little corporate activity, although in May 1975, Gordon Wilson, who was the chairman of the umbrella APF organisation in England, made a visit to New Zealand. He spoke at a meeting at St Peter’s in Wellington, stressing that, although the number of avowed pacifists remained low, he believed that there were a number of other Christians who shared the APF viewpoint to a degree, and that more should be done to reach out to them. To this end, the APF in England had been organising the observance of the

⁸² NZAPF, Conference Flyer, June 5th-7th 1971, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

⁸³ Minute Book, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MSX-3474, ATL.

⁸⁴ Read Mason, Letter to NZAPF, July 22nd 1974, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MS-Papers-4496-2, ATL.

inter-denominational Week of Prayer for World Peace. Wilson also spoke about the different challenges posed by peace-time, saying that while pacifism seemed easy to espouse during periods without war, where there was no conscription, pacifist groups should be engaged in active peace-making. NZAPF members throughout the remainder of the 1970s sought to progress along the lines suggested by Gordon Wilson. The organisation of the annual Week of Prayer for World Peace became a focus for Chris Barfoot in Auckland, and in Wellington, the NZAPF executive comprised most of the committee in charge of promoting its observance in a number of different churches. The latter half of the 1970s therefore saw more NZAPF activity than the earlier half, but it was still less significant than during the 1960s.

Unsurprisingly, overall membership declined. Both Walter Robinson and Harry Richardson passed away during the period of inactivity, Robinson in 1975 and Richardson in 1978. Walter Arnold became the Wellington City Missioner, but renounced his APF membership, saying that “to be active in the pacifist cause seems to be futile.”⁸⁵

Reform and Broadening of Mandate

In 1980, the NZAPF stirred somewhat from its dormancy and held a conference with the CPS in Wellington over Queen’s Birthday Weekend. The specific purpose of the conference was to establish direction and goals for the following few years. A number of broad aims were decided upon. For the NZAPF, these included emphasising education both within and without the Anglican Church, a greater public profile to be achieved with the appointment of media-spokespeople, and a broader construal of the issues that the group should be involved in, to include issues of

⁸⁵ Walter Arnold, Letter to NZAPF, August 20th 1979, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MS-Papers-4496-2.

social justice and crime and punishment.⁸⁶ The main manifestation of this broadening of concern was opposition to the 1981 Springbok Tour, while the emphasis on education led to a series of radio programmes and the beginning of a “missioner” scheme.

The NZAPF involvement in protests against the tour was quiet, focusing more on prayer and quiet witness. This was in keeping with their low-key presence at earlier protests against the Vietnam War and nuclear weapons. What is significant about NZAPF involvement in issues arising from Apartheid, however, is that it indicated a growing concern with the social issues underlying violence and war, and a recognition that international conflict was not the only arena in which a pacifist witness was relevant.

Opposition to the tour was widespread, and, as with the nuclear issue and Vietnam before it, attracted a broad range of individuals and groups with differing viewpoints. Though most protestors avowed a non-violent approach to dissent, the NZAPF took some time to decide on an appropriate course of action, citing the conflicting pressures of a desire to protest, and a concern that violent confrontations might arise out of the protest. Hugh Tollemache, a long-time NZAPF member from Auckland met with the Archbishop of New Zealand, Paul Reeves, who was prominent in the anti-tour movement. Reeves had recommended peaceful protest against the tour, and to this end, the NZAPF favoured prayer vigils as a form of protest and disseminated a leaflet entitled “Another Way to Protest.”

For the remainder of the 1980s, NZAPF members in Wellington occupied themselves with circularising new ordinands, championing an ill-fated Peace Tax

⁸⁶ Report on Combined NZAPF-CPS Conference 1980, APFNZ Branch Records, Folders MS-Papers-4496-1, MS-Papers-4496-2.

campaign,⁸⁷ and attempting to raise their public profile through a series of educational radio programmes, which were aired on community broadcaster Access Radio.⁸⁸

During this time, the broader peace movement in New Zealand was substantially focused on the issue of nuclear ship visits from the United States. For the NZAPF, this development was encouraging, but their part in it was small. NZAPF members tended to admire direct action of the kind favoured by George Armstrong and his Peace Squadron, but not to participate themselves. Another key development of the 1980s was the growing influence of the various groups involved in the nuclear free Pacific campaign. Despite not converting *en masse* to pacifism as per the NZAPF's stated aim, the overall Anglican Church, too, was increasingly expressing views closer to those of the NZAPF. Various resolutions were adopted by Christchurch, Nelson, Waikato and Wellington diocesan synods against nuclear war and the arms race, commending the ecumenical Week of Prayer for World Peace, and calling for a nuclear free Pacific. These resolutions were often moved by NZAPF members,⁸⁹ but their passage reflects a growing and much broader concern within the Church, at least on nuclear issues. The sinking of the *Rainbow Warrior* in 1985 also contributed to solidifying anti-nuclear sentiment in New Zealand, and when the fourth Labour government passed the New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament, and Arms Control Act in 1987, it was hailed by the NZAPF as "an astonishing result."⁹⁰

The English APF, apparently greatly impressed with New Zealand's nuclear free stance, had written to Prime Minister David Lange in 1986, asking for a written report

⁸⁷ NZAPF, Letter to APF in England, September 11th 1984, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 10.

⁸⁸ See APFNZ Branch Records, Folders 14, 18.

⁸⁹ Chris Barfoot, "A Note of Some Actions and Developments in New Zealand in the Field of Peace and War since 1978", June 28th 1987, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

⁹⁰ David Taylor, Article prepared for *Peace Together*, April 12th 1986, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

on how Christian pacifism had influenced his decision.⁹¹ The archives preserve no evidence that such a report was ever undertaken. The NZAPF had a more realistic view of their influence. David Taylor's account of the history of the NZAPF, written in the mid-1980s, recognised that "at no stage has the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship received support from any large number of Anglicans," but went on to praise the "very great patience and perseverance" of the "tiny percentage who belonged to it." Strikingly, he notes that "Anglican peace-workers found that their best opportunity lay in co-operating with peace-workers who were not Anglican."⁹² He lauded the cumulative pressure of the various peace groups which had led to the establishment of a nuclear free New Zealand, pointing out that, despite its marginality within the Anglican Church, the NZAPF could, through its co-operation with such groups as the Society of Friends, Pax Christi and the CPS, make some modest claim to having participated in applying this pressure.

In Auckland, members organised a relatively well attended debate on the incompatibility of Christ and warfare which was held in October 1982, and then in 1988, a very poorly attended "Diocesan Consultation on Armed Struggle." The specifically Anglican focused initiatives of circularising new ordinands and the Diocesan Consultation are discussed in detail in Chapter Three.

The tendency toward education rather than protest is reflected in the major NZAPF initiative begun in the 1980s, which was the travelling "missioner" scheme. The idea was first floated at a conference in 1982. Fundraising continued throughout the decade. In 1991, this money was used to support Sidney Hinkes, an English APF

⁹¹ APF, Letter to David Lange, January 22nd 1986, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

⁹² David Taylor, Article prepared for *Peace Together*, April 12th 1986, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

member and former paratrooper turned priest, travelling about New Zealand parishes arguing that the Christian faith was a pacifist one.⁹³

Recent Years

The NZAPF was concerned to capitalise on the increased exposure generated by Hinkes' mission, but a substantial upswing in activity never materialised. NZAPF activity continued to centre on semi-annual conferences and education. Ironically, the decrease in overt militarism in New Zealand society has appeared to weakened the NZAPF's witness. Without the galvanising issues of nuclear weapons, US ship visits or large-scale participation in international conflict, the NZAPF has maintained its structure but lacked in vitality. Membership declined somewhat throughout the 1990s as older members passed away, most notably Lance Robinson in 2001, and the Fellowship continued to struggle to achieve a profile within the Church.

The anti-nuclear legislation introduced since 1984 has remained popular, but a lack of direct military threats to New Zealand and the small part that New Zealand plays in the geo-political scene mean that there is now little immediate impetus for New Zealanders to consider problems of war and peace. Structural violence, domestic violence and social justice issues are more pressing concerns, and NZAPF members have theoretically broadened their mandate to include these areas, but here the pacifist response in the APF mould is less obviously applicable.

In his book *Field Punishment No. 1*, a history of the anti-militarist tradition in New Zealand, David Grant records:

with satisfaction ... that New Zealand has evolved from one of the most conformist, subservient, insecure, bellicose, dependent and martial of countries – the first to

⁹³ Hinke's mission is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

salute the Union Jack when Mother England called for help – to one of the most humanitarian, principled, independent and least militaristic in the western world.⁹⁴

Absent any large-scale pressure, New Zealanders are free to profess peaceful intentions and attitudes without thereby endangering themselves in any meaningful way. In twenty-first century New Zealand, a public demonstration against war is more likely to be ignored than attacked.

As far as the educational focus of the NZAPF is concerned, at Auckland Synod in 1992, NZAPF chairman John Marcon moved to commission the Anglican Social Justice Council in conjunction with the NZAPF and service chaplains to prepare a series of studies on peace and war entitled *Into 2000*. These studies were eventually further developed into a booklet called *Christ and War*, which was published by the NZAPF in 2003.⁹⁵ Individual NZAPF members Chris Barfoot, Margaret Bedggood and Dorothy Brown were heavily involved in setting up the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Otago, but the Centre was not a NZAPF initiative as such.

As a combined group, the NZAPF was not particularly active during the late 1990s and 2000s. In addition to the studies mentioned above, the NZAPF was involved in preparing submissions to the bishops ahead of Lambeth Conferences in 1998 and 2008. Most recently, an Ideas Workshop held as part of the 2010 annual conference. Here, members identified the perennial issue of lack of visibility as a weakness of the Fellowship.⁹⁶ While the nuclear-free legislation of the Fourth Labour government, and the growing tolerance and peacefulness of New Zealand were praised, it was recognised that the ageing nature of the NZAPF represented a barrier to

⁹⁴ Grant, *Field Punishment No. 1*, 8-9.

⁹⁵ NZAPF, "Christ and War", Self-published pamphlet, 2003.

⁹⁶ Report on Ideas Workshop April 10th 2010, Barfoot Papers, APF Minutes 2000-2010.

engagement with young people. Anglican identity was seen as both a strength and a weakness; it was thought to lend credibility, but introduced potential conflict with conservative elements within the Church. Additionally, the Anglican Church itself is an ageing institution. By maintaining an identity as an irreducibly Anglican group, the NZAPF consigned itself to a marginal position in terms of membership growth and influence among younger people. Through participation in the broader peace movement, the Fellowship was able to exert some influence over New Zealand society, but overall, it cannot be said that a growth in tolerance for pacifism resulted in a growth in pacifism.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that through their commitment to absolute pacifism, the NZAPF has remained a marginal minority voice. As the Fellowship expanded beyond its initial Christchurch base and as the issues of nuclear weapons and the Vietnam War became more prevalent, the NZAPF engaged more with the broader peace movement. They did this in large part with a view to convincing others of the value of pacifism. However, the nature of the peace movement was very distinct from the pacifism of the NZAPF, and this approach did not furnish the Fellowship with a significant number of new members. Instead of compromising on their core message, the NZAPF opted to remain an absolutist group, with greater emphasis on witness and education than direct action.

Ironically, the NZAPF often found it had more in common with the non-religious peace groups like CND than with the non-pacifist Anglicans to whom they were committed to witnessing. The broader peace movement that gained strength in New Zealand the 1970s and 1980s was diverse in its methods and motivations, and this

provided a source of difficulty for the NZAPF. They were, in a sense, too peaceful for the Anglicans and too Anglican for the peace movement. The often youth-driven and usually humanistic nature of the wider peace movement meant that Anglicanism was often seen as an aspect of the establishment, part of what was being rejected.

The history of the NZAPF was marked by a fundamental tension with respect to competing imperatives of purity of message, political relevance and growth. Faced with this tension, it opted for purity of message. This decision proved to be a substantial barrier to broad appeal. However, in order to understand the nature of the NZAPF position, and this limited appeal, it is necessary to carefully consider the kind of pacifism that the organisation espoused. Pacifism exists in a number of distinct forms, and the NZAPF's fortunes were to some extent linked with their particular brand of pacifism. It is to this task that the following chapter turns.

Chapter Two

THE CHARACTER OF NZAPF PACIFISM

Many different movements and doctrines fall under the rubric of “pacifism”. In order to better understand the character of NZAPF pacifism, and the limited support it attracted, it is important to distinguish it from other varieties. Martin Ceadel has offered a comprehensive typological framework within which to characterise different pacifist stances. This chapter analyses the NZAPF stance using Ceadel’s typology, and proposes that it demonstrates continuity with the Anglo-American interwar “liberal Protestant Pacifist” tradition.

Such an analysis is useful to better understand important tensions and difficulties in the NZAPF position. Of these, two are particularly important. The first relates to the relative immediacy of efficacy that the NZAPF have claimed for pacifism. In their attempts at persuasion, NZAPF members have concurrently stressed the scriptural/theological justifications for their pacifist position as well as prudential arguments focusing on likely outcomes and practical actions. The mixing of these two styles of argument is characteristic of liberal Protestant pacifism. However, the espousal of this kind of pacifism is curious in the post-World War Two context, as the position was weakened by World War Two and the influential critique of Reinhold Niebuhr. Fidelity to this form of liberal Protestant pacifism has been a contributing factor in the NZAPF’s continued marginality.

Furthermore, in maintaining a type of pacifism that rejects the violence of the State, most pointedly in the extreme case of conscription, the NZAPF were committed to seeing conscientious objection as the primary political manifestation of pacifism.

However, the power of this position has weakened over the course of the NZAPF's existence. The challenge to pacifists in times of peace has been well put by Elizabeth Anscombe: "Without conscription, pacifism is a private opinion."⁹⁷ The NZAPF has thus had to come to terms with a situation in which the traditional formulation of the relationship between pacifism and political action is more obscure.

Defining Pacifism

The concept of "pacifism" includes a range of different positions, within which there is considerable variation with respect to motivation, scope and political engagement. The term itself is a relatively new one, but has been applied retrospectively when referring, for example, to the pacifism of the Early Church, or of the Anabaptists. This situation is further complicated by scholars' tendency to define pacifism idiosyncratically, in support of the particular arguments that they are making. Jan Narveson's radical 1965 critique of pacifism, for example, defined pacifism as the belief that "it is morally wrong to use force to resist, punish or prevent violence,"⁹⁸ going on to argue that pacifism, so described, is logically inconsistent. Narveson defended his definition on the basis that only this extreme doctrine is "of philosophical interest."⁹⁹ Similarly, John Howard Yoder draws attention to a particularly uncharitable definition in the journal *First Things* which describes pacifism as "a doctrine that holds that it is morally preferable to allow Dr Mengele to continue to perform medical experiments on men, women, and children than it is to kill him."¹⁰⁰ Definitions like these are clearly straw men, chosen for particular

⁹⁷ G.E.M. Anscombe, *Nuclear Weapons: A Catholic Response* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1962), 52.

⁹⁸ Jan Narveson, "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis," *Ethics* 75 no. 4 (1965), 259.

⁹⁹ Narveson, "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis," 260.

¹⁰⁰ John Howard Yoder, "War as a Moral Problem in the Early Church: The Historian's Hermeneutical Assumptions," in *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, ed. Harvey L. Dyck (Toronto:

polemical purposes. As a description of actual pacifist attitudes, they are wildly inaccurate.

By contrast, scholars who are more sympathetic to pacifism tend to define it with a view to making it as credible as possible. For example, Jenny Teichman has defined pacifism as “anti-war-ism ... to distinguish pacifism proper from a more wide-ranging opposition to violence.”¹⁰¹ Andrew Alexandra employs the primary *Oxford English Dictionary* definition, which is the “belief in or advocacy of peaceful methods as feasible and desirable alternatives to war.”¹⁰² Both scholars are concerned to present pacifism as a valid political doctrine, at least in some of its forms. In Alexandra’s words, his aim is to show that “pacifism is not vulnerable to philosopher’s charges of impracticality.”¹⁰³ However, it should be acknowledged that some forms of pacifism are indeed impractical, or apolitical, and are positively espoused as such. The other-worldly pacifisms of the various sectarian communities aim at “faithfulness” rather than efficacy. In that context, the charge of impracticality is not considered particularly problematic.

