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About Us

The Anglican Peace and Justice Network, a recognized network of the Anglican Communion, was founded in 1985 to further the Church’s mission to “reconcile all things to Christ.” APJN brings together representatives appointed by their primates for a triennial consultation on issues of conflict resolution, human rights, and economic and environmental justice, lifting up the voices of women, young people and all those marginalized by oppressive systems. The Network reports to the Anglican Consultative Council. There are about 24 active Provinces.

Since its inception 23 years ago, APJN has met in Singapore, Zimbabwe, Brazil, Philippines, Scotland, USA, Korea, Aotearoa/New Zealand, Jerusalem, and Rwanda and Burundi. It has sent a special delegation to Sri Lanka. The business of the Network is managed by a Steering Committee made up of regional representatives. Dr. Jenny Plane Te Paa of Aotearoa is the current convener. The Network is developing communications using available technology to provide greater sharing of mutual justice concerns. More information may be found on the APJN section of the Anglican Communion website, www.anglicancommunion.org.

Mission Statement

Our aims:

• To assist the Communion in seeing the centrality of justice and peace to the mission of the Church
• To lift up and champion the role of women, young people, indigenous communities and other marginalized groups to have full voice and representation in the official councils of the Church as a matter of justice
• To provide a venue for Anglican provinces to bring forward issues of justice and peace in their local context giving them access to the wider Anglican Communion for partnership and joint witness
• To provide resources for the whole Church to enable local Provinces, dioceses and congregations to educate and advocate for global reconciliation
• To advocate human rights (especially for women and children), environmental justice and peacemaking to the Anglican Communion, civil society and governments wherever there are injustices

We do this by:

• Convening a Communion-wide gathering of representatives from each Province at least once every three years
• Reporting to the Anglican Consultative Council with recommendations for Communion-wide action on justice and peace concerns
• Providing continuity through the appointment of a steering committee made up of at least one representative of each region in the Communion
• Responding to Provincial partner invitations to send delegations to areas of distress for solidarity and consultation for action
• Issuing communiqués and statements on timely justice and peace concerns through the APJN steering committee
• Identifying resources for conflict transformation to be used by provinces which bear the scars of conflict
• Partnering with other inter-Anglican Networks, especially the Women’s, Youth, Indigenous, Refugee, and Environmental Networks
Foreword

The Anglican Peace and Justice Network has a well-established reputation within the global Communion for producing very high quality reports. In part this is a reference to the superb technical and aesthetic quality of the reports but mostly it has to do with recognition and appreciation of the unequivocal passion for God's peace and God's justice, which consistently characterizes the spirit and the intent of all of the endeavors of APJN.

This 2007/8 APJN report is once again typically indicative of the extraordinarily wide range of peace and justice initiatives and activities involving individual APJN members both within their own Provinces and beyond and those involving the Network as a collective of global Anglicans drawn from across the breadth of the Communion.

The poignancy of so much of this report is utterly compelling. The desperate urgency with which we are all being called to act in order to alleviate human suffering and to transform the causative circumstances giving rise to that suffering cannot be overstated.

There are a series of recommendations contained in the body of the APJN 2007 meeting report on pages 5-6. It is these recommendations which all are urged to act upon even as we daily commit ourselves anew to being as harbingers of God's peace, as advocates for God's justice, as compassionate servant workers in God's infinitely complex, irresistibly demanding mission field.

On behalf of the Anglican Peace and Justice Network I commend this comprehensive and challenging report to the Anglican Consultative Council under whose pastoral and administrative aegis we work. I give thanks to God for the contributions of all members of the Network, for members of the steering committee and for the precious enabling resourcing we enjoy from a small number of Provinces and from the Episcopal Church. Very special thanks are due to the Rev. Canon Brian Grieves for his consummate secretarial support over many years.

Dr. Jenny Plane Te Paa
Convenor
APJN Steering Committee
May 2008
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Transformed by testimonies of faith and courage
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Section One
The Rwanda/Burundi Meeting

APJN TRIENNIAL MEETING
in Rwanda and Burundi, 2007

Under the inspired leadership of the Rt. Rev. Pie Ntukamazina, Bishop of Bujumbura, Burundi, members of the Anglican Peace and Justice Network representing 17 provinces of the Anglican Communion were hosted by the Anglican churches of Rwanda and Burundi from 25 September to 3 October 2007. Bishop Pie, a leader within the Network since 1994, had long advocated for a meeting in the Great Lakes region of Africa.

The gathering was focused intentionally upon conflict resolution, exploring the role of violence and civil unrest in societies and considering how best the church might respond to these contemporary realities. Many members of the Network brought moving reports of their own experience of living in conflict situations.

