

Title	The church and war : contemporary anglican reflections on war and morality
Sub Title	
Author	原田, 健二郎(Harata, Kenjiro)
Publisher	Global Center of Excellence Center of Governance for Civil Society, Keio University
Publication year	2012
Jtitle	Journal of political science and sociology No.17 (2012. 10) ,p.1- 21
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	This paper explores the Church of England's recent views in the area of war and defence, drawing attention to its just war thinking recently revived by several theologians and churchmen. As a national established church, the Church of England has developed its own approach to modern warfare to meet the political circumstances of the day, on the one hand, and to place strong moral limits on the use of force, on the other. The paper attempts to review several uses of just war theory within Anglicanism in the contexts of the Second World War, nuclear deterrence in the Cold War, humanitarian intervention, the 'war on terrorism' and the Iraq War. On Iraq's case, the paper reflects on arguments by Dr Rowan Williams, the current Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard Harries, the former Bishop of Oxford and the Church's leading expert on just war theory, who both criticised the war in Iraq as unjust. Through this, I ask how the Church's changing attitude towards warfare highlights another unsettled question, namely the relationship between church and state in Britain, and, given the Church's moral concern, whether it benefits from being an Established church.
Notes	
Genre	Journal article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA12117871-20121000-0001

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

The Church and War: Contemporary Anglican Reflections on War and Morality

Kenjiro Harata

Abstract

This paper explores the Church of England's recent views in the area of war and defence, drawing attention to its just war thinking recently revived by several theologians and churchmen. As a national established church, the Church of England has developed its own approach to modern warfare to meet the political circumstances of the day, on the one hand, and to place strong moral limits on the use of force, on the other. The paper attempts to review several uses of just war theory within Anglicanism in the contexts of the Second World War, nuclear deterrence in the Cold War, humanitarian intervention, the 'war on terrorism' and the Iraq War. On Iraq's case, the paper reflects on arguments by Dr Rowan Williams, the current Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard Harries, the former Bishop of Oxford and the Church's leading expert on just war theory, who both criticised the war in Iraq as unjust. Through this, I ask how the Church's changing attitude towards warfare highlights another unsettled question, namely the relationship between church and state in Britain, and, given the Church's moral concern, whether it benefits from being an Established church.

I. Introduction

Perhaps no issue in recent international affairs has sparked more publicly heated debate than the Iraq War. Amongst many contenders in Britain, Archbishop of Canterbury Dr Rowan Williams, the Church of England's most senior cleric, famously opposed the US- and UK-led military action against Iraq, making numerous public pronouncements in the run-up to the war. Creating growing tension with the government led by Tony Blair, one of the most publicly committed Christians in British politics, that seemed to be the Church's symbolic act to reclaim, as it were, its (losing) moral ground upon the nation which has become more secularised than ever. That was also one of the rarest instances – or indeed the first – in recent history that the Church took a stand against the state's major decision like warfare, as the Church had supported most of the wars conducted by modern British gov-

ernments.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the Church of England's responses to and views on modern warfare – with its changing nature and effects upon ethical reasoning –, focusing on just war theory most recently applied to the Iraq War. The role of the Anglican Church in international relations has not sufficiently received scholarly attention, with the exception of a few recent important contributions.¹ Edited by Tim Blewett, Adrian Hyde-Price and Wyn Rees, *British Foreign Policy and the Anglican Church* (2008) focused upon the Church's wider contribution in world affairs from overseas aid and debt cancellation to counter-terrorism and arms trade.² The second worth mentioning is *The Price of Peace: Just War in the Twentieth-First Century* (2007), edited by Charles Reed and David Ryall.³ It grew out of a symposium held in 2005 on the challenge of just war theory in a new security environment largely characterised by 9/11, WMDs and Iraq. Cosponsored by the Church of England and the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, it staged a rare transatlantic dialogue for such eminent theorists – largely from a Christian background – as Jean Bethke Elshtain, James Turner Johnson and George Weigel from the US and David Fischer, Michael Quinlan, Richard Harries and Nigel Biggar from the UK.

As these works particularly show, the Church of England should be a constant interest for any ethical considerations of warfare in the British context. As the largest faith in one of the two major allied and coalition countries – the other being the US – throughout the modern era, and originated as the 'branch church' of the Catholic faith, Anglicanism is broadly committed to the medieval, Catholic just war tradition and practiced it within the framework of the modern national church.⁴ Exploring this aspect, the paper hopes to shed light on the way in which Christian just war ideas have practically engaged with government, public discourse and wider civil society in a specifically British context of church and state.

II. The Church of England in Contemporary Politics

The Church of England as a Christian church in the modern nation-state has an essentially 'dual loyalty' to God and the nation, the universal and the particular. Christians are citizens of the heavenly country as well as of the earthly, and the majority of British soldiers have historically been Christians – a substantial number of them being members of the established church. In a historically warring Christendom in Europe, the Christian churches, Catholic as well as Protestant, had to offer soldiers in the battlefield secure moral judgement not to harm or risk their consciences.

The Church of England assumes numerous public functions in the secular state – the most symbolic one being the anointing of the monarch at the Coronation – to 'infuse' its religious nature into politics. Alongside the monarchy, Parliament, the Cabinet and the judiciary, the established Church is best characterised as a 'missing dimension' or 'hidden wiring' of the unwritten British constitution – although its privileged status is significantly challenged by today's plural and secular trends in British society.⁵

The Church and the government, neither being ‘interdependent’ nor completely independent from each other, have sought to create ‘critical solidarity’, a mutually critical but constructive partnership, to address the nation’s political and moral concerns. From the Christian perspective, it is imperative for any churches to find a narrow path or middle way between Erastianism and extreme antistatism where their prophetic voice has an effective political impact.⁶

A crucially testing moment for this is obviously the time of war. The waging of war and the use of violence always test the way Christianity – as an institution as well as an individual’s inner conscience – fulfills its often incompatible duties towards God and human beings. The Christian churches which, from the primitive era, have voiced against violence – as Jesus said that ‘ye resist not evil’ (Matthew 5:39) and ‘all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword’ (Mat 26:52) – can be a legitimate counterbalance and moral check to the state. In so doing the Church of England has sought to address and confront the government, not in a simpler form of absolute pacifism or antiwar protests, but rather with the realism – or pragmatism – of actively engaging with the government to press, to the last, for a morally legitimate conduct of warfare. The Church can raise, prior to and during the war, public awareness on a peaceful means to avoid war, moral analysis on the cause of conflict and responsible ways to right and end the use of force, by the powers not of coercion but words and persuasion.

Frequent communications between the Church, government officials, ministers, MPs and the military exist even now, in a higher degree than any voluntary or non-established groups can have. Various instruments including bishops as ‘Lords Spiritual’ in the House of Lords, the General Synod, the Church’s Parliament, associate groups like Christian Aid and ecumenical actions with other faith communities retain considerable public influence. The Church also has peculiar international concerns and interests distinct from – and even conflicting with – the state, based upon its historical friendship and network with other churches across the globe, not least member churches of the Anglican Communion, the world’s third largest Christian denomination.