Simplistic definitions of pacifism do not, therefore, do justice to the variety of pacifist positions. Recognising this, a number of scholars have highlighted distinctions within pacifist thought, and suggested various typologies. Roland Bainton, for example, distinguishes between “a Christian pacifism of renunciation and a secular pacifism of

University of Toronto Press, 1996), 91; cf. David Dalin, “Judaism and American Public Life: A Symposium,” *First Things* 11 (1991): 20. The phrase is attributed to Dennis Prager, a radio host.

¹⁰¹ Jenny Teichman, *Pacifism and the Just War: A Study in Applied Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 2-3.

¹⁰² Andrew Alexandra, “Political Pacifism,” *Social Theory and Practice* 29, no. 4 (2003): 590; “Oxford English Dictionary,” accessed August 15, 2011,

<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/135824?redirectedFrom=pacifism#eid>.

¹⁰³ Alexandra, “Political Pacifism,” 590.

prudence.”¹⁰⁴ Yoder notes that “pacifism” is used in a number of ways, sometimes “to describe subcategories of just war thought”, or instead applied “to vocational or personal convictions which are not generalized.”¹⁰⁵ Peter Brock sees pacifism as ranging “from rigid vegetarianism, which recoils from killing any sentient being, to conscientious objection, which is confined to fighting in national wars and does not include taking human life in self-defence or in defence of an accepted system of international law.”¹⁰⁶ Martin Ceadel has attempted bring some clarity and rigour to the range of typologies proposed in relation to peace traditions by emphasising ten crucial distinctions.¹⁰⁷

Defining NZAPF Pacifism

Ceadel’s distinctions are particularly helpful for interpreting the character of NZAPF-style pacifism and distinguishing it from other forms. Ceadel draws in part from other scholars, including, most notably, Brock. In drawing from a range of sources, there is inevitably a degree of overlap in the distinctions he identifies. The ten distinctions are between: absolutism and reformism; pacifism and rigorous applications of Just War theory; permissibility or impermissibility of some aggressive force; intellectual distinctions and labels; varieties of non absolute “pacifism”;¹⁰⁸ the intellectual content of an ideology and its sociopolitical context; absolute pacifism and other absolutist stances; level of objection, i.e. to war, killing or any kind of force; the main ethical inspiration, be it Christian, humanistic or socialist, and, finally, orientation towards society. Some of these distinctions are intended to elucidate the differences

¹⁰⁴ Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, 248.

¹⁰⁵ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 29.

¹⁰⁶ Brock, *Twentieth-Century Pacifism*, v.

¹⁰⁷ Ceadel, “Ten Distinctions for Peace Historians,” 17-35.

¹⁰⁸ A term coined by the historian A.J.P Taylor and used by Ceadel to refer to quasi-pacifist stances which do not rest on an absolute rejection of all warfare.

between pacifists and quasi-pacifists, and are less relevant to the purpose of this chapter. The first, sixth, eighth, ninth and tenth distinctions are relevant, however, and form the basis of the following analysis.

Absolutism and Reformism

Ceadel's first distinction is that between absolutist positions "defined by rejection of a particular activity," and reformist positions which "seek the abolition of war through a restructuring of the political order." Ceadel notes that "much of the history of peace movements ... can be explained in terms of the struggle by organizations and individuals to combine absolutist and reformist approaches."¹⁰⁹ This is certainly true of the NZAPF. Members of the NZAPF are required to sign a declaration affirming their belief "that Jesus' teaching is incompatible with the waging of war; that a Christian church should never support or justify war; and that our Christian witness should include opposing the waging or justifying of war."¹¹⁰ This is an absolutist statement, in which war is categorically rejected. Nevertheless, this absolutist position does entail potentially reformist implications, as exemplified in the latter clause about opposing the waging or justifying of war.

Utopian and Ideological Pacifism

Ceadel's sixth distinction is derived by way of Karl Mannheim and Roger Chickering, and contrasts utopian pacifism with ideological pacifism. Utopian pacifism, in Chickering's terms, "conceives of war as an inseparable aspect of a social and political order that is utterly corrupt and beyond rehabilitation," while ideological

¹⁰⁹ Ceadel, "Ten Distinctions," 21.

¹¹⁰ "Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Aotearoa New Zealand Website," accessed August 22, 2011, <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/apf/index.htm>.

pacifism “rejects war because of the threat that it poses to a social and political order that is basically sound and praiseworthy.”¹¹¹ In these terms, the NZAPF is unambiguously ideological. Given the Anglican nature of the Fellowship, and that Church’s association with the State, it would be curious (though not impossible) to find a complete rejection of the social and political order. To be sure, NZAPF members have consistently rejected and repudiated certain aspects of the social and political order, such as those relating to war and preparation for war. At no point, however, have they advocated the dissolution of the state.

Objections to Force, Killing or War

The eighth distinction relates to what exactly is being objected to in adopting the pacifist position. Ceadel lists three main kinds of objection: to physical force of any kind, to killing, or to war. The first and most extreme position would preclude the ordering of the State, inasmuch as that order depends on the threat of force to dissuade those who would violate the law. NZAPF pacifism has never gone this far. In the “Three Answers” document prepared by the Auckland Branch of the NZAPF in response to the returned clergy questionnaires in 1965, members affirmed that they “must recognise that force is the ultimate sanction of the law and therefore necessary for the proper and peaceful ordering of society.”¹¹² The official statement of membership (noted above) is based on the rejection of waging, supporting and justifying war, which is the least extreme position that Ceadel’s distinction recognises. However, in opposing social injustices like Apartheid in South Africa, NZAPF members clearly went beyond simple rejection of war, and probably beyond just the

¹¹¹ Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and a World Without War: The Peace Movement and German Society 1892-1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 18-19.

¹¹² NZAPF, “Three Answers: An examination or dialogue”, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

rejection of killing as well. In the early years of the NZAPF a discussion on the topic of permissible and impermissible uses of force was held at the second NZAPF conference in 1955, led by Lance Robinson and Neil Mountier. Notes prepared for the discussion recognised that:

although membership of the APF requires only the repudiation of the methods of modern warfare, we reach this position from an interpretation of Christian theology, and this interpretation has, for most of us, fairly far reaching consequences on our view of the justification of force.¹¹³

Ethical Inspiration

The general NZAPF position can be illuminated further through consideration of Ceadel's ninth distinction, which addresses the ethical inspiration for pacifism. Ceadel distinguishes between Christian, humanistic and socialist inspirations. Naturally, NZAPF pacifism draws on the Christian tradition. More specifically, the primary justification for NZAPF pacifism is the teaching and example of Jesus. In their pamphlet on military service in 1968, NZAPF members wrote that:

the teaching of Jesus reveals a new concept of power, a new way of meeting and overcoming evil through non-resistance, love of enemies, and forgiveness. The commandment of love shows us the value of personality, other people's personality. The Fatherhood of God makes the world one family and all men brothers. We believe that the whole spirit of Our Lord's teaching and example is pacifist, and also that it is possible through grace and within the fellowship of the Holy Spirit for us to follow this teaching and this example.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Lance Robinson and Neil Mountier, Discussion Notes on Force, Undated 1955, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 2.

¹¹⁴ NZAPF, "A Christian Attitude toward Military Service: A guide to those required to register for Military Training," Self-published pamphlet, 1968.

In 1980, Robinson reiterated that “the Christian Pacifist position was not reaction to the horribleness of war but a conviction about the way God deals with evil.”¹¹⁵

Exactly what is meant by the teaching and example of Jesus? The famous passages on “turning the other cheek”, “resisting not evil” and “loving thy enemies” found in the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain are central to the NZAPF’s scripturally based justification for pacifism.¹¹⁶ Another important episode is Jesus’ response to Peter’s attempted defence in the Garden of Gethsemane, wherein he states that “all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”¹¹⁷ Moreover, in allowing himself to be crucified, Jesus lived out the requirements of this ethic, and the whole arc of his suffering and death bear witness to its stringent demands. Not only do Jesus’ words exhort his followers to love their enemies; his actions stand as a vivid example of what adherence to the law of love must look like in practice.

Another source of Christian inspiration for the NZAPF has been the example of the Early Church. For the NZAPF, the pre-Constantinian Church was seen to have been pacifist. This point was repeated on numerous occasions: for example, at a study day on 19 April 1980,¹¹⁸ in a letter in preparation for the 1988 Lambeth Conference that was sent to the Bishops of the Province as well as to the APF in England,¹¹⁹ and in the NZAPF/Episcopal Peace Fellowship (EPF) submission to the 1998 Lambeth Conference.¹²⁰ NZAPF members have consistently regarded the relaxation of the pacifist position after Constantine as a less perfect interpretation of the original message of Christ and of the Church. For example, Chris Barfoot’s review of Jean

¹¹⁵ Anonymous, Report on April 19th 1980 Study Day, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 16.

¹¹⁶ Matt. 5:38-48; Luke 6:27-28. All Biblical references are to the King James Version (KJV)

¹¹⁷ Matt. 26:52.

¹¹⁸ Untitled Report, April 19th 1980, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 16.

¹¹⁹ “Response from the NZAPF to Lambeth Resolution 5, The Seven Theses and ‘Peace and Justice’ – A Working Paper for Lambeth 1988”, October 12th 1987, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

¹²⁰ NZAPF, “Submission to the Lambeth Conference of 1998”, Barfoot Papers, Minutes, Letters, Conference Papers, 1990-2001. The EPF is the United States’ branch of the APF.

Lassere's *War and the Gospel*, submitted to *Church and People* on 10 October 1963, approvingly mentioned Lassere's use of the term "The Constantinian Heresy" to describe the compromise whereby the Church acquiesces in the exercise of temporal power by Christians in service to the State.¹²¹

Orientation to Society

Ceadel's tenth distinction is derived from Peter Brock (though Ceadel modifies Brock's terminology), and concerns the pacifist orientation towards society and the political process. This orientation can be variously pessimistic, mainstream, or optimistic (or, in Brock's terms, separational, integrational or goal-directed). A pessimistic orientation involves a sectarian and disengaged approach to politics during peacetime and a quietist witness during wartime. The mainstream orientation involves collaboration with sympathetic non-pacifists during peacetime and humanitarian or social work in wartime. An optimistic orientation involves developing a capacity for non-violent resistance in peacetime, and attempts to stop the war effort during wartime.

In terms of political orientation, the NZAPF has predominantly fluctuated between the mainstream and optimistic categories. During World War Two, before the formation of the NZAPF, the Taylors and the Thompsons had been PPU members, but maintained a relatively quiet witness – certainly quieter than that of the CPS. However, during the history of the NZAPF, New Zealand has not itself become involved in war on the scale of World War Two. The NZAPF's involvement in opposition to the Vietnam War was optimistic in orientation, insofar as members

¹²¹ Chris Barfoot, "Review of *War and the Gospel*", October 10th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

became involved in direct protest. On the other hand, most of the NZAPF's initiatives – including various forms of education within the Church, collaboration with more narrowly focused groups like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam (ICCV), and promotion of the Week of Prayer for World Peace – have been more mainstream than optimistic.

Characterisation of NZAPF Pacifism

Under Ceadel's typology, then, NZAPF pacifism may be characterised as absolutist and ideological, based ostensibly on objection to war (although in practice, objection to killing is close to universal within the group), ethically inspired by the Christian tradition, and predominantly mainstream in its orientation to politics.

This characterisation highlights contrasts between NZAPF pacifism and other specifically Christian pacifisms. For example, the Early Church was an often persecuted minority, and is most accurately described as pessimistic in its political orientation. Similarly, the sectarian Anabaptists, Mennonites and Brethren are utopian rather than ideological, and make no attempt to balance the absolutist and reformist attitudes noted in Ceadel's first distinction.

There are, however, two varieties of Christian pacifism with which the NZAPF shares a number of characteristics. One is the peace testimony of the Society of Friends, which, to paraphrase Roland Bainton, has been conceived of as both strategy *and* witness.¹²² The other is the Anglo-American Christian pacifism of the interwar years during which the APF was formed. Dick Sheppard, the founder of the APF, and Charles Raven, its foremost theologian, were theological liberals and political

¹²² Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, 248.

optimists.¹²³ While Sheppard gave the Christian pacifist movement broad appeal, it was Raven who gave it a more coherent theological basis in his books, *Is War Obsolete?*, *War and the Christian*, *The Cross and the Crisis* and *The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism*.¹²⁴ Raven's work is part of the tradition that John Howard Yoder has termed "liberal Protestant pacifism".¹²⁵

This tradition is characterised by an optimistic view of human nature, in contrast to the more pessimistic assessments offered by the neo-orthodoxy of Karl Barth and Christian realism of Reinhold Niebuhr, who were its primary critics. Raven saw morality as in some sense evolutionary.¹²⁶ Far from being incapable of sophisticated ethical action, as Niebuhr asserted in his *Moral Man and Immoral Society*,¹²⁷ society was becoming progressively more enlightened. Both Raven and Sheppard acknowledged the sacrificial nature of Christ's suffering on the cross, but nevertheless held that pacifism could constitute a viable political programme; it need not lead to a tragic outcome. While grounding his pacifism in Christocentric terms, Sheppard argued that even atheists like the sometime-pacifist Bertrand Russell could still be convinced pacifists on rational grounds.¹²⁸ Yoder writes that "liberal Protestant thinkers could still say that the position they saw as contemporary

¹²³ Sheppard and Raven retained this outlook for a time, at least. Sheppard died in 1937, while Raven became more pessimistic because of the advent of the Second World War, as well as the Niebuhrian and Barthian critiques of theological liberalism.

¹²⁴ Charles Raven, *Is War Obsolete? A Study of the Conflicting Claims of Religion and Citizenship* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1935); Charles Raven, *War and the Christian* (London: SCM Press, 1938); Charles Raven, *The Cross and the Crisis* (London: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1940); Charles Raven, *The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism* (New York: Fellowship Publications, 1951).

¹²⁵ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 271-284.

¹²⁶ Branford, "From Pacifism to Just War," 15.

¹²⁷ Niebuhr, *Man and Immoral Society*.

¹²⁸ Dick Sheppard, *We Say No: The Plain Man's Guide to Pacifism*, (J. Murray, 1935), quoted in Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform?*, 122.

common sense was also the standard Christian position from the New Testament.”¹²⁹

Tensions in NZAPF Pacifism

The above characterisation of NZAPF pacifism according to Ceadel’s typology illuminates two aspects of NZAPF pacifism. First is the question of efficacy and how it relates to the attempt to balance the absolutism of the NZAPF’s rejection of war with a commitment to reform. The second aspect that is illuminated regards the relationship between the practical actions demanded by pacifism and the changing nature of war in the latter twentieth century.

Absolutism, Reformism and the Question of Efficacy

As Ceadel puts it, “Pacifism is pulled in two opposed directions in its relationship with society: towards preserving its purity; or towards maximising its political relevance.”¹³⁰ Purity is attractive in its integrity but runs the risk of irrelevance; political engagement may be relevant but a politically engaged pacifism runs the risk of losing its essential character through compromise. In Ceadel’s analysis, it is the nature of the society in which the pacifist is embedded which determines the relative strength of these forces. A more peaceful society will tempt the pacifist to greater political participation, while a militaristic one will tend to increase the purity and vitality of pacifist witness.¹³¹ This dynamic can be seen reflected in the activities of the NZAPF. When particular conflicts or issues were widely unpopular, like nuclear weapons or the Vietnam War, there was a corresponding increase in practical arguments.

¹²⁹ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 273.

¹³⁰ Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain*, 16.

¹³¹ Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain*, 16-17.

As an organisation seeking to balance the absolutist and reformist imperatives of Ceadel's first distinction, the NZAPF defence and advocacy of pacifism has had a dual aspect. First, pacifism is seen to be a principled Christian response to war which derives its legitimacy quite simply from the teaching and example of Christ. Second, it is also maintained that the pacifist position will, if properly manifested in appropriate action, lead to peace. These arguments have co-existed throughout the history of the group. Their relative importance and employment have been predominantly influenced by the nature of the issue at hand and the audience to which they are addressed.