The meeting began in Kigali with a welcoming address by the Most Rev. Emmanuel Musaba Kolini, Archbishop of L’Eglise Episcopal au Rwanda and Bishop of Kigali. The Archbishop told the APJN members that their gathering was a “sacramental moment” bringing hope to the Rwandan people, in contrast to “the Rwanda of 1994, a time when the world abandoned us.” From April to July of 1994, more than one million Rwandans were slaughtered in what is acknowledged by the international community as genocide.

Citing Genesis 12:2-3, the Archbishop read of God’s call to Abraham to be a blessing to the nations and asked how the church could be a blessing to the earth in the aftermath of such horrific human violence. In Rwanda, where 90 percent of the people are Christian, he noted, genocide occurred amidst a failure of the church to prevent it. “It is very easy to be religious, but very difficult to be the people of God. What went wrong is a problem of the soul. The Lord is calling us to be a blessing.”

APJN members were deeply sobered by a visit to the Rwandan genocide museum, and by the careful, and often vivid, recounting of the root causes of the conflict, which include Rwanda’s colonial past and the role of the churches in this history. The museum delivers a clear message that this event, like others also depicted (such as the Holocaust, and the Armenian, Balkan, and Namibian genocides in the 20th century), should never be repeated. The museum records the work of reconciliation being done as part of rebuilding the nation, offering a hopeful glimpse of the future.

APJN members also were shaken by a visit to the Ntarama Church, where 5,000 people were slaughtered after taking refuge. The site now serves as a poignant memorial to the victims of the genocide. As Bishop Micah Dawidi, Sudan’s representative on the APJN, prayed for the victims and their families, members of the Network were enveloped in a spirit of prayer and reverence for the sanctity of life.

In a previously planned joint meeting with a Great Lakes delegation of the International Anglican Women’s Network, participants listened to women survivors from Rwanda who told disturbing and moving accounts of their ordeal. One, like thousands of others, was systematically hacked by machete and left for dead. When asked if she forgave those who committed these acts, she quietly replied, “The Bible calls us to forgive.” Another woman
spoke of being taken captive to the Congo region where she was brutally and repeatedly raped. As a result she became pregnant and infected with HIV. Her baby subsequently died and so she suffers not only the stigma and pain of AIDS but also the grief of losing a child. Both women attributed their ability to give witness to the historical reality, and to be messengers of hope, to the support they received from a social services organization known as AVEGA. It was established with support from the church in Rwanda to assist widows and orphans of the genocide.

APJN members saw many examples of ways in which the church is participating in the hard work of repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation. They expressed hope that their visit to Kigali served as a tangible measure of solidarity and support for the church and the country of Rwanda. They saw encouraging signs of rebirth among the people, especially in public health, education, justice, and environmental policy. One especially significant sign of hope was the official statistic showing that nearly 50 percent of the Rwandan parliament is made up of women.

After the Rwanda visit, members of the Network spent six nights in Bujumbura, Burundi, a country racked by years of civil strife and conflict. Bishop Pie led the group to a memorial site located on the grounds of a Roman Catholic seminary in the city of Buta. The memorial is dedicated to 40 seminarians and workers who were slaughtered by rebels. The rebels had demanded that the seminarians separate themselves along ethnic lines, so that one group would be killed and the other spared. In an extraordinarily courageous act of public witness, the young men declared they would rather die together than be separated. The memorial serves as a sign of hope and victory over evil and as a reminder to the church and the whole of society that in God’s plan for peace among all humankind there is to be “neither Jew nor Greek.”

Two women survivors in Burundi described their pain and suffering with members of the Network. Having survived death, nevertheless they and thousands of other women continue to live in tragically difficult situations of poverty, lack of housing, lack of means to support their children and, for many, HIV and AIDS as a result of infection from sexual abusers.

After field visits across Burundi, APJN members gathered for a two-day meeting chaired by the Network’s convener, Dr. Jenny Plane Te Paa of Aotearoa, New Zealand. A wide range of speakers from Burundi shared firsthand accounts of the ongoing socio-economic and political impact of violence and conflict giving rise to extreme conditions of poverty, HIV and AIDS, malaria, environmental degradation, and the continued abuse of women and children. Network members also heard poignant accounts of the resultant plight of thousands of internally displaced people traumatized by genocide and conflict in Rwanda, Burundi, and the neighboring Democratic Republic of Congo.