Christians or churches in a given hostile country could be the same participants in the Kingdom of God, the universal one Body of Christ, which suggests transnational solidarity existing even between adversaries at war. In the past, the English churches had close relationships with, for instance, the German Protestants under Nazi control and the Russian and Eastern Orthodox Churches under Communist rule. After the Falklands War in 1982, Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie gave a sermon to caution against religious expressions of nationalism, bearing in mind that the majority of Argentines were Christians, as were the British:

Those who dare to interpret God's will must never claim Him as an asset for one nation or group rather than another. War springs from the love and loyalty which should be offered to God being applied to some God

substitute, one of the most dangerous being nationalism.⁷

This sermon certainly irritated the Thatcher government which wanted the occasion to be more ‘triumphant’, but the Church’s transnational, international or multinational perspectives reflected in the sermon anticipate the Church’s special moral capacity beyond short-term political calculations. The Church has repeatedly warned politicians against using religious language or moral rhetoric regarding, for instance, their stand on communism, Middle East affairs and anti-terrorism not to undermine the UK’s international role as an ‘honest broker’. During the Iraq War, the Church being a chief mediator of the nation’s faiths took great care to keep multi-faith relations together, emphasising that it was not a war between religions. The Church is even expected to question and challenge received wisdom and common assumptions underlying the present public discourse, as ‘prophecy is capable of reaching beyond the [mere] immediate counsels of prudential ethics’ (Duncan Forrester).⁸

III. The Church and Modern Warfare

For the Anglicans’ political attitude – of not refusing to see the inevitable violence in the world and constructively pressing the government for a measured conduct –, just war is a right approach. Just war doctrine should be a practical counsel founded on a right recognition of the present but still try to secure the less violent and peaceful world, which could in some way anticipate the heavenly Kingdom even here and now.⁹

As the Church being ‘broad’ or *via media* has no ‘official’ teachings on war and peace,¹⁰ it historically embraced roughly three approaches to them: 1) a primitive but still influential pacifism based upon Jesus’s teachings, 2) a religiously sanctioned ‘holy war’ or ‘crusade’ view and 3) a just war doctrine after Constantine to reconcile biblical precepts with secular duties to the state. Until the early twentieth century, ‘holy war’ concepts were still prevalent, as Christian mission and British imperial interests were closely interconnected. An influential Bishop of London Arthur Winnington-Ingram famously said, during the First World War, that what the Church was to do was ‘mobilise the nation for a holy war’ to punish the evil of Germany.¹¹ Yet after a brief period between 1918 and 1939 when pacifist movements flourished, the Second World War offered British churchmen a first major context to develop just war reasoning, though in a somewhat different situation from the one it first emerged.

The Second World War

Whilst favouring peaceful means – including appeasement policy culminated at Munich – to avoid another ‘total warfare’ until just before 1939, Anglican leaders including Archbishop of Canterbury Cosmo Lang eventually supported the war against Nazis as just and a last resort. William Temple, Lang’s successor from 1942, famously remarked in a radio ad-

dress:

No positive good can be done by force; that is true. But evil can be checked and held back by force, and it is precisely for this that we may be called upon to use it.¹²

Temple, upholding the Christian values of liberty and civilisation as the basis of Britain's war effort, nevertheless cautioned against the notion of Britain fighting out of religiously-inspired hatred, punishment or revenge. Thus he supported the future reconciliation regime – the United Nations – to bring Germany into international solidarity.

One of the most contentious issues for the morality of that war was the Allied strategy of indiscriminate bombing of German cities started in 1940.¹³ Temple was basically convinced of the government's bombing campaign as effective tactics to achieve the right end of war, i.e., to prevent the evils of Nazis. Going further than the so-called 'double effect' principle (which teaches that 'unintended' harm to civilians is morally permissible if the bad effect is outweighed by the resultant good), he held – rather astonishingly – that in a modern 'total war' where every citizen was inevitably implicated in the state's action, one could not, militarily as well as politically, discriminate combatants from civilians. He thought that citizens had ultimate responsibility for whatever consequences states would bring about, implying that the German people had no excuses for being bombed.

Yet it was Bishop George Bell of Chichester who, no less resolutely believing the war with Nazis to be just, vigorously opposed the saturation bombing and clashed with politicians like Churchill and Eden. An active ecumenist who had personal friendship with Martin Niemöller and Dietrich Bonhoeffer of the German Confessing Church, he distinguished German citizens from the Nazi regime and demanded more UK action to support German Christians and persecuted Jews, many of which were, however, rejected by the then war government.

Nuclear Deterrence during the Cold War

Just war thinking to structure and criticise the cause and conduct of war developed more widely after the war, swinging between realist (or consequentialist) and pacifist tendencies somehow represented, respectively, by Temple and Bell.¹⁴ Like in the Catholic Church, just war ideas in postwar Britain developed mainly around the problem of nuclear weapons in the Cold War context.¹⁵ In contrast to conventional weapons that, as a tactics, *can* be used indiscriminately, the *essential* indiscriminateness of nuclear weaponry was to be seriously tested by the *jus in bello* criteria of micro-proportionality and non-combatant immunity, in particular.

Whilst the report in 1948, *The Church and the Atom*, commissioned by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York represented the realistic understanding of nuclear deterrence, the 1982 report, *The Church and the Bomb*, of a working party of the Church's Board for

Social Responsibility conducted a more rigorous application of just war criteria. The first report argued that ‘in certain rare circumstances, defensive “necessity” might justify the use of atomic weapons against an unscrupulous aggressor’.¹⁶ Whilst condemning the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as morally indefensible, it cautiously left some room for nuclear weapons to be used for a just cause and a limited end – not aggression or military purposes but only self-defence – and as a last resort.¹⁷ The then Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher committed himself to the view that in a fallen world the H-bomb was a ‘necessary deterrent’.¹⁸

Yet the latter report, although finally voted down in the General Synod, radically proposed Britain’s unilateral disarmament – renouncing of all its independent nuclear weapons – and denied nuclear deterrence *per se* as ‘immoral’. Nuclear weapons could not meet the principles of non-combatant immunity, proportionality of ends and right intention, it argued, and the implicit ‘intention’ or ‘threat’ to use them being the basis of deterrence was deemed ‘sinful’. It said:

[S]uch a conditional intention implies that one has consented in one’s mind to act immorally. For moral theology, sin is completed in act but begins in consent, and the consent to act immorally, even though the act be never performed, is already sinful.¹⁹