The primary distinction here is to do with efficacy. Both types of argument make a claim to ultimate efficacy, but the efficacy that the principled argument assumes is mediated through the particular Christian doctrine of the Resurrection. Its strength lies in the fact that it can therefore more readily be maintained against the allegation of immediate impracticality. Conversely, its weakness lies in the fact that, if it is going to be a convincing argument, it requires more substantial common ground in shared theological assumptions. This has been problematic for the NZAPF because, even in conversation with fellow Anglicans, they have had little success in convincing their non-pacifist interlocutors to consider the theological aspects of the problem of war.¹³²

With respect to efficacy, the Christian pacifist is able to draw on a resource that is not available to the socialist or humanitarian pacifist, or the adherent of Gandhian non-violence. From these other perspectives, the story of the life and death of Jesus may provide much to admire, but its essentially tragic character must also be admitted. For the Christian pacifist, however, the Resurrection is all-important. The apparent defeat of the crucifixion is miraculously transmuted into a victory. Christian

¹³² This will be explored in detail in Chapter Three.

pacifism may not be *immediately* effective, but it is ultimately effective. As Yoder puts it: “the Resurrection was an impossible unforeseeable new option, and it happened.”¹³³ This line of argument was ultimately prior to the more immediately practical arguments – in a talk to an Anglican youth group, Chris Barfoot emphasised the importance of the Resurrection, saying that:

If we say that the teaching of Jesus is not practicable in the affairs of nations, then is it not practicable in business or in industry or in the home or in the school; in short it is not practicable at all, it is but an intellectual ideal, and Christ is not risen. But Christ is risen and is triumphant, and we cannot choose to follow any other way.¹³⁴

The NZAPF letter to the bishops of the Province ahead of the 1988 Lambeth Conference also upheld the ultimate efficacy of the Christian pacifist response, while recognising its potential impotence in immediate terms:

The Christian way is unique. It involves complete abandonment to the power of Christ’s love. Violence is to love as darkness is to light, so in the totality of this love, violence cannot stand. The political expression of this love is of course, dramatic. It will involve no less than absolute pacifism. It also may well involve suffering and persecution. But for those who take seriously the Cross, the Resurrection and the New Commandment of love, there is no alternative. It is a matter of simple obedience to Christ...There is no assurance that governments nor even fellow members of our society will accept what we say. Nevertheless, our own reconciliation with God is not in danger if our work for reconciliation in society is to no avail. Our witness may send us into a political wilderness. Yet it is better to be in a political wilderness and retain one’s integrity than to compromise one’s beliefs in order to gain political credibility.¹³⁵

¹³³ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 319.

¹³⁴ Chris Barfoot, Talk to Otahuhu Young Anglicans April 21st 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 16.

¹³⁵ NZAPF, Letter to the Bishops of the Province, October 12th 1987, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

This potential immediate impotence is the most significant challenge for advocates of politically engaged pacifism. In a personal context, the pacifist may freely elect to undergo “suffering and persecution”, but it is much more problematic to prescribe a pacifist response to international conflict when it the suffering and persecution will be borne by others as well. It is especially problematic to prescribe a pacifist response predicated on the ultimate vindication of the Resurrection to people who do not accept the Resurrection. This was the situation for both the CPS and the NZAPF within the context of New Zealand society, and within the peace movement. Unlike the CPS, however, the NZAPF had a distinct focus on the Church.

As Ceadel observes: “pacifists spend much of their time trying to persuade those in the same tradition that it entails pacifism.”¹³⁶ With the Anglican Church as their primary audience, NZAPF members could justifiably assume a common belief in the Resurrection. The Resurrection was the ultimate guarantor of the efficacy of discipleship as spelled out in the Sermon on the Mount. In a letter to NZAPF members praising the scripturally-based pacifism of Charles Raven’s *The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism*, Roger Taylor wrote that “our fellow Church people who are not pacifists never give answers to such an argument as the book uses.”¹³⁷ Taylor saw the pacifist position as one to which Anglicans were called by virtue of their professed faith. Writing in 1953, he stated that the Fellowship’s task was “to go quietly on praying and working for the day when the whole Church will accept the fact that pacifism is not merely a possible interpretation of the Sermon on

¹³⁶ Ceadel, “Ten Distinctions,” 31.

¹³⁷ Roger Taylor, Circular Letter to NZAPF Members, January 14th 1953, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

the Mount, but something that follows inevitably from an acceptance of the Catholic faith.”¹³⁸

However, Roger Taylor’s concern that non-pacifist Anglicans did not engage with the theological issues was well founded. In their debates with non-pacifist Anglicans in New Zealand, members of the NZAPF were often confronted with the essential concern for immediate efficacy. When Eric Gowing first arrived in New Zealand, the NZAPF contacted him to see if he would consider joining the Fellowship. He declined, writing back to Roger Taylor in 1951 that he had found that “pacifists were often charged with failing to be realistic” and “very often felt there was more than a little truth in what was said.”¹³⁹ Barbara Mountier, who was secretary of the Wellington sub-branch of the NZAPF during the mid-1950s, felt that the NZAPF would do better to provide answers to those non-pacifists who raised practical concerns. Writing to Roger Taylor in 1955, she noted that the Wellington members felt “a great need to express clearly the action that Christian pacifists would advocate in specific situations ... and what might be the likely consequences of such action.”¹⁴⁰

The problem was also noted by Chris Barfoot and the Auckland branch in 1963, after a series of articles debating pacifism had been published in *Church and People*, saying that “arguments on each side had been conducted on different planes, - the pacifist on the theological and theoretical, - the non-pacifist on the practical and pragmatic level, - and arguments on both sides have been left unanswered.”¹⁴¹

During the 1960s, Auckland members sought to express a middle ground. As a response to a non-pacifist interlocutor who had said that they “would welcome

¹³⁸ Roger Taylor, Circular Letter to NZAPF Members, January 14th 1953, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹³⁹ Eric Gowing, Letter to Roger Taylor, April 24th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁴⁰ Barbara Mountier, Letter to Roger Taylor, May 4th 1955, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 2.

¹⁴¹ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Neil Mountier, March 15th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

convincing as to the pacifist strategy for achieving peace,”¹⁴² the Auckland branch members wrote that “The Christian strategy does not claim immediate results as its primary purpose.... Nevertheless, the problem of consequences is a serious one.”¹⁴³

Thus, the NZAPF began to exhibit the liberal Protestant pacifist tendency of espousing pacifism as both a principled expression of personal faith and as a viable political programme. During the 1960s, this approach gathered pace, driven by two major factors. First, most of the arguments from non-pacifist Anglicans that the NZAPF encountered were primarily pragmatic in nature, rather than theological. In order to convince others within the Church it became necessary to give more weight to the counsels of expediency. Second, the international conflicts of the 1960s were perceived as being more problematic ethically than World War Two had been, and more vulnerable to critique on practical grounds.

This tendency to combine practical and principled arguments for pacifism produces an internal tension. Yoder recognises a Biblical level of argument within liberal Protestant pacifism, but says that it “is not [its] real basis.”¹⁴⁴ For the liberal Protestant pacifists, with their optimistic social gospel, “all moral authorities are on the same side.”¹⁴⁵ This means that the dictates of common sense and enlightened moral humanism do not clash in any significant way with the Sermon on the Mount. It is convenient that the liberal Protestant pacifists can draw upon the teachings of Christ as a resource in the service of the pacifist ideal, but Christian faith is not essential to this kind of pacifism. Such a dynamic can be seen in the NZAPF’s 1968 pamphlet on military service, which stresses the confluence of reason, church

¹⁴² NZAPF, “NZAPF. Pacifist Witness and the Clergy. Results of the Questionnaire”, Undated 1965, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

¹⁴³ NZAPF, “Three Answers: An examination or dialogue”, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

¹⁴⁴ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 273.

¹⁴⁵ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 279.

teaching, scripture and individual conscience. The tension arises because arguments for practical pacifism are not arguments for absolute, theologically grounded pacifism. Absolute Christian pacifism admits and transcends defeat. It is not defensible outside the particular logic of the Cross.

The Niebuhrian Critique

In his enormously influential critique of interwar pacifism, Reinhold Niebuhr argued that conflating the ethic of Jesus with pragmatic arguments for pacifism is wholly illegitimate. According to Niebuhr, Jesus preached non-resistance, not non-violent resistance. The argument is crystallised in his essay “Why the Church is not Pacifist”, which featured in his *Christianity and Power Politics*, published in 1940. Here, Niebuhr condemned the contemporary forms of pacifism as heretical. Niebuhr accepted the validity of a pacifist reading of the Gospels, noting that “nothing is more futile and pathetic than the effort of some Christian theologians ... involved in the relativities of politics ... to justify themselves by seeking to prove that Christ was also involved in some of these relativities”.¹⁴⁶ On this basis, the sectarian and renunciatory pacifism of groups like the Mennonites and Anabaptists could not be judged a heresy. Such a stance, in which “the political problem and task” are “specifically disavowed,” was in fact “a valuable asset for the Christian faith”,¹⁴⁷ because it showed the extreme difficulty of complying with the ethical ideal of the Sermon on the Mount, and emphasised human sinfulness in corporate life.

On the other hand, Niebuhr argued that liberal Protestant pacifism was guilty of diluting the gospel message. The liberal Protestant pacifist advocacy of non-violent resistance had no basis in the teaching and example of Christ. Rather, Niebuhr

¹⁴⁶ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 8.

¹⁴⁷ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 4-5.

argued that Jesus' Sermon on the Mount and acquiescence to crucifixion demonstrated absolute non-resistance. Stripped of their scriptural warrant, the liberal Protestant pacifists are simply naïve. They "absorbed the Renaissance faith in the goodness of man",¹⁴⁸ but were "unable to appreciate the complexity of the problem of justice."¹⁴⁹ Niebuhr holds that advocates of political pacifism are dishonest in appropriating the teaching and example of Christ to lend credibility to their political project. He regards effective non-violence as a more morally preferable strategy than military force, but denies that such a strategy can find any grounding in Jesus. It is not qualitatively distinct from military force, because it is still coercive. The reason for Niebuhr's uncompromising attack on liberal Protestant pacifism is that he saw in its absolutism a blindness to the real moral difference between the imperfect democracies of the United States of America and United Kingdom and the vastly more imperfect dictatorships of the Axis powers.

The NZAPF was formed after Niebuhr, and its members were well aware of his critique. They occasionally responded by arguing that Jesus preached non-violent resistance,¹⁵⁰ and occasionally by saying that non-violent resistance – while not necessarily what Jesus preached – successfully reconciles the ethic of Jesus with the demands of justice.¹⁵¹ However, the twin blows of Niebuhr's critique and the grim realities of World War Two deeply eroded the basis of liberal Protestant pacifism. Its survival in the NZAPF in the post World War Two era appears somewhat anachronistic. Giving practical arguments for the pacifist position may have been necessary for persuasion within the Church, but in doing so, the NZAPF conflated

¹⁴⁸ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 5.

¹⁴⁹ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 14.

¹⁵⁰ Walter Robinson, Talk on "Non Violence and the Christian Conscience", March 16th 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 8.

¹⁵¹ NZAPF, "Three Answers: An examination or dialogue", APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

“principled” and the “prudential” pacifism. This contributed to the Fellowship’s marginality, because it ceded the point on the relative importance of faithfulness and consequential calculation, without going far enough into the prudential to even consider re-assessing the commitment to absolute war resistance. Thus, even partially sympathetic members of the Church could (and did) agree with the NZAPF on some points without being able to subscribe to the NZAPF’s platform.

Ideological Orientation and Practical Action

By Ceadel’s distinctions, the NZAPF has an ideological orientation to wider society. The objection that NZAPF members uphold is not a rejection of all force, but a rejection of war, at a minimum. So, NZAPF pacifism does not advocate a wholesale rejection of the power of the State, but only the aspects which relate to war and war preparation. The conflict becomes most pointed in the conflict between State and individual in times of conscription. The cultural context that gave rise to the APF was one in which war was reliant on mass mobilisation. In combination with an ideological orientation, this situation commended conscientious objection as a practical pacifist response to war. However, throughout the history of the NZAPF, conscientious objection has become less effective as a political expression of pacifism, due to increasing technological sophistication in war. The political expression of pacifism has therefore become more difficult to locate, which has further marginalised the NZAPF position.

Dick Sheppard’s Peace Pledge Union (PPU) was explicitly founded on the basis of promoting individual conscientious objection as the primary concrete manifestation of the pacifist witness, and the APF inherited this characteristic. Sheppard imagined that the PPU, if it grew to comprise a sufficiently numerous body of conscientious

objectors, would be able to make the waging of war impossible, by depriving the State of its army. Similarly, in founding the APF, Sheppard hoped that a pacifist Church could have much the same effect. Such a goal, however, required overwhelming numbers. As a minority, conscientious objectors could not hope to have a significant political effect. By the time of the outbreak of war in 1939, pacifists were forced to accept their political impotence.

The repudiation of war by the Church *en masse* would itself be an act of political pacifism, but Roger Taylor saw it as proceeding by way of personal conversion to conscientious objection. In a letter to a new member in 1950, he wrote that he believed that “peace will only come when every individual refuses to agree to ‘legalised murder.’”¹⁵² This commitment to conscientious objection as the locus of pacifist activity remained an important feature later in the NZAPF’s history as well. For example, a letter sent to the bishops of the Province ahead of the 1988 Lambeth Conference recommended putting forward the proposal that “the normative response of Anglicans to war, military service and armed struggle should be conscientious objection.”¹⁵³

In general, the potential power of conscientious objection as the primary political instantiation of pacifism has become weaker throughout the latter half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first. Technological sophistication has meant that the war burden on the advanced nations of the West has been dramatically lessened, at least in terms of casualties. Consequently, when the United States of America and the United Kingdom led the invasion of Iraq in 2003, they

¹⁵² Roger Taylor, Letter to RP Sanders, April 24th 1950, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁵³ NZAPF, Letter to the Bishops of the Province, October 12th 1987, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

could do so with marginal public support (in the US) and widespread public disapproval (in the UK). The anti-Vietnam war movement in the US gained significant traction when the number of middle-class conscript deaths made continuation of the war politically unsustainable. In the twenty-first century, Western casualties can be kept to a minimum, making wars politically easier to wage, even if they have an even more deleterious effect on the populations in the areas where Western forces are active.

A pacifist Anglican Church telling its members in 1914 to refuse military service may have been able to prevent British entry into the war, but the Church in New Zealand at present does not have the influence necessary to prevent deployment of the all-volunteer New Zealand Defence Force, both due to demographic decline and because the waging of war is no longer reliant on conscription and mass participation. In New Zealand, compulsory military training has not seriously been considered since it was abolished in 1972. In the absence of the crucible of forced conscription, the political consequences of an absolute personal pacifism are more obscure. Since 1980, the NZAPF has grappled with the task of applying their brand of pacifism to the new context. One focal point was the Springbok Tour in 1981. Opposition to the Tour stemmed from a sense of injustice, but it was a different type of conflict than the international wars with which the NZAPF had historically been concerned. Wellington member Read Mason wrote in the Wellington Diocesan magazine *Dialog* that:

Pacifism is usually thought of as a form of resistance to war but the ethic inevitably includes resistance to all forms of violence. The South African Government's racial

policies undoubtedly involve violence and so Christian pacifists have to oppose apartheid.¹⁵⁴

However, members were unclear as to how to respond, concerned that protests could become violent. In the end at least one of the Wellington members registered their protest in typically quiet fashion by attending a vigil led by Geoffrey Neilson at St Cuthbert's in Berhampore, offering tea and sympathy to protestors who came in after clashes with police.¹⁵⁵

Another focal point was the Peace Tax campaign, in which NZAPF members campaigned during the 1980s for a kind of peacetime conscientious objection by withdrawing financial support for military preparations. However, this issue was fraught with legal difficulties, derailed somewhat by Muldoon's snap election, and fell into abeyance by 1989.¹⁵⁶

The most salient recent example of Christian pacifist action in New Zealand has been the ANZAC Ploughshares' attempt to disable the surveillance equipment at Waihopai on the grounds that the base forms part of the US-led War on Terror. The NZAPF, while they sent congratulations to Peter Murnane for his part in the action,¹⁵⁷ have little history of direct action themselves. Furthermore, because of the lack of direct New Zealand involvement in international conflict, the concern with social justice issues and structural violence are more pressing for the New Zealand group. Margaret Bedggood, who was chairperson of the NZAPF between 2007 and 2008, wrote that:

¹⁵⁴ Read Mason, Response to "Another Way to Protest", as published in *Dialog* 19 October 19th 1981, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 14.

¹⁵⁵ Anonymous, Account of events at the Second Test, August 29th 1981, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 14.

¹⁵⁶ Margaret Mander, Report for Previous Three Years, April 30th 1989, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

¹⁵⁷ NZAPF, Minutes for Conference November 9th-11th 2010, Barfoot Papers, APF Minutes 2000-2010.

We need to acknowledge, to be challenged by, how much we, as the Church, are at best ambivalent in our attitudes to and responses to violence in all its forms, social, structural, judicial and financial as well as personal. We may not now endorse apartheid or genocide or honour killings but our teaching on war and peace and violence and resistance is still unclear at best; we may not advocate the killing of those who are different, Jews, Muslims, gays, heretics, but we are still unreliable about the place of women, children, gays and lesbians, people with disabilities, refugees, those of other faiths; we may have some misgivings about the death penalty, but our legal 'justice' measures still owe more to punishment than mercy. We seem unable to connect the Gospel call to peacemaking to outrage at extreme poverty, military expenditure or international injustice.¹⁵⁸

The historical form of NZAPF pacifism is tied to mid twentieth-century conceptions of the relationship between pacifism as inward disposition and as political engagement. In peace-time, it was difficult for the NZAPF members to decide upon positive action, particularly given that they did not engage in the kind of action that George Armstrong or the ANZAC Ploughshares have instigated. Locating the causes of conflict in the more diffuse forms of structural violence and economic and social injustice necessitates a different practical application of Christian pacifism. In one sense this brings the NZAPF closer to the work of the Anglican Social Justice Commission, or the activity of the Church as a whole. However, this threatens the existence of the NZAPF as a separate and absolutist pacifist organisation.

Conclusion

Essentially a continuation of the liberal Protestant pacifist tradition, the NZAPF has struggled to transcend the difficulties that put paid to that tradition's interwar period

¹⁵⁸ Margaret Bedggood, Chairperson's Report, November 21st 2008, Barfoot Papers, APF Minutes 2000-2010.

of popularity. The Fellowship possesses neither the other-worldly purity of a purely renunciatory pacifism, nor the practical effectiveness of a calculating politically engaged movement of non-violent resistance. Their continued adherence to this essentially mid-century conception of pacifism has been a weakness because it appeared irrelevant after World War Two and the Nieburhian critique.

Furthermore, as weapons technology increased in sophistication, the power of conscientious objection as the expression of pacifism decreased. The NZAPF recognised this, but the manner of their pacifism provided little in the way of an obvious direction forward for peace-time activity.

Under Ceadel's typology, the CPS can be seen to profess a very similar pacifism to that of the NZAPF, although with a more optimistic orientation politically. The CPS disbanded in 2002 as a result of similar difficulties in applying their form of pacifism to the modern context. Preaching to an increasingly secular New Zealand society, and intimately related to the struggle of New Zealand Christian conscientious objectors during World War Two, the CPS had struggled for relevance for some time. The NZAPF, however, survives, probably owing to their denominational focus. While the Anglican Church in New Zealand continues in maintaining a non-pacifist stance, the NZAPF still has a purpose. The following chapter examines how the NZAPF has attempted to bring a pacifist witness to the Anglican Church in New Zealand.

Chapter Three

THE NZAPF AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

The denominational focus of the NZAPF was one of its most distinctive characteristics. This focus stemmed originally from the circumstances surrounding the origin of the umbrella APF in England. Dick Sheppard founded the APF to be an explicitly Anglican counterpart to his own secular Peace Pledge Union, which was unified by no particular religious attitude. Sheppard sought, through the activity of the APF, to convert to pacifism not only individuals within the Church, but the corporate structure of the Church itself. The NZAPF retained this aim, which helped to distinguish the Fellowship from the CPS.

This chapter examines the central ways in which the NZAPF attempted to bear witness to the Anglican Church in New Zealand throughout the history of the group, and assesses the effectiveness of this approach. The NZAPF sees pacifism as intrinsic to the Christian faith, and members have therefore attempted persuasion by way of education. Focusing on the theological aspects, they found clergy to be a more sympathetic audience than laity.

Overall, however, the NZAPF's influence on the Anglican Church, measured by growth in members, was negligible. This was partly related to pre-existing Anglican hostility or indifference to pacifism, but more importantly stemmed from the NZAPF's decision to maintain an absolutist witness rather than to engage substantially with partially sympathetic elements within the Church.

Lack of success in converting non-pacifist Anglicans, and significant points of contact with non-Anglican pacifist or peace groups, led the NZAPF to reassess its denominational focus at two periods, in the late 1960s and in the early 1980s. This re-assessment comprised part of the wider discussion on broadening the Fellowship's mandate to include issues of social justice and structural violence. The first period of re-assessment was stymied by a lack of overall activity during the 1970s and the death of key members. During the second period, members opted to retain the original Anglican-specific focus as primary, but to attempt outreach to non-Anglican organisations as well.

Over the period that the NZAPF has been active, the Anglican Church became more inclined to voice dissent to government policy on war and peace issues. This tendency culminated in strong public statements issued against the second invasion of Iraq in 2003. Nevertheless, the shape of Anglican opposition to war was not pacifist, and the absolute pacifism of the APF remained a marginal minority voice. The focus of Anglican concern in public issues is much more related to social issues than to international conflict. Consequently, despite the more sympathetic Church environment, the NZAPF remains a small group and the absolute pacifist position that they advocate remains marginal within the Church.

The Denominational Focus

The NZAPF retained and reinforced the denominational focus in its early years. Roger Taylor, writing to members in 1951, spoke of the Fellowship's task as being "to pray and work for the repudiation by the Church of the way of armaments and

war.”¹⁵⁹ At the first NZAPF conference, held in late August 1954, members agreed upon a statement that:

“as a fellowship we are especially concerned with persuading our fellow-churchmen that pacifism is inherent in the Faith which they profess, and so building up a body of opinion within the Church of England that, in her official Councils and by her official leaders, war may be outlawed and participation in it may be declared to be incompatible with Christian discipleship.”¹⁶⁰

Such a focus provided a point of contrast with the ostensibly non-denominational, though substantially Methodist, CPS. Shortly after the founding of the NZAPF, the CPS had written to Roger Taylor, expressing the view that they had always anticipated that they would become supplanted by denominational peace fellowships, but that the growth of such societies had not (at that point) occurred.¹⁶¹ Charles Chandler, writing in a newsletter in late 1961, explicitly drew this connection, pointing out that although the CPS was “more widely representative of pacifist opinion”, it was the especial concern of the NZAPF to “witness to our own brethren ... in our own Church, for we are painfully aware of how much of a minority opinion ours is, within the Church of England.”¹⁶² In his role as chairman of the NZAPF, Chandler felt strongly that the Anglican Church was not fulfilling its responsibilities with respect to warfare. In a newsletter to members in early 1962, he wrote that “the most reprehensible body in the world today ... is the Church itself. Expert in passing resolutions at Lambeth, but silent in between Lambeths.”¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ Roger Taylor, Letter to NZAPF Members, August 1953, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁶⁰ Anonymous, Report on the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship 1954 Conference, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

¹⁶¹ CPS, Letter to Roger Taylor, November 13th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁶² Charles Chandler, NZAPF Newsletter 1, 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

¹⁶³ Charles Chandler, NZAPF Newsletter 3, 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

Strategies and Activities

It is central to the APF understanding of Christian pacifism that it derives primarily from the teaching and example of Jesus. In their interactions with non-pacifist Anglicans, therefore, NZAPF members opted for an educative approach, hoping to open a dialogue whereby members of the Church could be convinced that pacifism is inherent in the Christian faith which they profess. The strategies and activities of the NZAPF have reflected this understanding. In general, attempts to promote dialogue have been more successful when directed at clergy than at laity.

Correspondence in Church newspapers was one of the most important vectors for engagement for the NZAPF. Shortly after the formation of the New Zealand branch, Roger Taylor and Thurlow Thompson wrote to the *Church Envoy*, the Dunedin diocesan magazine, advertising the existence of the NZAPF and providing some background on the APF in Britain.¹⁶⁴ The editor declined to publish this material, claiming that it did not accord with the views of the diocese.¹⁶⁵ Later, the NZAPF would have rather more success with *Church and People*, both in publishing advertising and publicity for the group and in carrying on a debate with non-pacifist Anglicans. The Auckland branch, in particular, was pleased by the opportunity to represent a pacifist viewpoint in a series of articles, from both pacifist and non-pacifist perspectives, which were published from late 1962 to early 1963.¹⁶⁶

A key piece of encouragement for the NZAPF and their strategy of discussion and education was Resolution 107 from the 1958 Lambeth conference, which stated, in

¹⁶⁴ Roger Taylor and Thurlow Thompson, Letter to the editor of *Church Envoy*, February 17th 1948, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁶⁵ *Church Envoy*, Letter to Roger Taylor, March 10th 1948, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

¹⁶⁶ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Neil Mountier, March 15th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

part, that “the Conference calls Christians to subject to intense prayer and study their attitudes to the issues involved in modern warfare.”¹⁶⁷ Almost every piece of NZAPF correspondence directed to an Anglican audience after 1958 included an explicit mention of Resolution 107. For example, when the Auckland branch hosted the first NZAPF conference, in Auckland in 1963, the event was conceived as “an opportunity for witness within the Church as a whole, a time at which the Anglican Church in the Auckland diocese might be stimulated into considering its responsibilities under Resolution 107”.¹⁶⁸

Approaches to Laity

Strategies aimed at promoting dialogue with the Anglican laity included the proposed creation of diocesan study groups, the sponsoring of debates, addresses given to school and Church groups, the publication of a pamphlet on military service, production of studies like *Christ and War*, and the funding and promotion of a travelling pacifist “missioner” to the Church. Of these, the two most widely successful were the dissemination of the pamphlet on military service in 1968, and the missionary scheme.

The pamphlet, entitled *A Christian Attitude toward Military Service: A Guide to those Required to Register for Military Training*, generated considerable debate. Its contents addressed arguments for and against compulsory military service, and gave general information on the legal situation for those who wished to conscientiously object. Views were presented by both opponents and supporters. The pacifist position was defended by the Auckland branch of the NZAPF, specifically Chris

¹⁶⁷ “Lambeth Conference Archives,” accessed December 6, 2010, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/downloads/1958.pdf>.

¹⁶⁸ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Neil Mountier, September 20th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

Barfoot, Phil Crump and Shaun Pennycook,¹⁶⁹ while the non-pacifist position was given by M.R. Houghton. More than a thousand copies of the pamphlet were sent to Church youth groups, Anglican schools, and universities.¹⁷⁰ Overall, it was well received, and furnished at least one opportunity for further dialogue, when Chris Barfoot was invited to give an address to members of the Young Anglicans in Auckland.¹⁷¹ It was also successful in attracting at least some younger members to the NZAPF.

The missioner scheme was a much more extensive project. In late 1982, the executive of the NZAPF was given “the authority to initiate a fund-raising scheme ... for the purpose of promoting a mission to the Anglican Church under the auspices of the APF in the cause of pacifism.”¹⁷² By 1989, the missioner fund had reached \$28,350,¹⁷³ though it remained to be decided who that missioner would be. Paul Oestreicher had been offered the position, but declined due to a principled commitment to ecumenism.¹⁷⁴ The missioner scheme eventually came to fruition in 1991, with the arrival of Sidney Hinkes from the APF in England to fill the role. Throughout the year, he and his wife travelled to every diocese in New Zealand arguing that “Christianity is a Pacifist Faith.”¹⁷⁵ According to his own report, he gave 105 sermons, 202 talks, 15 press interviews and 13 radio broadcasts in his capacity as missioner.¹⁷⁶ The Christian broadcaster Radio Rhema was one of the stations, and they interviewed Hinkes twice but the interviews did not go well. On one

¹⁶⁹ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Lance Robinson, August 23rd 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

¹⁷⁰ Anonymous, Letter, February 7th 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 8.

¹⁷¹ David Dunningham, Letter to Chris Barfoot, February 28th 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 8.

¹⁷² Meeting Minutes for General Meeting, October 15th 1982, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 14.

¹⁷³ Report on APF-CPS Conference June 2nd-5th 1989, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

¹⁷⁴ Margaret Mander, ‘Report for the Previous 3 years’, April 30th 1989, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

¹⁷⁵ Margaret Mander, Report presented at General Meeting, November 9th 1991, Barfoot Papers, Minutes, Letters, Conference Papers, 1990-2001.

¹⁷⁶ Sidney Hinkes, Report on Mission, November 1991, Barfoot Papers, Minutes, Letters, Conference Papers, 1990-2001.

occasion, Hinkes was asked if he was aware of a prediction of a great war between Russia and Israel, making pacifism unscriptural. This encounter left him “seriously worried about the political philosophy behind New Zealand’s only religious radio station.”¹⁷⁷ Overall, the response from the bishops was positive; Murray Mills, Bishop of Waiapu, and Bruce Gilberd, Bishop of Auckland, were particularly well disposed toward the mission. Twenty new members joined the NZAPF as a result of the campaign, which was the most significant numerical increase since the formation of the Auckland branch. This brought membership to a relatively high-point of 104, including the first Māori member of the NZAPF.¹⁷⁸

On the whole, direct communication with lay members of the Anglican Church was rare, though it was often suggested at conferences. When it did take place, the results were often disappointing. In 1988, for example, the NZAPF organised the “Auckland Diocesan Consultation on War and Armed Struggle”. This event was well prepared for, and included a keynote by Gordon Wilson from the English APF. The organisers hoped that the consultation would be an expression of the opinion of the whole diocese, but in the end only 17 people attended, and most of those were NZAPF members. The event gave rise to a number of resolutions of a pacifist nature, but these differed in no significant way from those that arose from NZAPF conferences and general correspondence. Such a disappointing turn-out led Hugh Tollemache to opine that “one seriously questions the worth of even attempting to communicate with the grass-roots, pew-sitting Anglican.”¹⁷⁹ Tollemache speculated

¹⁷⁷ Hinkes, Report on NZ Mission.

¹⁷⁸ Margaret Mander, Report presented at General Meeting, November 9th 1991, Barfoot Papers, Minutes, Letters, Conference Papers, 1990-2001; Hinkes, Report on NZ Mission.

¹⁷⁹ Hugh Tollemache, Report from the Auckland Branch, May 26th 1989, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

that there could have been any number of reasons behind the low turn-out to the 1988 consultation, including “good old Anglican apathy.”¹⁸⁰

Approaches to Clergy

By and large, the NZAPF was more successful at promoting dialogue in its approaches to clergy than to laity, though this too was limited. At the second NZAPF conference, held on 25 August 1956, members discussed the idea of sending peace literature to New Zealand clergy. By the time of the formation of the Auckland branch, Wellington NZAPF members had already been distributing the English APF pamphlet *Incompatibility – War and Christ* within their diocese. In an effort to engage clergy in the Auckland diocese on issues of war and peace, the Auckland branch began sending out monthly issues of the English APF magazine *The Anglican Pacifist* (renamed *Challenge* in early 1965), starting from July 1964. On 26 July 1965, a letter and questionnaire was sent out along with the twelfth and final issue of the magazine. NZAPF members in other areas of the country followed suit at later times in their own dioceses, but never received a comparable number of replies. Even in Auckland, of the 108 clergy to whom the questionnaire was sent, only 35 replied. The letter asked for “any constructive criticism or advice you can offer to strengthen our efforts to stimulate deeper Christian concern about matters of peace and war,” as well as pointing out that with the problem of New Zealand’s participation in Vietnam looming, there was a need for people to clarify their thoughts on the issue.¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰ Hugh Tollemache, Letter to NZAPF, April 16th 1988, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 12.