The ensuing Synod in 1983, however, passed a less radical amendment proposing, instead of Britain’s unilateral reduction, the ‘no first use’ principle to be taken by all nuclear powers, claiming that nuclear posture should only be ‘defensive’ in nature. The motion called on the UK government to ‘maintain adequate forces to guard against nuclear blackmail and to deter nuclear and non-nuclear aggressors’. Archbishop Runcie remarked that he could not ‘accept unilateralism as the best expression of a Christian’s prime moral duty to be a peacemaker’, and favoured multilateral negotiations then taking place in Geneva.²⁰ ‘The road to the realization of this [God’s] Kingdom is heavily mined and we have to tread carefully, defusing the mines one by one’, Runcie said.²¹

The ever-unresolvable discussions on nuclear morality were simply to lose their imminence on the occasion of détente between East and West and the eventual fall of the Cold War. More moderate reports (such as *Peacemaking in a Nuclear Age*, the Board for Social Responsibility, 1988) appeared and the Church gradually shifted its focus from imagined nuclear warfare to real, conventional battles. During the years of 1945-1991, it can be said, the Church failed to establish a fixed interpretation of just war and sometimes relied on the more convenient and realist logic of the ‘balance of terror’ or simply on nuclear stalemate. Richard Harries, a moderate realist on nuclear issues, admitted in 1986 the ‘sole benefit’ of nuclear deterrence – or the truth of nuclear peace – to limit conventional warfare between superpowers. He even described it as the ‘hands of God using our evil intentions for good purposes’, a divine judgement forcing states to be prudent and cautious of not going to war,

which was no longer a rational option for them.²²

Humanitarian Intervention and the ‘War on Terror’

As the Cold War ended, the Church’s new international concern shifted towards humanitarian intervention in response to the intra-state human rights violations and, after 2001, military fight against terrorism by non-state actors. The First Gulf War in 1991 to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait was the one that the Church could narrowly support as a last resort. Statements then made by Archbishops Runcie and John Habgood of York expressed this point, with some caveats regarding human casualties or the impact on Islam.²³

But what was problematic, behind new global settings, for historic Christianity was the increasing tendency in Western governments to reintroduce, as it were, the value-based defence or diplomatic initiatives masked in moral claims. Having been reluctant on using overtly religious language and ‘demonising’ the enemy in international conflicts since 1945, the Church could dispute, as some have done, for instance, Tony Blair’s ‘ethical foreign policy’ agenda, his ‘Doctrine of the International Community’ and his description of the Kosovo conflict as a ‘battle between good and evil, between civilisation and barbarity, between democracy and dictatorship’.²⁴ The cosmopolitan or liberal interventionism to which Blair committed himself risks, from just war perspectives, blurring the boundary between political and military aspects of strategy and granting politicians unqualified moral impetus or indeed self-righteousness to intervene prematurely to prevent ‘Hitlerian’ dictators from prevailing. During the Kosovo crisis the Church still had difficulty in reconciling humanitarian objectives with the use of force, being critical of NATO bombing at first but supportive only after the war ended. (Seeing the atrocity of ethnic cleansing, a post-war report *Inside Out: The Balkans Conflict*, by the Board for Social Responsibility, even suggested that the Church could have taken more urgent action to address the manifest evil).²⁵

The situation became even more difficult with the September 11 attacks and President Bush’s ‘crusade’ view on the ‘war on terror’ and ‘axis of evil’ address to step up the conflict with Iraq. The US (and UK) international mission to defend freedom and democracy as a (rather abstract) ‘way of life’ against indiscriminate terror became increasingly value-driven, to the extent of violating some aspects of the classical just war requirements. In bringing abstract, and indeed undebatable, ideas into the cause and goal of war, and with sentiments and passions of the terrorised people in support of the government, careful considerations on the proportional means to counter terrorism – including diplomacy, intelligence and education – are liable to be undermined. That was the Church’s immediate concern expressed in its Board for Social Responsibility’s briefing paper *Al-Qaida and Afghanistan: A Just War?* published just in November 2001.

IV. Anglican Just War Thinking

As Philip Towle observes, Anglicans lay as well as clerical gradually came to accept the

Catholic doctrine of just war in this time of uncertainty, after the 1990s, as a more reliable and sounder base on which to criticise government policies ‘than Davidson, Lang and Bell were able to find’.²⁶

Anglicanism affirms, as Catholicism does, as its basis of just war theory, natural reason independent of revelation, the validity of natural law and the common conscience of mankind. Whilst the practical implications of just war theory can be read entirely in secular terms, its motives and origins are essentially Christian. Social issues including war and peace, however, do not constitute ‘orthodoxy’ for Anglicanism or matters essential to faith or salvation. Under the Anglican structure of ‘dispersed authority’, they are pronounced not uniformly by the *Magisterium*, but in various forms including statements by church leaders, Synod debates, expert reports, individual theologians and lay opinions.

The Church of England has historically embraced many, and sometimes impressive, pacifists, not least members of the influential Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. One of the founding members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, alongside Bertrand Russell, was Canon John Collins of St Paul’s Cathedral. Yet a just war approach crucially differs from idealistic pacifism in theological worldviews and does not claim to satisfy Christian conscience in any instant way. It presupposes that man’s ability to know God and his will is significantly flawed due to our original sin. Man inevitably lives in a peccable world in anticipation of the eternal Kingdom in heaven, living between the time of Christ’s resurrection and his coming again in glory. In a real, sinful world filled with violence, we have to choose and take responsibility for the least bad of all options available to us as fallible human beings. As Michael Howard, an eminent military historian who is personally an Anglican, said:

The trouble is that if Christianity really is incompatible with war, we have to turn our backs on two thousand years of warring Christendom and assume that during those centuries God was unaccountably withholding His Holy Spirit from His Church. No: God can only work *through* his creation . . . God did not give any of us the power to transcend the cultural limits of our own times. He finds us as we are, and uses us as He sees fit.²⁷

Just war thinking assumes the necessity of coercive power to reconstitute right order and does not offer absolute certainty about when ultimate disarmament – in the heavenly kingdom, possibly – takes place. Yet it should not turn into our complete submission to theological fatalism or moral relativism. Only after admitting our sin, we can take gradual and realistic steps to reduce human violence, towards the realisation of God’s Kingdom, what Reinhold Niebuhr called an ‘impossible possibility’. Due to our fallible knowledge, any professed cause of war must be conditional in God’s providential eye. As Runcie has said, God’s will is not an ‘asset’ owned by particular groups or nations. Christian just war theory

requires a continual process of, and a tenacious mind to pursue, dialogue, evaluation and reframing to convince the government of right requirements for war or measured ways to avoid it. In addition, as Harries says, ‘those who stand in the just war tradition will regard themselves as neither doves nor hawks but owls’, who take account of the contingencies and irrational factors that bring war about.²⁸