¹⁸¹ NZAPF, Letter to Auckland Clergy, July 26th 1965, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 6.

Not many of the replies contained any suggestions for encouraging discussion along the lines enjoined by Resolution 107. One vicar mentioned that he had “incurred the wrath of most of the congregation” by recently preaching on the subject of the Vietnam War.¹⁸² An older vicar “doubted the value of the typical pacifist stand as ‘defending a prepared position’ which he felt led only to ‘increased blood-pressure and opposition rather than to discussion and new perspectives’.”¹⁸³

The relative success of the Auckland questionnaire in eliciting responses owed something to the close relationship between the Auckland branch and its bishop, Eric Gowing, who was a member. During the 1980s, the Auckland branch also engaged in sympathetic correspondence with Paul Reeves, Archbishop of New Zealand, who was well disposed to the pacifist viewpoint, though not himself a pacifist,¹⁸⁴ and who agreed to bring NZAPF concerns to the attention of the bishops.¹⁸⁵

The sympathy of the bishop could make a substantial difference. On the other hand, an unsympathetic bishop could also be a significant impediment. The Wellington branch, under the chairmanship of Lance Robinson in the 1980s, undertook to send letters and membership forms to newly ordained clergy in the Wellington diocese. This invoked the ire of the Bishop, Edward Norman, who took issue with the NZAPF’s “unfair” targeting of new ordinands. Moreover, he attacked protest as a method of dissent for Christians, affirmed a non-pacifist account of Church teaching and argued that the security of the free world depended on nuclear weapons.¹⁸⁶ In

¹⁸² NZAPF, “Pacifist Witness and the Clergy: Results of the Questionnaire”, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

¹⁸³ NZAPF, “Pacifist Witness and the Clergy: Results of the Questionnaire”, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

¹⁸⁴ Hugh Tollemache, Letter to NZAPF, March 15th 1981; Report on Combined APF-CPS Conference, May 31st-June 2nd, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MS-Papers-4496-1.

¹⁸⁵ Paul Reeves, Letter to NZAPF, May 27th 1982, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MS-Papers-4496-2.

¹⁸⁶ Edward Norman, Letter to NZAPF, May 24th 1982, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 14.

reply, Lance Robinson defended the letters to ordinands as gentle and relevant, and recommended that the Bishop read Roland Bainton as an antidote to the idea that the Church has always said that there are worse things than war. Robinson also attacked the idea of security through strength (most vividly, through nuclear weapons) as un-Christian, stating that “‘in spite of man’s sin, God is still able to achieve his purpose for creation.’ But it is ‘in spite of’, not by means of.”¹⁸⁷ As the Vicar of St Barnabas’ in Khandallah, Lance Robinson had the parish newsletter of July 1982 publish opposing statements on nuclear weapons from himself and the Bishop. Norman responded in further correspondence by questioning the sincerity of NZAPF congratulations in the ordinand letters, and pointed out that in inviting ordinands to join a pacifist organisation, the NZAPF were inviting disloyalty, as such a profession of pacifism would violate their declarations with respect to Article 37 of the 39 Articles.¹⁸⁸

In terms of engagement with bishops the decennial Lambeth Conferences were an important venue. Most recently, the NZAPF was involved, along with the US-based Episcopal Peace Fellowship, in the preparation of the APF submission to bishops at the 2008 Lambeth Conference.¹⁸⁹ The submission highlighted the repeated anti-war resolutions passed at successive Lambeth conferences. In the event, the attempt to bring the issues of war and peace to the fore at the conference was stymied by the ubiquity of the controversy regarding ordination of homosexual priests and the resulting strain within the greater Anglican communion. However, there was

¹⁸⁷ Lance Robinson, Letter to Edward Norman, June 21st 1982, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 14.

¹⁸⁸ Edward Norman, Letter to NZAPF, December 9th 1982, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder MS-Papers-4496-1.

¹⁸⁹ Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, “War, Peace and Lambeth Conference: A set of briefing papers prepared by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship for Delegates to the 2008 Lambeth Conference,” accessed June 20, 2011, <http://www.anglicanpacifists.com/uploads/docs/10-Lambeth%202008%20Booklet.pdf>.

somewhat of a disconnect between the Lambeth resolutions and the regular life of the Church, as Chandler had lamented in 1962.

Difficulties with the NZAPF Approach

These engagements with the Anglican Church in New Zealand never inspired more than a modest increase in membership for the NZAPF. There are two major reasons for this. The first reason relates to the historic marginality of pacifism in the Anglican Church, and a disinclination, particularly among laity, to consider problems of war and peace in the theological terms that the NZAPF favoured. This rendered the educative approach of the Fellowship less effective. The other reason was the commitment made by the NZAPF to purity of message rather than to growth, even as the Church itself became less hostile to pacifism.

Pacifism was never close to being a mainstream position within the Anglican Church. During World War Two, and immediately after, the best that Anglican pacifists received from the Church hierarchy was tolerance, not support. Even this was not widespread. William Fitchett, the Bishop of Dunedin, was explicitly anti-pacifist, and the Bishops of Nelson and Waiapu, William Hilliard and George Gerard, were outspoken in their appeals for Anglicans to back the war effort.¹⁹⁰ Clergy holding pacifist viewpoints were often loath to express them, sometimes because of pressure from the hierarchy, but sometimes also because of pressure from parishioners. David Taylor argued, in Akaroa in 1945, for more lenient treatment of conscientious objectors, but found that such a stance constituted “possibly the most unpopular sermon ever preached from this pulpit.”¹⁹¹ After the war, much of this sentiment

¹⁹⁰ Haworth, *Marching As To War*, 172-173.

¹⁹¹ Haworth, *Marching As To War*, 178.

remained. The editor of the *Church Envoy's* refusal to print the letter advertising the formation of the NZAPF gives an impression of the mood of the diocese under Fitchett.

Theological Aspects

The NZAPF had a constant battle to persuade non-pacifist Anglicans to debate the issues of war and peace in theological rather than practical terms. As mentioned above, at the heart of the NZAPF approach was a conviction that pacifism was inherent in the faith professed by Anglicans, and that through education and discussion, those non-pacifist members of the Church would come around to the pacifist position. Consequently, in the early years of the fellowship, the NZAPF, and particularly Roger Taylor, offered no real compromise to the counsels of expediency. For Taylor, pacifism was rather, "something that follows inevitably from an acceptance of the Catholic faith."¹⁹²

The assumption that non-pacifist Anglicans would adopt a pacifist stance if the theological basis was explained to them did not account for the number of factors that influenced whether or not someone was likely to 'convert' to pacifism. An awareness of the content of scripture always sat alongside competing imperatives such as patriotic loyalty, the authority of Church teaching, and a whole host of pragmatic considerations, familial obligations and societal pressures. Even Eric Gowing, who accepted the NZAPF understanding of the ethic of Jesus, had initially

¹⁹² Roger Taylor, Letter to NZAPF Members, January 14th 1953, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

declined to join the NZAPF based on his conviction that pacifists were failing to be realistic enough in recognising the evil of Communism.¹⁹³

Additionally, Anglicanism has long accepted a broad range of positions on ethical issues of every kind. To assume a common ethical attitude within the whole Church, or even an inclination to deal with political issues in distinctively Christian terms, proved to be overly optimistic. With its history as the established Church of England, many Anglicans were nominal adherents, communicant members by convention as much as by conscious decision or principled conviction. The demands of involvement in the Church were naturally greater for clergy, and the difference between clergy and laity in terms of their receptivity to NZAPF's arguments for pacifism was instructive in this regard. Clergy took the theological basis of pacifism more seriously, and had more inclination and occasion to ponder the theological issues involved in modern warfare, which was less often the case for lay members. However, even amongst clergy there was a tendency to argue against absolute pacifism in practical rather than theoretical terms.

Purity of Message

The NZAPF had to balance the purity of their original message with the demands of persuasion, but this proved to be difficult to do because commitment to the absolute pacifist stance allowed little leeway. To give up pacifism would have been a denial of the essential nature of the APF. Within this limit, NZAPF members sought to persuade by making common cause where possible with non-pacifist Anglicans. However, while concerns over nuclear weapons and the wars in Vietnam and Iraq

¹⁹³ Eric Gowing, Letter to Roger Taylor, April 24th 1951, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

led to a greater degree of sympathy with the NZAPF on particular issues, it did not lead to an increase in membership.

The 1965 clergy questionnaire represented a relatively high point of engagement between the NZAPF and non-affiliated clergy in Auckland. Although it stimulated less discussion within the Church than had been hoped, it provided an opportunity for the NZAPF to examine their own pacifism in light of the views of at least a segment of the diocesan clergy. In particular, it highlighted the tension between pacifism as an absolute stance, and a situationalist response to particular conflicts. Such a debate was also taking place in the English APF, with the umbrella organisation finding itself “considerably divided on this matter.”¹⁹⁴

One younger vicar in his response to the questionnaire advocated

concentration more on current problems, e.g. Viet Nam, than on generalized positions, and considers that many clergy are beginning to oppose military involvement on the grounds that this war is immoral or futile or too risky, or a denial of the Church’s catholic mission to all men. ‘The literature would be more successful if it constantly portrayed the living issues of war today,’ he writes, i.e. whether war today is the same as in 1939 or 1914; nuclear war and its possibilities in 1965; what lessons were learned in the World Wars; and how to disentangle the Church from ‘its tragic alliance with anti-communism and capitalism’.¹⁹⁵

Vietnam was proving to be a much more divisive conflict than previous wars in which New Zealand had been involved. In contrast to World War Two, when the cause, if not necessarily the conduct of the war, had been widely considered “just”, many Church people who were not avowed pacifists were nonetheless opposed to military

¹⁹⁴ APF, Letter to Chris Barfoot, January 7th 1966, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 6.

¹⁹⁵ NZAPF, “Pacifist Witness and the Clergy: Results of the Questionnaire”, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

action in Vietnam. An advertisement run in the *NZ Listener* of April 1966, calling for a cessation of bombing and withdrawal of NZ troops from North Vietnam, was signed by 417 people, 17 of whom were Anglican clergy (including 8 APF members). Wellington clergy made a relatively good showing, which Chris Barfoot speculated may have been in part a result of NZAPF influence through the mailing of *Challenge*.¹⁹⁶

The NZAPF had been faced with a similar dilemma in their dealings with the various anti-nuclear groups like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). In the mid-1960s context, the commitment to absolutism was re-affirmed by Chandler, who, following the results of the questionnaire, wrote that he had “always thought that our main purpose as a Society is to ‘leaven the lump’, that is, to build up a growing body of opinion, particularly among the clergy, which is absolutist.”¹⁹⁷ Chandler’s comments expressed the considered position of the NZAPF executive.

In the final analysis, the NZAPF was not prepared to soften its absolute pacifist stance in order to broaden its appeal and grow its membership. As the wider anti-war movement gained pace in New Zealand, this commitment to purity of message further marginalised the NZAPF with respect to other voices in the Church. The NZAPF was certainly aware of this trend. Harry Richardson, a Wellington member, wrote in 1967 lamenting the NZAPF’s “inability to get through to the general run of the laity,” believing that “most ministers ... with their theological training are aware of the beastliness of war but getting anything across to the average layman must be a torturing business.”¹⁹⁸ In the annual report for 1968, Chris Barfoot admitted that the

¹⁹⁶ Chris Barfoot, Letter to Harry Richardson, June 19th 1966, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 6.

¹⁹⁷ Charles Chandler, Circular Letter to NZAPF Members, Undated 1965, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

¹⁹⁸ Harry Richardson, Letter to Chris Barfoot June, 2nd 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

NZAPF's witness had been maintained but not increased. The level of engagement that had been achieved in Auckland was not repeated in other Dioceses. A distribution of *Challenge* and a questionnaire in the diocese of Waiapu had yielded only six replies out of fifty clergy, and all but one reply had been negative.¹⁹⁹ The report went on to say that the weight of non-pacifist opinion in the Church seemed difficult to budge, leading half of the Auckland members to despair of the prospect and look instead to secular institutions for progress. Speaking apparently for the other half, however, the report re-affirmed that "faith in the Church as the Body of Christ compels us to share in her redeeming work".²⁰⁰

At the 1969 AGM, the NZAPF executive shifted from Auckland to Wellington. Charles Chandler was in ill-health and wished to retire as Chairman, and Chris Barfoot, having been secretary for some years, was inclined to take a break. It was also felt that having the executive in Wellington would potentially rejuvenate the Wellington branch, which had been far less active throughout the 1960s than had the younger and larger Auckland branch.²⁰¹ It would also leave Auckland members more able to focus more on local matters.²⁰² The new chairman was Walter Robinson, and his first newsletter addressed the new context in which the NZAPF found itself, and the continued marginality of the fellowship in relation to the Church. Noting that the NZAPF consisted of 73 out of the 114,783 Christmas communicants of the Anglican Church, he went on to say that it was

obvious that the influence of the APF on the clergy and laity is minimal ... we are accommodated as a fringe element within the Church. It is equally obvious that we

¹⁹⁹ Chris Barfoot, Annual Report for 1968, April 24th 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

²⁰⁰ Chris Barfoot, Annual Report for 1968, April 24th 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

²⁰¹ NZAPF, Letter to Barbara Woods, March 15th 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 9.

²⁰² Chris Barfoot, Letter to Barbara Woods, June 3rd 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 9.

have to become far more effective exponents of pacifism within and outside of the Church, and this will mean updating our understanding of Peace and War so that it makes sense in the 1970's.²⁰³

Discussion on Broadening the Mandate

The intransigence of the Anglican Church as a whole was increasingly convincing some members that the focus of the NZAPF had to change, but such a perspective was a challenge to the *raison d'être* of the NZAPF. The Auckland branch had displayed a greater willingness to work outside of the Anglican context, compared to the rest of the Fellowship. For example, Auckland members had collaborated with the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam (ICCV) and the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR), as well as conducting a dialogue with the Peace Council, Progressive Youth and the Communist Party.²⁰⁴ Paul Oestreicher, who attended NZAPF conferences as a young man, visited in 1969. Meeting with Auckland members in March 1969, he praised the Auckland branch's efforts at reaching out to non-Anglican institutions, and stated that he thought that the NZAPF should be working more ecumenically, as well as adopting a broader approach to pacifism which included concern with the social and economic conditions that give rise to conflict. This discussion was taking place within the wider NZAPF as well. As Walter Robinson wrote: "It is as much the role of the Christian Pacifist to turn his attention to the prevention of war and the positive maintenance of peace as it is to register his objection to war."²⁰⁵ Such a focus would be broader, but it was intended to still be inclusive of the original APF mission to the Anglican Church: "The Anglican Church in the past has been noted for its jingoism ... it is now time for us to begin to

²⁰³ Walter Robinson, NZAPF Newsletter, May 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

²⁰⁴ NZAPF, Report on Dialogue held November 14th 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

²⁰⁵ Walter Robinson, NZAPF Newsletter, May 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

rectify this image.”²⁰⁶ However, in the event, this discussion on broadening the mandate was delayed by the overall lack of NZAPF activity during the 1970s.

Re-invigorated in 1980, the NZAPF was faced with the same questions about their role that had been present in 1970. The CPS, too, had struggled with the new shape of the peace movement in the Vietnam War era, and the two groups held a combined conference to elucidate their position in the contemporary context.²⁰⁷

Following on from the concerns raised by Paul Oestreicher, Walter Robinson and Kevin Clements, the conference raised the idea of a broader approach to pacifism, and greater engagement with social issues, for which the Springbok Tour in 1981 provided some impetus. The potential to reach a more sympathetic audience outside the Church led to greater efforts in the public sphere, for instance, through addresses on pacifism given over public radio. However, the primary denominational focus was retained. The Anglican Church was much less hostile than at the time of the NZAPF’s formation, but as with the broader peace movement, increased sympathy did not lead to any great increase in membership.