In the light of this human imperfection, it must be added that conscientious objection must be fully implicated in just war thinking. The Lambeth Conferences of the Anglican Communion have successively confirmed the rights of conscientious objection and civil disobedience whilst affirming some just wars. For instance, Resolution 27 of the 1988 Conference states that, whilst understanding ‘those who, after exhausting all other ways, choose the way of armed struggle as the only way to justice’, it urges support for ‘those who choose the way of non-violence as being the way of our Lord’. As Michael Howard said, in God’s house ‘there is plenty of room for the warrior priest as well as the Quaker, for the crusader for war as well as the crusader for peace’.²⁹

V. Rowan Williams and the Iraq War

Let us then turn to Rowan Williams first, to examine the recent instance of Anglican just war thinking. In the first place, the Archbishop of Canterbury is not the absolute judge to decide on the morality, let alone legitimacy, of war and is entirely free whether or not to adopt just war doctrine in deliberating on international conflicts. Previous archbishops Robert Runcie and George Carey more or less accepted it in their own right.³⁰

Williams (then as Archbishop of Wales) was visiting New York, near the World Trade Center, when the plane crashed on 11 September 2001, and based on that experience he wrote *Writing in the Dust*. This book, though stressing that there is no easy answer, is basically intended as a caution against attempts (in some parts of the Christian discourses) to interpret divine will prematurely to legitimate military counteraction. He writes: ‘Perhaps it’s when we try to make God useful in crises, though, that we take the first steps towards the great lie of religion: the god who fits our agenda’.³¹ In a moral situation where everyone rushes for God to seek solution or, if that fails, even questions God’s existence, he nevertheless urges ‘patience’ so that, after the traumatic events, the words of faith and a quest for enduring security under God’s peace will slowly rise again. He says:

God has made a world into which he doesn’t casually step in to solve problems...He has made the world so that evil choices can’t just be frustrated or aborted...but have to be confronted, suffered, taken forward, healed in the complex process of human history, always in collaboration with what we do and say and pray.³²

As a sensible way to respond to the assumed ‘evil’ and man’s suffering in this world,

he suggests the story of 'Jesus and the woman taken in adultery' in the Gospel of John (8:1-11). Jesus, Williams argues, did not draw a line or fix an interpretation, but simply allowed a moment for people to see things and themselves differently, a moment 'long enough for some of our demons to walk away'. Only then, as he says, there was 'judgement and release'.

Carefully worded texts, Williams's book in 2002 distances itself from his own Church's overall attitude during the 2001 Afghanistan attack which, failing to articulate a uniform response, acquiesced in a way to the US-led 'self-defence' action. The General Synod in November 2001 to which the briefing paper 'Al-Qaida and Afghanistan' was referred discussed this in a critical tone, but ended by adopting the noncommittal motion stating that terrorism 'may legitimately be opposed in the last resort by the use of proportionate armed force'. Archbishop Carey was then reported as describing the US attack as 'a necessary conflict'.³³ Yet a vocal opponent of it, Williams questioned the concept of a 'war on terrorism' as a costly and open-ended military campaign.³⁴

Contrary to being silent on Afghanistan, however, the Church of England became actively engaged, almost as an institution, with the possible military action against Iraq by invoking just war arguments. In October 2002, the House of Bishops' submission to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee warned that preventative action at that moment would lower the threshold for a just war 'unacceptably', since the threat of Iraq was 'growing' but not 'imminent'.³⁵ Whilst cautiously admitting some scope for pre-emptive (anticipatory) self-defence action when the threat is immediate and clear, it added criticism, regarding Iraq, of the lack of postwar peace settlement and emphasised the authority of the UN. The bishops' paper distinguished, rather confusingly, between 'pre-emptive' war against imminent and manifest danger which is legitimised under the UN charter, and illegitimate 'preventative' war when the threat is rather long-term and distant, and neither imminent nor serious.

Formally installed in February 2003, the new Archbishop of Canterbury took an unprecedentedly ecumenical and multi-faith approach to stand against the war which he thought did not meet the just war criteria and thus morally flawed.³⁶ On 20 February, Williams issued a joint statement with Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor, the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, calling for continued UN weapons inspections (with Iraq's full compliance) and warning the 'unpredictable humanitarian consequences' of a war.³⁷ As the two major denominations in UK Christianity whose ethical deliberations on warfare were heavily influenced by the just war tradition, the Anglican and Catholic Churches facilitated their ecumenical cooperation rather easily, compared with other non-established, free churches.³⁸ In his first press conference at Lambeth Palace, Williams warned Blair and Bush to 'tone down their moral rhetoric in the drive to war with Iraq', saying:

There is no war that is holy and good in itself and to bring in the heavy artillery of a religious kind, to say that this is the only way of resisting

evil, is something that has to be watched for.³⁹

On 20 March, at the start of the war, Williams lined up with other five major faith leaders – including Muslim and Jewish ones – to issue a statement saying in a critical tone that as the diplomatic means were blocked, ‘military action can only be a limited means to an end’. It especially pleaded for civilian innocence under Geneva conventions and ‘a just, lasting and secure peace’ in Iraq and the Middle East.⁴⁰ In June 2004, together with David Hope, the Archbishop of York, Williams sent a letter to Tony Blair on behalf of all Anglican 114 bishops to raise post-conflict issues including the conduct of coalition troops. It criticised their treatment of Iraqi detainees as the ‘apparent breach of international law’ and the West’s ‘double standard’, and urged a swift transfer of sovereignty to an Iraqi government. Williams in a radio interview in December 2006 reflected on the events, suggesting that doing more to take a stronger position before the invasion might have made a difference.⁴¹

Having once joined the CND (and even being arrested at the US base) and opposed the First Gulf War, Williams did have certain reservation, in fact, about (especially the realist view) of just war doctrine.⁴² In his lecture in October 2002 entitled ‘Chaos dogs the end of war’, Williams questioned the contemporary validity of a classical just war doctrine linked with the sovereign state’s ability to wage war.⁴³ Instead he argued for a more flexible theory of ‘just intervention’, not just military but political and economic, together with a new proper ethic on military conduct and values of justice, to respond to the largely policing style of war undertaken multinationally in the Gulf, the Balkans and Africa. The classical nation-state system, he alleges, is significantly challenged to the extent of losing automatic loyalty from the citizen, since modern threats of nuclear or mass destructive weapons, international terrorism and globalised economy all disapprove the single state’s ability to guarantee its citizens’ security and livelihoods.

He insists on strengthening transnational authority – the United Nations at its centre – to force a just intervention and sanction in the international community which should be based upon a global consensus on the goods of freedom, rights and human opportunities. That intervention includes civilian and economic measures – such as a ‘Marshall Plan for Africa’ – designed to achieve collective and durable human security.

He developed his thoughts on just war in his October 2003 lecture ‘Just War Revisited’, which was intended as a partial response to George Weigel, a US Catholic just war ethicist who supported the Iraq War.⁴⁴ Against Weigel’s denial of ‘presumption against violence’ and his case for the state’s prime moral duty to protect citizens and right order,⁴⁵ Williams reemphasises non-violent assumptions inherent in Christian just war thinking.⁴⁶ At the centre of Aquinas’s discussion of public violence, he argues, is simply the acknowledgement ‘that action which employs violence of some sort for the restoration of a broken or threatened social order does not have the nature of sin’. The legitimacy of that public violence certainly depends upon how we conceive the natural and common good for human beings.

Williams admits that just war theory belongs to the tradition of statecraft primarily for

political leaders, but denies what Weigel called a ‘charism of political discernment’ – one of his controversial points – claimed to be unique to the vocation of public service but denied to religious leaders. Williams responds:

There is no such thing in moral theology as a ‘charism of political discernment’. A charism is a gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed for the building up of the Body of Christ, and wisdom is undoubtedly a gift of the Holy Spirit. But there is no charism that goes automatically with political leadership. A political leader may or may not be open to the gifts of the Spirit; democracy itself assumes, though, that the professed wisdom of any leader or any party is challengeable.⁴⁷

Violence should be waged only by the public authority concerned with the relevant common good and only for determined ends which, in current political understanding, must be finally referred to the United Nations. Just war theory in today’s interdependent world demands higher lawful authority and a broader understanding of the public good and interest than national ones, he argues. In waging war, political leaders are inevitably exposed to serious assessment by ‘larger standards of the human good than simply national interest’. In classical theory force is simply justified to defend a community’s health and survival. ‘But that health and survival are themselves undermined when defended by indiscriminate and disproportionate means’, he contends.⁴⁸ Admitting the limits of the present Security Council, he argues for a ‘Standing Commission on Security’ within the UN structures which incorporates legal and other professionals and advises on and recommends UN intervention where necessary.

To Williams, the current US appears to behave like a ‘solitary nation state battling terror or aggression morally exposed to an uncomfortable degree’. As a terrorised and threatened state, the US loses its ‘power of self-criticism’ and becomes ‘trapped in a self-referential morality’, a situation which makes an effective counter-terrorism even difficult. What political rulers need, even in the midst of this struggle against terrorism, is not an instant charism but the ‘virtue of political prudence’ – to judge what means are appropriate to agreed ends –, and it requires ‘good habits’ and constant renewal in vigorous public deliberation processes. The churches and moral theology still have a lot to contribute by exercising their ‘freedom’ – as well as responsibility – ‘to sustain the self-critical habit in a nation and its political classes’. The government must be attentive to the complexity of public voices coming from, for instance, lawyers, NGOs, historians, religious communities and journalists, he claims.

VI. Richard Harries and the Iraq War

If Williams represents a pacifist or non-violent strand in today’s Anglicanism, a more realis-

tic one is taken by Richard Harries, the recently retired Bishop of Oxford (1987-2006) and now Gresham Professor of Theology. An expert on military ethics influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr, and with army experience in his youth and duty as Chaplain to the Forces, he has continuously responded to Britain's international engagements over several decades, almost on behalf of the Church. Harries and Williams – Bishop and Professor of Oxford in the 1980s – have long disagreed on the application of just war theory to nuclear deterrence, the First Gulf War and Afghanistan,⁴⁹ but on Iraq they reached the same conclusion. (The reason, methods and of course clerical position to criticise the war must be different, though). Also, the fact that the bishop who had supported 'every military action' conducted by UK governments – in the Falklands, the Gulf, Kosovo and Afghanistan – now opposed the Iraq War had a profound effect on national debate, casting more doubt on the moral case for war. BBC's *Panorama: The Case Against War* broadcast on 8 December 2002, for instance, featured him as the 'last senior churchman one would expect to oppose war with Iraq'.

On Iraq, Harries argued that military action by coalition forces without Security Council resolutions was unlawful and illegitimate, though stressing that the UN as a higher international authority to settle competing national interests still needed constant reform.⁵⁰ He supports legitimate military intervention into the intra-state affairs to achieve the transnational common good in a world where the non-intervention principle collapsed. He also admits some anticipatory, pre-emptive action to defend a nation against, for instance, outlaw regimes intent on using weapons of mass destruction which clearly are the imminent threats to international security.⁵¹ But this time in 2003 clear evidence of Iraq's imminent threat was not sufficiently proven.⁵² The requirement of last resort, he says, suggests a 'clear moral obligation' to pursue every effective means to avoid war under the auspices of the UN – this time to pursue the re-admittance of UN weapons inspectors into Iraq, which was finally abandoned by the US and UK leaders.⁵³

As to the criterion of right intention, Harries argues that the Iraq War fatally lacked post-invasion plans to be built on a long-term vision of peace and just order not just in Iraq but in the Middle East. Creating more political instability and civilian violence in the Arab region, that constituted one salient failure of the Iraq War. Church leaders consistently warned, from the macro-proportionality principle, the serious consequences of a war to unleash more evils than were already being endured. War must be waged not only for righting an injustice but for creating a better order in broader interests of the common good, in other words for a well-considered *jus post bellum*.⁵⁴

Harries thinks that a genuine 'success' in combating terrorism should be more about what he describes as 'winning hearts and minds' of the global public to rightly address the root cause of terrorism than about military victory alone. Seen in this light, situations like that of Iraqi prisoners and Guantanamo Bay are deeply worrying for the West's confidence in counter-terrorism, whilst the terrorists cannot win their global battle and public sympathy. Another worrying matter even for the legitimacy of war itself was that the coalition forces did not fully assess the death and casualties of – in many cases civilian – Iraqis, since war

must be waged not just for the benefits of one's own but the other side's.⁵⁵ This indicates further doubts on the observance of *jus in bello* – micro-proportionality and discrimination of civilians from combatants – in Iraq.⁵⁶

Harries agrees with Williams that there is a 'presumption against war' in Christian just war theory, in the sense that the criterion of last resort clearly indicates that if it is possible to solve conflict by non-violent means, there is a 'strong moral obligation' to do so.⁵⁷ War is always a 'tragic necessity', and the use of force is only provisional in God's eye. Just war thinking is totally different from a 'crusade mentality', he emphasises.⁵⁸ Even a 'just' war which met the necessary criteria does not allow people to think, with self-righteousness, that it is God's war fought on God's side, an illusory temptation which the just war mind properly limits.