Changes in Anglican Attitudes

Anglican attitudes to war, particularly among clergy, shifted over the years of the NZAPF’s existence. The Church itself became less strongly associated with the State, and more inclined to take a prophetic role. However, in its public role, the focus of Church concern was not on war particularly, but rather on issues of social justice. Even where Church people were concerned with war, they did not tend to take a pacifist position. The pace of this shift began to quicken during the 1970s, at a

²⁰⁶ Walter Robinson, NZAPF Newsletter, May 1969, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

²⁰⁷ Anonymous, Report on Combined APF-CPS Conference, May 31st-June 2nd, APFNZ Branch Records, Folders MS-Papers-4496-2, MS-Papers-4496-3.

time when the NZAPF was almost completely dormant. Consequently, when the NZAPF began to become more active again in 1980, the Fellowship re-emerged into a more welcoming context. In general, however, the shape of Anglican opposition to war from the 1970s onward had little of the contour of doctrinaire pacifism. Older clergy were more inclined to support the status quo, and the laity evinced a degree of conservatism on issues of war and peace. There have been clear anti-war voices within the Church in the period since the 1970s, particularly in relation to the Falklands War, the various conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and the two Iraq wars. However, these voices have not proceeded from a rejection of all war along pacifist lines. Rather, they reflect an increasing rediscovery and more stringent application of Just War criteria.²⁰⁸ Rowan Williams, for instance, as Archbishop of Canterbury, characterises the Christian response to war in cautious and peaceful, but decidedly non-pacifist terms.²⁰⁹

In his brief survey of the changing Anglican attitudes to modern warfare, Philip Towle notes a correlation between the decline of the Church's public influence and its willingness to criticise government decisions to go to war.²¹⁰ As the demographic pre-eminence of Anglicanism in New Zealand began to drop away dramatically in the 1970s, the quasi-establishment character of the Church was increasingly challenged. As Towle points out,²¹¹ distance from the establishment is a double-edged sword; decoupling of the Church from the establishment allows greater room for a more strident prophetic voice, but by the same principle marginalises the voice of the Church in public affairs.

²⁰⁸ Philip Towle, "Church, State and Modern Warfare," In *Civil Society, Religion and Global Governance: Paradigms of Power and Persuasion*, ed. Helen James (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 57.

²⁰⁹ Rowan Williams, "What Is Christianity?," *Islam & Christian-Muslim Relations* 19, no. 3 (2008): 325-32.

²¹⁰ Towle, "Church, State and Modern Warfare."

²¹¹ Towle, "Church, State and Modern Warfare," 58.

Since World War Two, for the Anglican Church in New Zealand, issues of war and peace have seldom been at the forefront of concern. Troop commitments in Vietnam were modest enough that the direct effect on New Zealanders was minimal and the Church, in a period of significant decline in affiliation and attendance, had much more pressing issues to deal with. Anglicans were more involved in protests against the Springbok Tour in 1981 and nuclear ship visits, but even this activism was divisive. The most visible involvement of the Anglican Church in New Zealand political life has pertained to social justice issues, rather than international conflict. The Hikoi of Hope in 1998 was the most prominent example of this involvement.

Even with respect to international conflict, however, a more peaceful outlook does not equate to pacifism. A statement against the second Iraq War issued by New Zealand Church leaders, including the Anglican Bishops of Christchurch and Wellington, as well as the General Secretary of the Church, is explicitly within the Just War tradition:

Christian reflection on the justice of going to war allows nation states the right of lawful self-defence once all peace efforts have failed, and there is no international authority with the necessary competence and power to maintain international peace and security. None of these conditions are met in the present case.²¹²

This is not a pacifist statement. The moral authority invoked is not the Sermon on the Mount, but a combination of Church teaching and international law. The NZAPF, however, supported the statements of the Anglican and Catholic Churches on the Iraq War without any complaints.²¹³ Given the non-doctrinaire, more contextual or situationalist shape of Anglican concern with war in recent years, it seems

²¹² Peace Movement Aotearoa, "NZ Church Leaders Joint Statement on the Threat of War against Iraq", <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/cra0909.htm>, accessed 3 July 2011.

²¹³ Executive Meeting Minutes for May 17th 2003, APF Minutes 2000-2010.

reasonable to conclude that the influence flowed from the more diffuse wider peace movement to the Anglican Church, rather than from the NZAPF.

Conclusion

Despite its continuing focus on the Anglican Church, the NZAPF has not been successful in its attempts to persuade the Church to adopt pacifism on a large scale. Given its broad and inclusive nature, high degree of nominal adherence and historic establishmentarian character, the Anglican Church has not been a promising mission field for the NZAPF. Seeing pacifism as a necessary deduction from the teaching and example of Christ, the Fellowship has stressed education in their engagement with the Church. This approach was more successful with clergy than with laity, and the theological aspects of the issues raised did not convince many lay members of the Church.

Given the lack of success in converting the Church to pacifism, NZAPF members reassessed their denominational focus on either side of their period of comparative inactivity during the 1970s. However, as with the commitment to absolute pacifism rather than a more situationalist approach, the initial formulation of the Fellowship's mandate remained substantially intact. As mentioned in the conclusion to Chapter Three above, the denominational focus contributed to the NZAPF's resilience

compared to the similarly absolutist CPS, even as it limited the organisation's attractiveness to its Anglican constituency.

The Anglican clergy have become, in their public pronouncements, far less strongly associated with the governmental position, but in this respect they are more inclined to focus on domestic social justice concerns. When war is an issue, the Church has tended to articulate a revived Just War response, rather than a pacifist one. Just War theory is influential within the Anglican Church and has undergone renewed application in the context of the Vietnam War and nuclear weapons. The Just War tradition is therefore a crucial aspect of Anglican attitudes to war and peace, and an important part of the intellectual and theological context in which the NZAPF operated. The following chapter therefore critically examines the NZAPF's engagement with Just War theory in more detail, and the implications of that engagement for the NZAPF's overall position and success.

Chapter Four

THE NZAPF AND JUST WAR

Just War theory first appeared in its recognisable Christian form with St Augustine of Hippo in the fourth century. It has been, and remains extremely influential to this day, as the stated ethic of the Roman Catholic Church and most Protestant determinations, including the Anglican Church. It has become increasingly important in the latter half of the twentieth-century as a framework within which non-pacifists can air their concerns about modern warfare. Yoder identifies a lack of thoroughgoing engagement with Just War theory as a weakness of liberal Protestant pacifism.²¹⁴ This characterisation holds true for the NZAPF, and the weaknesses in the NZAPF's engagement with Just War theory further account for the organisation's limited overall impact.

This chapter gives a brief account of Just War theory, as classically understood, before examining the NZAPF's engagement with it. To engage fully with the intersection of Just War theory and pacifism is beyond the scope of this thesis, and chapter. Rather, as with previous chapters, the fundamental focus is on the clash between the NZAPF's maintenance of its absolutist stance and potential compromise with partially sympathetic elements of the Church. Instead of making common cause with Just War adherents, the NZAPF treated Just War theory as part of an argument for pacifism. This proved to be problematic in two respects. First, the NZAPF argument overestimated the importance of Just War theory on non-pacifists in the Anglican Church. Second, and more seriously, it rested upon a problematic rejection of Just War theory which itself employed Just War criteria. In using Just War criteria

²¹⁴ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 282.

to critique modern warfare, the NZAPF were effectively not arguing for pacifism, but rather for the need for a theological approach to issues of war and peace. This was itself an important strand of the NZAPF message, but rather than recognising the points of contact between pacifism and Just War theory, the NZAPF argument sidelines Just War theory and potential practical allies in terms of particular conflicts. The weakness and lack of coherence in this argument have also contributed to the marginality of the NZAPF within the Church.

Just War Theory

The cessation of anti-Christian persecution and the movement of Christians into positions of power within the Roman Empire had significant implications for the ability of the Church to maintain a pacifist witness. The eclipse of pacifism as the teaching of the Church occurred with what Yoder has termed the “Constantinian Shift.”²¹⁵ As the Church and the Empire came to be more closely identified with one another, the demands of the Sermon on the Mount had to be reconciled in some way with the wielding of temporal power and the maintenance of the Empire. This led to the development of Just War theory.

Just War theory aims to bring the activity of warfare into the ethical realm. It essentially analogises warfare with the corrective coercive internal power of the State to punish criminals. The theory has two major components – *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*, which relate to the just conditions for going to war and just conduct within warfare, respectively. Over the long history of the Just War tradition, various ethicists and theologians have given different formulations of the criteria under which a war can be considered just, and this summary is necessarily brief.

²¹⁵ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 57.

Jus ad bellum criteria typically include some variation on the following: the war must be waged under the auspices of a legitimate authority; the war must be fought to redress an obvious wrong; the costs of the war must be proportional to the wrong that is being redressed; the war must be fought with the intention of establishing peace, and without malice; war must be the last resort, in the event that non-violent negotiation and arbitration have failed; the war must have a reasonable chance of success. *Jus in bello* criteria typically include: discrimination between guilty and innocent, which leads to immunity for non-combatants; damage done should be limited to what is necessary for the achievement of the war aims, and proportional to the wrong which was the cause of the war.²¹⁶

Just War Theory and Modern Warfare

The destructiveness of modern warfare presents a challenge to those who would defend at least some recent conflicts in terms of the Just War tradition. The entire history of the NZAPF has taken place in the nuclear age. Nuclear weapons have become the ultimate symbol of this heightened destructiveness, though it should be noted that in terms of casualties, their effect was not as profound as that of the large scale conventional bombing campaigns over London, Berlin, Dresden or Tokyo during the Second World War. These campaigns constituted a clear violation of at least one of the *jus in bello* provisions of Just War theory, that of non-combatant immunity. The threatened widespread use of nuclear weapons, particularly in the sense of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) during the Cold War, is also clearly problematic for the principle of proportionality. It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which the deaths of potentially hundreds of millions of civilians could be considered

²¹⁶ See for instance: Paul Ramsey, *The Just War* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968); Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1992); Teichman, *Pacifism and the Just War*; Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*.

the lesser evil. Furthermore, Just War theory stipulates that there must be a reasonable chance of success. Any nuclear attack by either the United States or the Soviet Union would have guaranteed a massive response, causing widespread damage to both sides, so unless the conditions for success included the devastation of the main population centres, ecological destruction and likely crippling of most government functions, even a relative victory could scarcely be called successful. Violations of non-combatant immunity certainly pre-date modern warfare, so it is rather the scale of civilian deaths, or the principle of proportionality, that is substantially challenged by nuclear weapons and by the destructiveness of modern warfare more generally. There are two potential responses to this challenge for the Just War theorist. The first is to maintain that the traditional formulation of Just War theory remains relevant, which tends to lead to a rejection of the possession of nuclear weapons as unjust. This has been the reaction of many within the Catholic Church. Of particular note are Pope Paul VI's 1965 encyclical *Gaudium et spes* and the 1983 US Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter *The Challenge of Peace*. The second is to update and re-contextualise the Just War tradition in order to allow for the use of nuclear weapons, or at least to justify possession of nuclear weapons on the basis of deterrence or limited use. A number of Christian ethicists within academia, such as Paul Ramsey and George Weigel, have adopted this approach. Weigel in particular argues for the priority of *ad bellum* just war principles concerning "dynamic and rightly ordered political community",²¹⁷ criticising the stress that *The Challenge of Peace* lays on the criterion of proportionality.

From a secular perspective, Michael Walzer has argued that nuclear weapons "explode the theory of justice in war" and that "our familiar notions about *jus in bello*

²¹⁷ George Weigel, "Moral Clarity in a Time of War," *First Things* 129 no. 1 (2004): 24.

require us to condemn even the threat to use them.”²¹⁸ The principles of proportionality and right conduct are violated by the use nuclear weapons. It can, however, be maintained that just wars are possible in the modern era, as long as they do not employ these methods. As a matter of individual casuistry, modern wars may be accepted or rejected as just, irrespective of the existence of nuclear weapons. For example, Walzer rejected the Vietnam War on Just War principles, and more recently, representatives of most major churches rejected the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, again using Just War principles.

As pacifists, NZAPF members were not concerned to update Just War theory so that it made sense in modern terms. NZAPF engagement with Just War theory took the form of a rhetorical strategy, an argument designed to elicit support for the pacifist position. The argument was repeatedly employed by the NZAPF in their correspondence with non-pacifist Anglicans.

The NZAPF Argument involving Just War Theory

Despite its historic importance, there are no references to Just War theory in the early correspondence of the NZAPF. It was first mentioned in a letter sent by the Auckland branch to the US consulate in 1963, which argued that there was no possibility of a just war involving nuclear weapons.²¹⁹ The appearance of Just War concerns was thus a reflection of the NZAPF strategy of proposing more practical reasons for pacifism in order to persuade others within the Church. This tendency, as noted above, became more pronounced at the time of the growth of the Wellington and Auckland sub-branches. The NZAPF adopted the specific formulation of Just War criteria used in the German Dominican priest Franziskus Stratmann’s

²¹⁸ Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, 282.

²¹⁹ NZAPF, Letter to the U.S. Consulate in Auckland, February 4th 1963, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

The Church and War.²²⁰ Stratmann gives a list of ten conditions,²²¹ which represent a synthesis of the criteria given at various times by Augustine, Aquinas and Francis de Victoria. Using these criteria, NZAPF members arrived at an argument which sought to show that pacifism was the only permissible Christian response to modern warfare.

An indicative formulation of the argument can be found in a letter prepared by the Auckland sub-branch of the NZAPF and sent to the Bishops of the Province in preparation for the 1988 Lambeth conference:

The theory of the Just War is no longer tenable with nuclear war – (i) there is no longer reasonable chance of victory (ii) there is likely to be more damage and distress caused by the war than by the wrong which is the cause of it (iii) the involvement of non-combatants is total.... The two other attitudes which Christians have taken towards war in the past are pacifism and crusade. Pacifism was general in the early Church and is well authenticated by the early Fathers.... The crusade was a war of military conquest against the infidel in the name of the Cross, but this is not being seriously considered by Anglicans today, nor can it be scripturally tenable for other Christians.... We recommend... that the normative response of Anglicans to war, military service and armed struggle should be conscientious objection.²²²

The argument is structurally very similar to that put forward by Roland Bainton towards the end of his *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*,²²³ and can be summarised as follows: There are three possible Christian (and therefore Anglican) responses to war – these are the Just War, Crusade or Holy War, and pacifism. The Crusade is no longer upheld by the Anglican Church as a possible response.

²²⁰ See, for example, "Three Answers – an examination or dialogue", APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

²²¹ Franziskus Stratmann, *The Church and War* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1928), 79.

²²² Chris Barfoot, Philip Crump & Sandra Jackson, "Response from the NZAPF to Lambeth 1978 Resolution 5, The Seven Theses (APF) and 'Peace and Justice – Working paper for Lambeth 1988'", October 12th 1987, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 17.

²²³ Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, 248.

Additionally, modern warfare, in its technological sophistication, particularly the use of nuclear weapons, has made the Just War an untenable response. With the Just War and the Crusade rejected as possible Christian responses to modern warfare, only pacifism remains. Therefore, the normative response of the Anglican Church to modern warfare should be pacifism, instantiated through conscientious objection.

A Critique of the Argument

The NZAPF argument raises two concerns. The first is related to the difficulty that NZAPF members found in persuading non-pacifist Anglicans to debate in theological terms. The argument over-estimates the role of Just War theory in guiding how most Anglicans thought about war. The second is that the argument is incoherent in rejecting Just War theory on the grounds that it disallows modern warfare. Rejection of modern warfare using Just War criteria is just a successful application of Just War theory in a negative case.

Christian Responses to War

The first premise ostensibly provides an exhaustive list of Christian responses to war. If this premise is considered to be a *descriptive* historical statement about how Christians have responded to war, it is very difficult to validate. Wherever Christians have participated in war at the command of whatever relevant secular authority without seeking a specifically Christian justification for that participation, the statement must be considered inaccurate. In refining Bainton's tripartite taxonomy of Christian responses, Yoder, for example, has already included a fourth category, that of the "blank check", which seeks to recognise "that one of the real moral options has always been not to express any specific critical judgement at all on the violence of

the ruler.”²²⁴ Yoder argues that his new category introduces an important distinction between Just War theory proper, and the more lax interpretations that have sometimes fallen under its rubric; “the difference ... is not just a game in logic,”²²⁵ but rather has significant implications for the treatment of conscientious objectors, the prosecution of war crimes and the nature of political discourse. Such a response is often justified by emphasising the separation of the public and private spheres of morality. Where this separation is relatively complete, a blank check response is more natural. Just War theory, by contrast, seeks to bring Christian principles to bear on the political decision-making process, and thus implies a closer relationship between the two spheres.