Any warfare that was fought, however reluctantly as a last resort, should be the result of human sin, a sign of failure for both the warring parties. Archbishop Runcie gave a sermon after the Falklands War – which he believed to be just and an 'inevitable tragedy' – calling for the mourning of the Argentine war dead as well as the British and reconciliation between the two nations. 'War is a sign of human failure and everything we do and say here today is in that context', Runcie, who was never a pacifist, remarked.⁵⁹ As Harries quotes Niebuhr, even when fighting a 'just war', we must still acknowledge our ubiquitous evil, care for the enemy and even 'pray for wicked and cruel men, whose arrogance reveals to us what the sin of our own hearts is like when it has conceived and brought forth its final fruit'.⁶⁰ Harries himself led a prayer service in Oxford, in the midst of the Iraq War, for the deployed soldiers as well as for peace in the region, a prayer which he said 'reminds us that God has created us all, of whatever nationality, and that we are all made in God's image'.⁶¹

In September 2005 the House of Bishops' working party chaired by Harries published a report, *Countering Terrorism: Power, Violence and Democracy post 9/11*, to reflect on the events surrounding 9/11, terrorism and Iraq. In it, the churches' constructive role in a 'world characterised by power and violence' – though religion is seen as part of the problem – is particularly emphasised. Setting out thirteen 'Christian Principles' of ethical and theological substance, the report claims that the church has a distinctive gospel to proclaim, a gospel of peace between God and humanity brought about by Christ (Principle 9), and that the church carries special responsibility in the area of reconciliation (Principle 10).⁶² It especially recommends establishing in postwar Iraq, in a multi-religious form, a kind of story-gathering and public healing body similar to Truth and Reconciliation Commission in post-apartheid South Africa chaired by Desmond Tutu, the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town.

In relation to Iraq, it might be possible for there to be a public gathering...at which Christian leaders meet with religious leaders of other, mainly Muslim, traditions, on the basis of truth and reconciliation, at which there would be a public recognition of at least some of the factors

mentioned [in the report]’.⁶³

Every Christian should work as a peacemaker to restore true peace amongst man, and ultimately between God and mankind, always bearing in mind universal human dignity irrespective of nationality or religion. ‘In a world where right is rarely wholly on one side, the Churches have a particular role to play in articulating the faults, wrongs and inconsistencies of all parties to a dispute’. For human sinfulness and penitence are universal, it maintains.⁶⁴

Harries has been a long advocate in the Church of the cause of humanitarian intervention aimed at advancing liberal democratic values. ‘Man’s capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man’s inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary’ is the maxim he learned from Niebuhr.⁶⁵ Democracy, with its values of freedom and independence and separation of powers, is a desirable form of government, especially in that it checks ‘our human capacity to tyrannise and oppress one another’. Yet Harries also emphasises that we must not make the quest for democracy a global ‘crusade’, since democracy should be accommodated in culturally different ways and cannot be imposed upon by force.⁶⁶ The Bishops’ report includes theological criticism of religious fundamentalism, Christian as well as Islamic, and America’s apocalyptic self-image, saying:

Both international law and human rights, properly understood, have a theological foundation in the purpose and will of God. But to go beyond this and read human history with a confidence that one knows precisely what God is doing through current events, is an illegitimate extension of our limited, creaturely status and viewpoint. History outwits all our certitudes.⁶⁷

This corresponds with Williams’s emphasis on caution and patience after 9/11. The report’s first, and essential, Christian principle thus states: ‘The whole political sphere, including the pursuit of international order, lies open before God’. ‘Those who make decisions and act within it are ultimately accountable to a power higher than any human assembly’.

Now it seems that the just war doctrine has secured the place of orthodoxy in the current Church of England, owing to the active argumentation, prompted by the Iraq War, by Harries and other bishops (such as Tom Wright of Durham and Tom Butler of Southwark).⁶⁸ The Church’s recent report, for instance, by Ethical Investment Advisory Group, *Defence Investments Policy* (2010), explicitly states: ‘Just war probably represents the centre of gravity within the thinking of the Church of England today, as reflected in Synod debates over the last 30 years’ from nuclear deterrence to Iraq.⁶⁹ The General Synod in 2007 also passed a motion, regarding the replacement of Trident, which called on ‘Christian people to make an informed contribution to the issues raised in *The Future of Trident* [report] in the light of Christian teaching about Just War’. The motion in effect urged the government to reconsider its plan of upgrading Trident.

As this paper suggested, attitudes to warfare are ‘not defining matters for Anglican orthodoxy’, the 2010 report admits. But firmly reflected in international law, just war thinking for Christians who accept it is an ‘expedient response to the challenges of living in a fallen world’, it claims. The Christian churches have recognised that ‘prior to the eschaton (the final consummation of all things), it may be necessary to commit sin in order to prevent the commission of a much greater sin’. This would not be a universal Christian ideal, but in reality ‘has informed Christian practice through much of the history of the church’. The report recommends, in view of the principle of discrimination, that the Church should exclude from its investments any company involved in the production of indiscriminate weapons (such as nuclear, chemical and biological, and anti-personnel mines).

VII. Conclusion

This paper has only discussed arguments by Williams and Harries as expressing two major clerical voices on Iraq and just war, leaving out other prominent British theologians such as Oliver O’Donovan (Anglican) and Duncan Forrester (Presbyterian) and less contemporary figures like Elisabeth Anscombe (Roman Catholic) and Donald MacKinnon (Scottish Episcopalian). Nigel Biggar (Anglican) is recently arguing for a more ‘liberal’ reading of the just war criteria and maintains the legitimacy of the Iraq War, clearly representing a ‘revisionist’ tendency within Anglicanism.⁷⁰

Yet Biggar rather being exceptional, the Church of England leadership is likely to maintain its strict understanding of just war in addressing future, and possible, international conflicts which will greatly involve humanitarian crises, global or regional terrorism and corrupt regime in need of reform. Indeed Harries, a long supporter of nuclear deterrence, is now proposing abandoning Trident which, for him, is losing strategic significance for Britain. Williams and Tom Wright also questioned the morality of the US operation in May 2011 which killed ‘unarmed’ Osama bin Laden, the then leader of al-Qaeda, as a deviation from true justice.⁷¹ Yet tensions between pacifism and just war theory, as well as the realist and pacifist readings of just war, will remain within Anglicanism, as long as attitudes to war do not provide doctrinal orthodoxy.

Given its concern for so-called ‘new wars’, the Church might have to consider how the use of force against terror networks or outlaw regimes committing massive human rights violations would still remain just, limited and proportionate. As anticipatory ‘self-defence’ or preemption on the side of the oppressed or terrorised becomes a value-inspired mission, it risks losing crucial incentives to qualify the use of violence even against the terrorists, and creates a situation where agreed ends justify any means. In order to address the government over these issues, whether the Church can fulfill its moral purpose and prophetic mission by remaining an Established one is a long-standing question.⁷²

Traditionally the Church of England sought a constructive dialogue with government, in such a place as the House of Lords, to press for the legitimacy and ethically just conduct

of war. Archbishop Fisher's intervention on Britain's invasion of Egypt in 1957 and Bishop Bell's on saturation bombing were classic examples, sparking much national debate (criticism included) at that time. Yet debates taking place within civil society will be even more important to crystallise the public perception of the morality of war, and that is what the national Church should encourage in a multi-faith, plural society. As the case of Iraq has shown, engagement with civil society and cooperation with other faith communities not least in the time of conflict, the universal issue of life and death in its most extreme form, may suggest the changing place of the (not yet disestablished) Church in contemporary Britain.