While Just War theory is the stated ethic of the Anglican Church, it is worth noting, that the wording of Article 37 of the 39 Articles makes no mention of justice, but refers only to the “commandment of the Magistrate” as legitimising Christian participation in war.²²⁶ While proper authority is an important part of the *jus ad bellum* component of Just War theory, it is not by itself sufficient to establish the justice of a particular war. Article 37 can thus be used to support any non-pacifist response to war, including that of the blank check. For the Anglican Church in New Zealand, perhaps even the blank check is inaccurate as a historical categorisation of the response to war. The Boer War excited no significant criticism,²²⁷ which would seem to be a blank check response, but by the time of the First World War, members of the Church issued more militant statements: “Through Thee will we overthrow our enemies, and in Thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us.”²²⁸ This

²²⁴ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 33.

²²⁵ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 35.

²²⁶ “Anglicans Online | The Thirty-Nine Articles,” accessed April 20, 2011, http://www.anglicansonline.org/basics/thirty-nine_articles.html.

²²⁷ Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa*, 95

²²⁸ *Church Gazette*, 1 October 1914, 171, quoted in Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa*, 96.

kind of language is more characteristic of the Crusade than the Just War or blank check responses. The Second World War saw no comparable blood-thirstiness or wholesale identification of the war aims of the state with the purpose and designs of God, but neither did the Church criticise the obliteration bombing of German and Japanese cities and the corresponding civilian casualties in Just War terms.²²⁹ Military necessity, by and large, trumped specifically Christian moral considerations. Clearly, not all non-pacifists within the Church were Just War adherents. As with the other dioceses, the NZAPF sent out a questionnaire in 1967 to Wellington clergy asking where they stood on the pacifist issue.²³⁰ Of the twenty-four who responded, only six were Just War adherents, with fifteen respondents either claiming to be either non-pacifist or undecided.²³¹

Despite its presentation as an historical assertion, the first premise of the NZAPF argument is thus better understood as a *prescriptive* statement. Roger Taylor's early complaint that the NZAPF's "fellow Church people who are not pacifists ... succeed in remaining non-pacifists only by keeping the problem of war and peace as something irrelevant to the Cross,"²³² was obviously focused on pacifism. However it implies a certain frustration with those within the Church who refused, or were at least not inclined to consider the moral questions of warfare within a specifically Christian context. In a May 1971 newsletter, then NZAPF chairman Walter Robinson applied the words of Jacques Ellul in *Violence*²³³ to the New Zealand Anglican

²²⁹ Even in England, such criticism was limited to a few dissident voices like that of George Bell, Bishop of Chichester during the war.

²³⁰ NZAPF, Questionnaire Sent to Wellington Clergy, May 4th 1967, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 7.

²³¹ Anonymous, Compilation of Results of Wellington Questionnaire, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 18.

²³² Roger Taylor, Letter to NZAPF Members, January 14th 1953, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 1.

²³³ Jacques Ellul, *Violence: Reflections from a Christian Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1970).

context, quoting “that Christians conform to the trend of the moment without introducing into it anything specifically Christian.”²³⁴

Both Just War theory and Christian pacifism are attempts to bring a specifically Christian ethical perspective to the problem of war. In this sense they both stand against the blank check response. The NZAPF did not make common cause with Just War theorists in the Church because their absolute pacifism regards Just War theory as an unacceptable compromise.

Using Just War Criteria to Reject Just War Theory

The NZAPF argument was instead that modern warfare presented an insurmountable challenge to the Just War tradition, which should therefore be abandoned in favour of pacifism. From the early 1960s onward, this was a perennial feature of NZAPF engagement with the Anglican Church. Writing to Wellington clergy in 1966, Lance Robinson said that the NZAPF were “convinced that arguments such as that for a ‘just war’ are, in the words of John XXIII, ‘hardly tenable’ when applied to modern warfare.”²³⁵ The 1968 pamphlet on military service argued that “the ‘just war’ theory traditionally held by the main denominations of the Church can no longer be used to justify modern war, mainly because of the indiscriminate involvement of non-combatants and the scale and intensity of all modern weapons, conventional as well as nuclear.”²³⁶ Chris Barfoot’s annual report for 1968 re-affirmed the view that “nuclear weapons have put paid to any possibility of just war.”²³⁷

²³⁴ Walter Robinson, Newsletter, May 1971, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 15.

²³⁵ Lance Robinson, Letter to Wellington Clergy March 28th 1966, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 6.

²³⁶ NZAPF, “A Christian Attitude toward Military Service”.

²³⁷ Chris Barfoot, Annual Report for 1968, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 13.

This argument presents two obvious difficulties. The first is that the NZAPF take for granted that Just War theory rejects nuclear war, but do not engage in any substantial way with the literature on this topic. However, given that they are a pacifist group, this is a lesser concern. The second and more compelling difficulty is that the argument against modern warfare is also seen as an argument against Just War theory. A passage from the NZAPF's 1986 submission to the Defence Review Committee shows how these two points have gone together:

Pacifists in all the Churches see the pacifist witness of the first 300 years of the Church's life as a truer response to the life and teaching of Christ, and to the leading of God's spirit, than the compromise of the Just War doctrine which developed thereafter and became accepted teaching in most Churches, though always, in theory, with much qualification as to causes for, probable effects of, and means used in, going to war. In any case modern wars, and certainly nuclear war, have made their justification on the basis of this doctrine no longer tenable.²³⁸

For the premise about Just War theory to do the work that the argument requires it to do, it must argue that Just War theory is not a permissible Christian response to war. This is separate from the argument about modern warfare, however, and the last excerpt cited above shows how these two arguments have become conflated. Just War theory is rejected because it is a "compromise", pacifism being a "truer response to ... Christ". Without assessing the validity of this argument, it is clearly a coherent and defensible one. On the other hand, regarding the (assumed) incompatibility of modern warfare and Just War theory as an argument for the rejection of Just War theory is incoherent. The NZAPF argument uses Just War criteria to criticise the conduct of modern warfare, but then goes on to reject not only modern warfare, but Just War theory itself. If the rejection of modern warfare on Just

²³⁸ NZAPF, Submission to Defence Review Committee, Undated February 1986, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 11.

War grounds is legitimate, then this argument strengthens the viability of Just War theory as a framework for moral decision-making, rather than weakening it, much less doing away with it entirely. An argument against war is only an argument for pacifism if it criticises war from a pacifist perspective, rather than a Just War perspective. Yoder has pointed this out as part of his account of the relationship between pacifism and Just War theory.²³⁹ However, no NZAPF literature or correspondence provides evidence of a recognition of this intrinsic tension. Although the *Christ and War* series of studies produced by the NZAPF as a response to the World Council of Churches' (WCC) proposed Decade to Overcome Violence includes a section on the Just War, wherein it is noted that there are areas "where the just war may be reassessed basically on its own criteria,"²⁴⁰ the paradoxical nature of this assessment is not pursued.

Conclusion

Because of the important position that Just War theory holds within the Anglican Church, the NZAPF often argued by applying Just War criteria to particular conflicts. Meeting with representatives of other Christian pacifist groups, including the Catholic group Pax Christi, the CPS and the Society of Friends at the 2001 NZAPF conference, members decided that the invasion of Afghanistan did not constitute a Just War,²⁴¹ which is a mildly curious thing to find avowed pacifists saying. This is another reflection of the central interplay in NZAPF history between absolute pacifism and the reform impulse. If the incompatibility of Just War theory and modern warfare is granted, the non-anarchistic pacifism of the NZAPF would differ very little

²³⁹ Yoder, *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, 348-349.

²⁴⁰ NZAPF, *Christ and War: A Series of Eight Studies* (Auckland: New Zealand Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, 2003), 56.

²⁴¹ Anonymous, 2001 Conference Minutes, Barfoot Papers, Minutes, Letters, Conference Papers, 1990-2001.

in practice from a rigorously applied Just War approach. Particularly in light of the difficulty that the NZAPF had in convincing non-pacifist Anglicans to treat war and peace issues in a distinctively Christian and theological fashion, this can be seen as another instance of the commitment to absolute pacifism contributing to the Fellowship's marginality. Collapsing the difference between Just War theory and pacifism did not help to clarify the nature and significance of the pacifist position. Rather, it arguably obscured the NZAPF's contribution, as well as the value of belonging to the organisation.

Just War theory is an important strand of the Christian response to war. It gained increased prominence as a response to the involvement of non-combatants and other concerns around modern warfare. As this chapter has argued, the NZAPF did not engage with the tradition in depth but rather used it as part of an argument in support of their own absolutist pacifism. However, this approach relied upon an incoherent rejection of Just War derived from Just War criteria. An argument for pacifism cannot employ Just War theory in this fashion. To maintain a distinction between rigorous Just War theory and pacifism requires the rejection of Just War theory on pacifist grounds, such as in an assertion that war, or killing is always wrong. The NZAPF's position in this respect was inconsistent, as they used Just War criteria to criticise particular conflicts, like the invasion of Afghanistan, while rejecting the framework which made this assessment possible.

CONCLUSION

Throughout its history, the NZAPF has held true to the characteristics which defined the Fellowship at the outset. Even within the context of post-World War Two New Zealand, the Fellowship has retained its commitment to an absolute and all-encompassing pacifism. Members have also kept their primary focus on witness to the Anglican Church itself. The NZAPF has not swerved from its primary message: that Christian discipleship demands personal and political pacifism as an integral part of the “humble attempt to make our lives compatible with the teaching and example of our Lord.”²⁴² Through correspondence, meetings, synod resolutions and Sidney Hinkes’ “mission”, they have brought this conviction before the Anglican Church in New Zealand in the hope that non-pacifist Anglicans might see the incompatibility of warfare with the ethical demands of the Christian faith. As members of the broader peace movement, they have been less directly active than most, preferring the quiet approach of prayer vigils and persuasion through education to the noisy agitation of public protest.

With respect to prioritising purity of message or growth, the NZAPF has chosen purity of message. This has led to marginality even as New Zealand society in general has become more peaceful. In a time of no conscription, most New Zealanders have little immediate concern with issues of war and peace. Successive New Zealand governments have adopted relatively peaceful stances on nuclear testing and nuclear ship visits, and, since the 1980s, largely kept out of international conflict – with the exception of a small number of special forces sent to Afghanistan

²⁴² Lance Robinson, Circular letter to NZAPF Members, Undated (early) 1960, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 4.

in support of the US-led invasion. But this peacefulness does not stem from a prior commitment to absolute pacifism, but a pragmatic foreign policy based on the desire to avoid unnecessary conflict, and the geographical isolation which allows it. The peace groups which pressed for New Zealand withdrawal from Vietnam, and promoted the idea of a nuclear free pacific were mostly humanitarian in their motivations. Furthermore, they were focused on specific issues rather than a broad and complete pacifism. New Zealand society has also become increasingly secular. The NZAPF style of pacifism remained substantially contiguous with the inter-war liberal Protestant pacifist tradition which spawned its parent organisation.

NZAPF pacifism was also distinctively shaped by its adherence to conscientious objection as the political manifestation of a personal pacifist conviction. This was substantially because they maintained, in Ceadel's terms, an "ideological" orientation to the State, which treats the political order as essentially decent and demands non-compliance only in the case where the demands of citizenship clash irreconcilably with the pacifist position, as with conscription. However, this too contributed to their marginality as the power of conscientious objection weakened in the face of the greater technological sophistication of modern warfare. Without conscription, the NZAPF have had to find new ways of articulating the political ramifications of their pacifism, and this discussion is still embryonic.

The character of NZAPF pacifism is absolutist in its rejection of war, but, driven by the demands of persuasion, the Fellowship has been drawn into offering some pragmatic defence of the pacifist position. However, this appeal to practicality was circumscribed by the prior commitment to pacifism. Between World Wars One and Two there had been an alliance between committed pacifism and the quasi-pacifist prudential rejection of war that characterised what A.J.P. Taylor and Ceadel have

termed “pacifism.” World War Two broke this alliance as most “pacifists” found that they were willing to bear arms in the cause of defeating Hitler. On many subsequent issues such as the Vietnam War or the Second Gulf War, “pacifists” and pacifists have found themselves once again in agreement, but the pacifist commitment to peaceful methods irrespective of context has proved a stumbling block, even for those who are substantially sympathetic. Where the choice is between war and an intolerably unjust subjection, the pacifist position becomes much more counter-intuitive, and much more demanding to uphold.

Here, the religious character of NZAPF pacifism becomes most apparent. The Fellowship was formed in the post-war environment by the Thompsons and the Taylors, who had maintained a pacifist position throughout World War Two, despite its apparent ineffectiveness in immediate terms. As an English APF member, the novelist Vera Brittain, wrote during the war:

Pacifism is nothing other than a belief in the ultimate transcendence of love over power. This belief comes from inward assurance. It is untouched by logic and beyond argument – though there are many arguments both for and against it. And each person’s assurance is individual; his inspiration cannot arise from another’s reasons, nor can its authority be quenched by another’s scepticism.²⁴³

The symbol of this “ultimate transcendence” is the Resurrection. Consequently, the practical arguments regarding immediate efficacy that NZAPF members gave for their pacifism were always of lesser importance than those that drew on the vindication which was shown by the Resurrection. However, even within the Anglican Church, this line of argument was not influential. Kenneth Stead’s history of Anglican pacifism in Auckland notes the fundamental “failure ... to even persuade the Church

²⁴³ Vera Brittain, *Humiliation with Honour* (London: Andrew Dakers, 1942), 8.

to engage in dialogue on the issues when they were presented in Christian rather than secular terms.”²⁴⁴ Concerns with immediate efficacy continued to weigh heavily on potential non-pacifist converts to the pacifist position. The educative approach therefore made little headway. Non-pacifist Anglican interlocutors tended not to challenge the pacifist reading of Christ, but to regard it as irrelevant to their views on war. As with broader society, the Anglican Church became more peaceful in its outlook over the course of the NZAPF’s history, but this owed more to a revived Just War tradition than to pacifism.

NZAPF engagement with Just War theory was partial and used Just War as part of an argument for pacifism. However, this argument failed to account for the prevalence of the “blank check” response among non-pacifist Anglicans, and furthermore, rejected Just War theory while employing Just War principles. Instead of making common cause with rigorous Just War adherents on particular issues, the NZAPF retained its absolute rejection of war to the detriment of their influence and growth.

This thesis has focused on the limited success of the NZAPF in persuading others to become pacifists. But there is another dimension to the NZAPF role, which has gone largely without comment. Charles Chandler wrote in 1961 that “our pacifist beliefs are first expressed on the level of our personal relationships. It is a Christian philosophy that permeates the whole of Christian living.”²⁴⁵ Through meetings, retreats and correspondence, the NZAPF has enabled members to support one another in their personal conviction of pacifism. Additionally, they have promoted and facilitated study and engagement with contemporary issues of war and peace in

²⁴⁴ Stead, "Involvement of Members of the Auckland Diocese of the Anglican Church in the Peace Movement since 1945".

²⁴⁵ Charles Chandler, NZAPF Newsletter, Undated (late) 1961, APFNZ Branch Records, Folder 5.

the light of Christian pacifism. This they have done with great integrity. The search for a meaningful application for Christian pacifism in the modern context continues to this day.

Adherence to absolute pacifism rather than engagement with sympathetic elements within and without the Church has certainly played a large part in the Fellowship's marginality. But another aspect is the intrinsically demanding nature of pacifism itself. In times of war, the potential consequences for adopting a pacifist stance have included physical and mental torture. This can only be faced with courage. Even in times of peace, it has been an unpopular position, and pacifists are often reviled as being naïve and idealistic at best, and cowardly at worst.