Notes

¹ Other valuable works include Alan Wilkinson, *The Church of England and the First World War* (London: SPCK, 1978); Tom Lawson, *The Church of England and the Holocaust: Christianity, Memory and Nazism* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006); Roger Williamson, 'The Church of England in International Affairs: 1979 to mid-1997', in K. R. Dark (ed.), *Religion and International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 217-249.

² Blewett et al. (eds.), *British Foreign Policy and the Anglican Church: Christian Engagement with the Contemporary World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

³ Charles Reed and David Ryall (eds.), *The Price of Peace: Just War in the Twentieth-First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

⁴ In contrast to the development of just war theory in America – where theorists with diverse religious or philosophical backgrounds, including Paul Ramsey, Michael Walzer and the Catholic Bishops, have actively engaged –, the British case is ranked as a minor interest. But Charles Reed recently investigated the use of just war theory amongst British churches during the two Gulf Wars (*Just War?*, New York: Church Publishing, 2004).

⁵ Faced with this challenge, the place of 26 bishops' seats in the Lords chamber is one of the seriously contested issues.

⁶ For this tension, see George Moyser, 'The Church of England and Politics: Patterns and Trends', in Moyser (ed.), *Church and Politics Today: The Role of the Church of England in Contemporary Politics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985), pp. 14-16.

⁷ Robert Runcie, *Windows onto God* (London: SPCK, 1983), p. 109. The Falklands War which lasted from April to June 1982 coincided with Pope John Paul II's historic visit to Britain, and Argentines were predominantly Roman Catholic nations.

⁸ Duncan Forrester, 'The Theological Task', in Howard Davis (ed.), *Ethics and Defence: Power and Responsibility in the Nuclear Age* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), p. 43.

⁹ Richard Harries, 'Should Trident be Replaced?', in Brian Wicker and Hugh Beach (eds.), *Britain's Bomb: What Next?* (London: SCM Press, 2006), p. 22.

¹⁰ Apart from the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion which sanctioned Christians 'at the commandment of the Magistrate to wear weapons and serve in the wars'. It can be said, as history proved, that the Church leadership is prone to conservative or realist views, thus

becoming Church's 'semi-official' stance, whilst pacifism is popular amongst clergy and laity.

¹¹ *Guardian*, 10 June 1915, quoted in Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-2000* (London: SCM Press, 2001), p. 45. But the leadership including Archbishop of Canterbury Randall Davidson and Bishop of Oxford Charles Gore cautiously denied the clergy's direct participation in combat action.

¹² Radio broadcast, August 1939, quoted in William B. Johnston, 'The Churches' Role in the Nuclear Debate', in Davis (ed.), *Ethics and Defence*, p. 243.

¹³ See Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, 4th Edition (New York: Basic Books, 2006), Chapter 16 'Supreme Emergency'.

¹⁴ But Bell could be rather a pacifist than a just war advocate.

¹⁵ Pope John XXIII's *Pacem in terris* and the US Catholic Bishops' *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response* (1983) and *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace* (1993) all addressed nuclear problems, whilst the latter two explicitly used just war arguments.

¹⁶ *The Church and the Atom: A Study of the Moral and Theological Aspects of Peace and War*, the Report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (London, 1948), pp. 110-111.

¹⁷ *The Church and the Atom*, p. 111. The report legitimates the use of atomic weapons when it is against a 'present and imminent danger' and 'the only hope of effective defence would lie in bringing overwhelming force to bear upon the enemy immediately'. In that condition, whatever casualties and damage inflicted could 'rightly be regarded as incidental to self-defence' (p. 52).

¹⁸ Dianne Kirby, 'The Church of England and the Cold War Nuclear Debate', *Twentieth Century British History*, 4:3 (1993), p. 282.

¹⁹ *The Church and the Bomb: Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience*, the Report of a working party of the Board for Social Responsibility of the General Synod of the Church of England (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1982), p. 98.

²⁰ Runcie, *Windows onto God*, pp. 168, 169-170. Runcie denied the full use of nuclear weapons as unjust, saying that 'there could not be any *jus in bello* in full-scale nuclear war' and 'there is no such thing as just mutual obliteration' (*Ibid.*, p. 116).

²¹ Runcie, *Windows onto God*, p. 120.

²² Richard Harries, *Christianity and War in a Nuclear Age* (Oxford: Mowbray, 1986), p. 169. He also argued, during *The Church and the Bomb* debate: 'The possibility of nuclear war will remain until the end of time. It is a truism that nuclear weapons can never be disinvented. We cannot pretend that we do not know what we do in fact know. So even if all nuclear stockpiles were destroyed the knowledge of how to make nuclear weapons would remain' (Richard Harries, 'Conventional Killing or Nuclear Stalemate?', in David Martin and Peter Mullen, eds., *Unholy Warfare: The Church and the Bomb*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983, pp. 210-211).

²³ Reed, *Just War?*, pp. 85ff. After the war, the Church's concern over Iraq shifted to the humanitarian impact of economic sanctions.

²⁴ In the so-called 'Blair Doctrine' speech to the Chicago Economic Club in April 1999, Blair also set out his justifications for humanitarian military intervention by invoking just war doctrine.

²⁵ Richard Harries also moderated his opinion. See his 'Kosova – A Statement', The Church of

England, 24 March 1999 and 'For a Christian, this is a just war', *The Independent*, 2 April 1999.

²⁶ Philip Towle, 'The Anglican church, the state and modern warfare', in Helen James (ed.), *Civil Society, Religion and Global Governance: Paradigms of Power and Persuasion* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 57.

²⁷ Quoted in Harries, *Christianity and War in a Nuclear Age*, p. 159.

²⁸ Harries, *Christianity and War in a Nuclear Age*, p. 71.

²⁹ Michael Howard's University Sermon at Oxford in 1984, quoted in Harries, *Christianity and War in a Nuclear Age*, p. 159.

³⁰ Robert Runcie, 'Just and Unjust Wars' (Lecture to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, 25 January 1983), in *Windows onto God*, pp. 111-120; Daniel Gover, *Turbulent Priests?: The Archbishop of Canterbury in Contemporary English Politics* (London: Theos, 2011), pp. 43-45.

³¹ Rowan Williams, *Writing in the Dust: After September 11* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), pp. 8-9.

³² Williams, *Writing in the Dust*, p. 8.

³³ Gover, *Turbulent Priests?*, p. 42.

³⁴ As will be seen, Williams is more cautious about preemptive war than Harries and the House of Bishops' papers.

³⁵ *Evaluating the Threat of Military Action Against Iraq: A submission by the House of Bishops to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Select Committee's ongoing inquiry into the War on Terrorism* (9 October 2002), pp. 2, 22, 25.

³⁶ Carey also stepped up his objection to the war in his last months as Archbishop.