In early twenty-first century New Zealand it is easy to believe that international conflict is a distant issue. But our peacefulness is easily won. When there is no conscription, no large-scale involvement in war, the Christian pacifist must become a peace-maker. Especially since the 1980s, the most important arena for the pacifist witness in New Zealand may not be that of actual international conflict, but of those things that make for conflict; poverty, the arms race, racism and inequality. The economic troubles of the 1930s played no small part in creating the conditions that eventually led to World War Two. As this conclusion is being written, protesters are camped out on the steps of St Paul's Cathedral in London, drawing attention to the extremes of wealth and poverty that the global financial system has created. The Anglican Church has an opportunity to champion the dispossessed and help to create a just peace. Within the Church, the NZAPF's uncompromising standard and integrity represents a faithful contribution to the dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Unpublished Material

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship New Zealand Branch: Records, MS Group 0129: 91-134, Folders 1-21. Alexander Turnbull Library.

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship New Zealand Branch: Records, MS Group 0129: Folders MS-4496-1, MS-4496-2, MS-4496-3, MSX-3474.

New Zealand Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, Miscellaneous Records (1990-2010), Chris Barfoot Papers, Auckland.

Books and Pamphlets

New Zealand Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, "A Christian Attitude toward Military Service: A guide to those required to register for Military Training." Self-published pamphlet, 1968.

New Zealand Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, "Christ and War: A Series of Eight Studies." Self-published pamphlet, 2003.

Gale, Ali. *The Establishment of the Aotearoa New Zealand Peace & Conflict Studies Centre Trust*. Prepared for an AUT Cooperative Education Practicum, November 2009.

Websites

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Aotearoa New Zealand Homepage.
<http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/apf/> (accessed 10 March 2010)

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Homepage.
<http://www.anglicanpacifists.com/index.php/1/home> (accessed 10 March 2010).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Anscombe, G.E.M. *Nuclear Weapons: A Catholic Response*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1962.

Bacrach, David S. *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300- c. 1215*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

Bainton, Roland H. *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.

- Baxter, Archibald. *We Will Not Cease*. Christchurch: Caxton Press, 1965.
- Berry, Christine. *The New Zealand Student Christian Movement, 1896-1996: A Centennial History*. Christchurch: The Student Christian Movement of Aotearoa, 1998.
- Brittain, Vera. *Humiliation with Honour*. London: Andrew Dakers, 1942.
- Brock, Peter. *Twentieth-Century Pacifism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970.
- Brock, Peter. *Varieties of Pacifism: A Survey from Antiquity to the Outset of the Twentieth Century*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998 (1981).
- Ceadel, Martin. *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Chickering, Roger. *Imperial Germany and a World Without War: The Peace Movement and German Society 1892-1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Clements, Kevin P. *Back from the Brink: The Creation of a Nuclear-Free New Zealand*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1988.
- Clouse, Robert, ed. *War: Four Christian Views*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1981.
- Crane, Ernest. *I Can Do No Other: A Biography of the Reverend Ormond Burton*. Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1986.
- Davidson, Allan K. *Christianity in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Education for Ministry, 1991.
- Davidson, Allan K., ed. *Living Legacy: A History of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland*. Auckland: Anglican Diocese of Auckland, 2011.
- Davidson, Allan K. and Lineham, Peter. *Transplanted Christianity: Documents illustrating aspects of New Zealand Church History*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1987.
- Davis, Brian. *The Way Ahead: Anglican Change and Prospect in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Caxton Press, 1995.
- Ellul, Jacques. *Violence: Reflections from a Christian Perspective*. Translated by Cecilia Gaul Kings. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Fitzgerald, Charlotte. *Peace Movement Aotearoa: Bibliography of Peace Archives*. Wellington: The Movement, 1991.
- Galvin, Ray. *The Peace of Christ in a Nuclear Age*. Auckland: G.W. Moore Ltd., 1983.

- Gibb, James. *Making Proof of the Ministry*. Wellington: Reed, 1935.
- Glover, Rupert Granville. *New Zealand in Vietnam: A Study in the Use of Force in International Law*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1986.
- Grant, David. *A Question of Faith: A History of the New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society*. Wellington: Philip Garside Publishing, 2004.
- Grant, David. *Field Punishment No. 1: Archibald Baxter, Mark Briggs and New Zealand's Anti-Militarist Tradition*. Wellington: Steele Roberts, 2008.
- Grant, David. *Out in the Cold: Pacifists and Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand During World War II*. Auckland: Reed Methuen, 1986.
- Guy, Laurie. *Shaping Godzone: Public Issues and Church Voices in New Zealand 1840-2000*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2011.
- Hauerwas, Stanley and Wells, Samuel. *The Blackwell Companion to Christian Ethics*, Malden: Blackwell, 2004.
- Haworth, Geoffrey. *Marching as to War? The Anglican Church in New Zealand during World War II*. Christchurch: Wily Publications, 2008.
- Ker, John M. and Sharpe, Kevin J., eds. *Toward an Authentic New Zealand Theology: Proceedings of the 1982 Meetings of the Auckland Theology Forum*. Auckland: University of Auckland Chaplaincy Publishing Trust, 1984.
- Locke, Elsie. *Peace People: A History of Peace Activities in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Hazard Press, 1992.
- Maguire, Daniel. *The Horrors We Bless: Rethinking the Just-War Legacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Mathews, Shailer. *Jesus on Social Institutions*. New York: MacMillan, 1928.
- Morell, W. P. *The Anglican Church in New Zealand: A History*. Dunedin: Anglican Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1973.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *The Challenge of Peace*. Washington D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001 (1932).
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christianity and Power Politics*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1969.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey. *Christian Pacifism in History*. Berkeley: World Without War Council, 1971.

O'Donovan, Oliver. *The Just War Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Orr, Edgar. *Christian Pacifism*. Ashington: The C. W. Daniel Company Ltd., 1958.

Patterson, Eric, ed. *Christianity and Power Politics Today: Christian Realism and Contemporary Political Dilemmas*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Rabel, Roberto. *New Zealand and the Vietnam War: Politics and Diplomacy*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2005.

Ramsey, Paul. *Basic Christian Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

Ramsey, Paul. *The Just War*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.

Raven, Charles. *Is War Obsolete? A Study of the Conflicting Claims of Religion and Citizenship*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1935.

Raven, Charles. *The Cross and the Crisis*. London: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1940.

Raven, Charles. *The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism*. New York: Fellowship Publications, 1951.

Raven, Charles. *War and the Christian*. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1938.

Rain, Lynn. *Community: The Story of Riverside, 1941-1991*. Lower Moutere: Riverside Community, 1991.

Reid, Charles J., ed. *Peace in a Nuclear Age: The Bishops' Pastoral Letter in Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986.

Robinson, John A. T. *Honest to God*. London: SCM Press, 1963.

Roth, John D. *Choosing Against War: A Christian View. "A Love Stronger Than Our Fears"*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2002.

Stratmann, Franziskus. *The Church and War*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1928.

Teichman, Jenny. *Pacifism and the Just War*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1986.

Ulrich, John. *Journey Towards World Peace: A History of the New Zealand Peace Council*. Wellington: Lake Ohia, 1998.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Wilkinson, Alan. *Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945*. London: SCM Press, 1986.

Wink, Walter. *The Powers That Be: Theology for a New Millennium*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Yoder, John Howard. *Christian Attitudes to War, Peace and Revolution*, edited by Theodore J. Koontz and Andy Alexis-Baker. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009.

Book Chapters and Articles

Ahdar, Rex J. "A Christian State?" *Journal of Law and Religion* 13, no. 2 (1999): 453-482.

Alexandra, Andrew. "Political Pacifism." *Social Theory and Practice* 29, no. 4 (2003): 589-606.

Biggar, Nigel. "Specify and Distinguish! Interpreting the New Testament on 'Non-Violence'" *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22, no. 2 (2009): 164-184.

Biggar, Nigel. "The New Testament and Violence: Round Two." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 23, no. 1 (2010): 73-80.

Branford, David. "From Pacifism to Just War: Changing Attitudes in the Church of England 1930 to 1940." *Modern Believing* 49, no. 2 (2008): 14-21.

Browne, Merv. "The Courage of a Conscientious Objector". *Peace Review* 18, no. 2 (2006): 221-226.

Bullert, Gary B. "Reinhold Niebuhr and *The Christian Century*: World War II and the Eclipse of the Social Gospel." *Journal of Church and State* 44, no. 2 (2002): 271-290.

Cahill, Lisa Sowle. "Theological Contexts of Just War Theory and Pacifism: A Response to J. Bryan Hehir." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 20, no. 2 (1992): 259-265.

Ceadel, Martin. "Ten Distinctions for Peace Historians." In *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, edited by Harvey L. Dyck, 17-35. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Clark, Mark T. "The Paradox of War and Pacifism." *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 47, (1995): 220-232.

Clements, Kevin P. "New Zealand's Role in Promoting a Nuclear-Free Pacific." *Journal of Peace Research* 25, no. 4 (1988): 395-410.

Clough, David. "On the Relevance of Jesus Christ for Christian Judgements About the Legitimacy of Violence: A Modest Proposal." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22, no. 2 (2009): 199-210.

Cookson, J. E. "Appeal Boards and Conscientious Objectors". In *Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War*, edited by John Crawford, 173-198. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Cookson, J. E. "Illiberal New Zealand: The Formation of Government Policy on Conscientious Objection, 1940-1." *New Zealand Journal of History* 17, no. 2 (1983): 120-143.

Cookson, J.E. "Pacifism and Conscientious Objection in New Zealand". In *Challenge to Mars: Essays on Pacifism from 1914-1945*, edited by Peter Brock and Thomas P. Socknat, 292-311. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Dalin, David G. "Judaism and American public life : a symposium." *First Things* 11 (1991): 16-36

Davidson, Allan K. "Peace and Pacifism: New Zealand Presbyterians 1901-45." In *Reforming the Reformation: Essays in Honour of Principal Peter Matheson*, edited by Ian Breward, 181-96. Melbourne: Australian Scholarly, 2004.

Dorrien, Gary. "American Liberal Theology: Crisis, Irony, Decline, Renewal, Ambiguity." *Cross Currents* 55, no. 4 (2006): 456-481.

Evans, John. "Government Support of the Church in the Modern Era." *Journal of Law and Religion* 13, no. 2 (1999): 517-530.

Geering, Lloyd. "New Zealand Enters the Secular Age". In *Religion in New Zealand* edited by Christopher Nichol and James Veitch, 238-263. Wellington: Victoria University, 1980.

Green, Clifford J. "Pacifism and Tyrannicide: Bonhoeffer's Christian Peace Ethic." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 18, no. 3 (2005): 31-47.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Religion in the Public Sphere." *European Journal of Philosophy* 14, no. 1 (2006): 1-25.

Hays, Richard B. "Narrate and Embody: A Response To Nigel Biggar, 'Specify and Distinguish.'" *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22, no. 2 (2009): 185-198.

Hays, Richard B. "The Thorny Task of Reconciliation: Another Response to Nigel Biggar." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 23, no. 1 (2010): 81-86.

Johnson, James Turner. "Can a Pacifist have a Conversation with Augustine? A Response to Alain Epp Weaver." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 29, no. 1 (2001): 87-93.

Johnson, James Turner. "Just War in the Thought of Paul Ramsey." *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 19. no. 2 (1991): 183-207.

Johnson, Kermit D. "The Nuclear Reality: Beyond Niebuhr and the Just War." *The Christian Century* 99, no. 31 (1982): 1014-1017.

Kemp, Kenneth W. "Personal Pacifism." *Theological Studies* 56, no. 1 (1995): 21-38.

Lineham, Peter. "The Religious Face of Patriotism: New Zealand Churches in the Second World War". In *Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War*, edited by John Crawford, 199-220. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Lineham, Peter. "Social Policy and the Churches in the 1990's and Beyond". In *The Future of Christianity*, edited by John Stenhouse and Brett Knowles, 142-182. Adelaide: Australian Theological Forum Press, 2004.

Martens, Paul. "The New Old Challenge to Just War Reflection: Nuclear Weapons" *Didaskalia* 17, no. 1 (2005): 19-36.

Miller, Richard B. "Christian Pacifism and Just-War Tenets: How Do They Diverge?" *Theological Studies* 47, no. 3 (1986): 448-472.

Moses, John A. "Anglicanism and Anzac Observance: The Essential Contribution of Canon David John Garland." *Pacifica* 19 (2006): 58-77.

Narveson, Jan. "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis." *Ethics* 75, no. 4 (1965): 259-271.

O'Brien, William V. "Just War Doctrine in a Nuclear Context." *Theological Studies* 44, (1983): 191-220.

Overy, Richard. "Parting with Pacifism." *History Today* 59, no. 8 (2009): 23-29.

Paris, Peter J. "Response to Langdon Gilkey's Inaugural Address at the Niebuhr Society, 22 November 2003 in Atlanta." *Political Theology* 5, no. 4 (2004): 475-479.

Reitan, Eric. "The Irreconcilability of Pacifism and Just War Theory: A Response to Sterba (1992)." *Social Theory and Practice* 20, no. 2 (1994): 117-134.

Roedel, John. "Sacrificial and Nonsacrificial Mass Nonviolence." *Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis and Culture* 16, (2009): 221-236.

Smucker, Donald E. "The Theological Basis for Christian Pacifism." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 27, no. 3 (1953): 163-186.

Tillich, Paul. "Christian Basis of a Just and Durable Peace". In *Theology of Peace*, edited by Ronald H. Stone, 73-87. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990.

Towle, Philip. "The Anglican church, the state and modern warfare". In *Civil Society, Religion and Global Governance: Paradigms of power and persuasion*, edited by Helen James, 51-60. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.

Watts, Craig M. "Just War, Pacifism and the Ethics of Protection." *Encounter* 71, no. 1 (2010): 35-62.

Weaver, Alain Epp. "Unjust Lies, Just Wars? A Christian Pacifist Conversation with Augustine." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 29, no. 1 (2001): 51-78.

Weigel, George. "Moral Clarity in a Time of War." *First Things* 129, no.1 (2004): 20-27.

Weitzel, R. L. "Pacifists and Anti-Militarists in New Zealand, 1909-1914." *New Zealand Journal of History* 7, no. 2 (1973): 128-47.

Williams, Rowan. "What is Christianity?" *Islam & Christian-Muslim Relations* 19, no.3 (2008): 325-332.

Yoder, John Howard. "War as a Moral Problem in the Early Church: The Historian's Hermeneutical Assumptions." In *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical Perspective*, edited by Harvey L. Dyck, 90-110. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Theses and Unpublished Documents

Beath, N. "Protestants and Protestors: The Presbyterian Church in New Zealand and the Vietnam War." University of Otago Research Essay in Theology, 2001.

Larsen, Freda. "The Peace Movement in New Zealand, 1909-39" BA honours dissertation in History, Massey University, 1982.

Stead, Kenneth G. "Involvement of Members of the Auckland Diocese of the Anglican Church in the Peace Movement since 1945." MA thesis in Religious Studies, Massey University, 1999.

Stone, J. L. "'A Dwindling Elderly Group Faithfully Preparing for the Last War Instead of the Next?': The New Zealand Christian Pacifist Society in the Vietnam War Period (1963-1973)". BA Hons research exercise in History, Massey University, 2003.

Websites

Anglicans Online. "The Thirty-Nine Articles."
http://www.anglicansonline.org/basics/thirty-nine_articles.html (accessed 20 April 2011).

Elections New Zealand. "Referenda: Elections New Zealand."
<http://www.elections.org.nz/elections/referendum/referendums.html> (accessed 3 December 2010).

Institute of Economics and Peace, Economics Intelligence Unit. "Global Peace Index: 2010 Methodology, Results & Findings."
[http://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/PDF/2010/2010 GPI Results Report.pdf](http://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/PDF/2010/2010_GPI_Results_Report.pdf) (accessed 11 August 2010).

Lambeth Conference Archives.
<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-25.cfm> (accessed 1 August 2011).

Peace Pledge Union Website.

<http://www.ppu.org.uk/ppu/history.html> (accessed 1 August 2011).

Pope Paul VI. "Gaudium et spes".

http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html (accessed 24 November 2011)

Underhill, Evelyn. "The Church and War."

<http://disseminary.org/hoopoe/pubs/underhill.html> (accessed 9 March 2010).