³⁷ On 24 February 2003, in a private, regular meeting, Williams informed Blair of his concern for the war. Reed suggests that part of the Anglican and Roman Catholic strategy was to 'encourage Blair in his strategy of constructive engagement with Bush, in the hope that this would lead to a moderation in US policy' (*Just War?*, p. 118).

³⁸ Reed (*Just War?*, pp. 117ff.) contrasts the 'advising role', vis-a-vis the government, assumed by the Anglican and Catholic Churches with the 'campaigning' style taken by the Church of Scotland and the Free Churches (like the Baptists, the United Reformed Church and the Methodists).

³⁹ Reed, *Just War?*, p. 111.

⁴⁰ The faith leaders include Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor (Roman Catholic), Reverend David Coffey (The Free Churches Moderator), Dr Jonathan Sacks (The Chief Rabbi), Shaikh Dr Zaki Badawi (Chairman of the Council of Mosques and Imams UK) and Reverend Esme Beswick (Co-President of Churches Together in England).

⁴¹ Interview with BBC Radio 4's Today programme, 29 December 2006.

See http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/6216099.stm (Accessed 20 April 2012)

⁴² He could rather be a pacifist than a thoroughly just war thinker.

⁴³ Rowan Williams, 'Chaos dogs the end of war', *Common Theology*, 1:2 (2002), pp. 7-12.

⁴⁴ Rowan Williams, 'Just War Revisited', Lecture to the Royal Institute for International Affairs, Chatham House, 14 October 2003, reprinted in *First Things*, 141 (March 2004), pp. 14-21.

⁴⁵ Weigel explored this 'presumption for justice' or 'presumption against injustice' in his 'Moral

Clarity in a Time of War', *First Things*, 128 (January 2003), pp. 20-27. See also John Hymers, 'Regrounding the Just War's 'Presumption Against Violence' in Light of George Weigel', *Ethical Perspectives*, 11:2/3 (2004), pp. 111-121.

⁴⁶ Runcie too affirmed that the just war tradition 'seeks to prevent wars and has a built-in reluctance to resort to the use of force' (*Windows onto God*, p. 111). The Lambeth Conferences have successively confirmed the antiwar principle adopted in 1930 that 'war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Resolution 25).

⁴⁷ Williams, 'Just War Revisited', p. 17.

⁴⁸ Williams, *Writing in the Dust*, p. 34.

⁴⁹ For their clash on the Gulf, see Rowan Williams, 'Onward Christian Soldiers?', *The Guardian*, 1 November 1990; Richard Harries, 'The Path to a Just War', *The Independent*, 31 October 1990 and 'A just war not a crusade', *The Guardian*, 20 January 1991.

⁵⁰ But he does not argue that military action always needs UN's prior approval. One exceptional case was Kosovo, where the action by the coalition of states was against an immediate and manifest humanitarian crisis, supported by the great majority of countries in the region and worldwide, and validated soon afterwards by the UN itself (Richard Harries, 'The Continuing, Crucial Relevance of Just War Criteria', in Blewett et al. eds., *British Foreign Policy and the Anglican Church*, p. 33).

⁵¹ Harries, 'A British theological perspective', in Reed and Ryall (eds.), *The Price of Peace*, p. 307.

⁵² In a memorandum to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee in June 2003, the Church's Public Affairs Unit argued that 'it is crucial that states considering pre-emptive action have more than probable cause to believe they must attack' and present 'demonstrable and compelling evidence of the hostile intent and capability of a perceived aggressor'. 'Otherwise, questions will always be asked as to whether a pre-emptive attack was itself nothing more than an act of aggression'.

⁵³ Richard Harries, 'This war would not be a just war', *The Observer*, 4 August 2002.

⁵⁴ For *jus post bellum*, see separate articles written by John Langan, Gwyn Prins and Mary Kaldor in Reed and Ryall (eds.), *The Price of Peace*, pp. 219-273.

⁵⁵ *Countering Terrorism: Power, Violence and Democracy post 9/11*, A Report by A Working Group of the Church of England's House of Bishops (September 2005), p. 22.

⁵⁶ The US defence policy in 2003/2004 to fight a large-scale conventional war with 'overwhelming combat power' is also deemed problematic given the principle of proportionality (*Countering Terrorism*, pp. 22-23).

⁵⁷ Harries, 'The Continuing, Crucial Relevance of Just War Criteria', p. 35.

⁵⁸ Harries, 'The Continuing, Crucial Relevance of Just War Criteria', p. 31; Harries, 'A British theological perspective', pp. 304-305. Given this point, military victory should not be an end in itself, but rather a means to achieve an appropriate political settlement.

⁵⁹ Runcie, *Windows onto God*, p. 108.

⁶⁰ Harries, 'The Continuing, Crucial Relevance of Just War Criteria', p. 31.

⁶¹ 'Prayers for peace after Bishop's plea', BBC News, 23 February 2003.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/2791777.stm (Accessed 20 April 2012)

⁶² *Countering Terrorism*, pp. 73-74.

⁶³ *Countering Terrorism*, p. 28.

⁶⁴ *Countering Terrorism*, p. 74.

⁶⁵ Richard Harries, 'What Makes Us Think That God Wants Democracy?', in Harries and Stephen Platten (eds.), *Reinhold Niebuhr and Contemporary Politics: God and Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 154-168.

⁶⁶ Harries, 'A British theological perspective', p. 309.

⁶⁷ *Countering Terrorism*, p. 74. The report also says: 'The connection between religious faith and membership of a particular nation was weakened by Jesus and then severed by Paul. This implies that regard for one's own nation as the chosen people should be seen as sub-Christian. There is no uniquely righteous nation. No country should see itself as the redeemer nation, singled out by God as part of his providential plan' (p. 52).

⁶⁸ They played a leading role in articulating reports and papers by the Board for Social Responsibility, the House of Bishops or the Public Affairs Council.

⁶⁹ Church of England Ethical Investment Advisory Group, *Defence investments policy* (London: Church House, 2010), para. 7.

⁷⁰ Nigel Biggar, 'Between development and doubt: the recent career of just war doctrine in British churches', in Reed and Ryall (eds.), *The Price of Peace*, pp. 55-75; Nigel Biggar, 'The Church of England on War and Peace', in Kirchenamt der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (ed.), *How the Churches in Germany and England Contribute to Ethical Decision-making* (Hannover: EKD, 2003), pp. 19-31.

⁷¹ See Jonathan Chaplin, 'Was the Osama bin Laden killing an act of just war?', *The Guardian*, 12 May 2011.

⁷² Even Williams was criticised by some, during the Iraq War, as compromising his antiwar, prophetic stance by assuming other roles in relation to the state, such as sending a pastoral letter to army chaplains serving in the war to 'reassure' them. It stated that the chaplains 'stood in a long and honourable tradition of Christians bearing witness to the love of Christ in hard and dangerous places' (Reed, *Just War?*, p. 128).