APJN originally planned to visit the Democratic Republic of Congo but at the last minute was advised that it was too dangerous to travel to Goma from Kigali by road. Instead, Bishop Bahati Bali-Busane of Bukavu, representing the DRC on the Network, offered a compelling account of the current situation in his region, drawing special attention to the ways in which conflict inevitably and often cruelly affects women and children.

Bishop Micah of Sudan outlined the background to the war in Sudan between north and south, its recent resolution through a Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and the conflict and humanitarian disaster continuing to unfold in Darfur. APJN joins with the people of the Sudan in deploring the violence, racism, and inter-religious conflict that continue, especially in Darfur.

APJN members learned that Muslims and Christians...
of southern Sudan once coexisted in relative harmony; the skills and attitudes necessary for living peacefully amidst diverse religious and ethnic realities are not unknown there. The participants were encouraged to hear of efforts by the Episcopal Church of Sudan to provide training in conflict resolution skills, and APJN recommends that skills of negotiation, cooperation, mutuality and interdependence should be revived with urgency across the Anglican Communion.

The report from Uganda indicated there is hope that a 21-year conflict in the north appears to be coming to an end, and that the ongoing peace process hosted by the government of southern Sudan will bear fruit. The report included the story of those bishops in the northern dioceses who struggled for a long time in isolation until 15 bishops from the south crossed over to the conflict zone and learned how their brother bishops had risked their lives to meet with rebel groups and even slept on the streets with abandoned children to protect them. Seeing the effects of war firsthand and praying side by side created the possibility for the whole country and church to take full ownership of their role in conflict resolution.

There was a report of the further deterioration of the appalling political situation in Zimbabwe, once the breadbasket of central Africa and now reduced to begging from neighboring countries for the country's most basic needs. APJN acknowledges that this tragic situation has two causes: (1) political mismanagement of the country, the blocking of any reform and the suppression of voices of opposition and (2) the failure of the United States and the United Kingdom to realize the commitments they made in the 1978 Lancaster Agreement, to assist in redistribution of land.

Stirring accounts of situations in Panama, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Philippines were reminders of the complicity of the United States and other countries in perpetrating and perpetuating acts of violence and social and economic destruction. In the Great Lakes region of Africa, the world turned its back on killing of unprecedented ferocity, which might have been prevented. This underlined the importance of strengthening the prophetic mission of the church to hold political powers to account for their actions.

After hearing many reports of horrific acts of violence...
by gunmen and armed militias, APJN members asked themselves who benefits from the sale of small arms, and reflected on the role of makers and sellers of arms in contributing to all conflicts.

The story of the Anglican Church of Canada’s efforts to seek healing and truth with aboriginal peoples pointed to the fact that reconciliation is not only a project in places of visible conflict, but is also called for where historic injustices have not been adequately addressed or resolved.

In addition to the conflict situations mentioned, the APJN also heard concerns about the recent violence in Myanmar and responded to calls for prayer for the people of that tortured land. The Network continues to support a vigorous and urgent peace process in Israel/Palestine as a matter of the highest priority and it further expresses its ongoing concerns for the conflicts in Iraq, Sri Lanka, and Pakistan.

Dr. Jeremiah Yang, a longtime member of APJN, reported on plans for the Towards Peace in Korea (TOPIK) conference in North and South Korea 14-21 November, 2007, under the leadership of the Anglican Church in Korea. The themes of reconciliation and reunification of the Korean peninsula were a focus of the APJN meeting held in Seoul in 1999. APJN had commended the plan for reunification to the Anglican Consultative Council in its 1999 report and joined the Anglican Church in Korea in urging the Archbishop of Canterbury to support this effort. (The conference proceeded as scheduled. The Archbishop sent retired Archbishop Robin Eames, who served as president of the conference, and APJN delegates participated in conference presentations.)

Canon Delene Mark, another longtime APJN member, described the Toward Effective Anglican Mission (TEAM) conference in March 2007 in Boksburg, South Africa. This conference drew more than 400 participants, representing more than 30 provinces and extra-provincial churches from around the Anglican Communion to consider new strategies for addressing the pervasive issues of HIV and AIDS and poverty eradication, especially through the Millennium Development Goals. The APJN discussed the recommendations of the TEAM conference, specifically Number 9 on strengthening peace and justice initiatives in areas of conflict and human displacement. APJN sees its triennial meeting as advancing the agenda of the TEAM conference.

APJN heard a brief report from Dr. Te Paa on issues

5,000 sought refuge in a church
Shaken by the poignant memorial at Ntarama, Rwanda, for victims slaughtered during the 1994 genocide, Maylanne Maybee of Canada joined other APJN members in prayer.
of conflict within the Anglican Communion, how they are being addressed and how they are affecting the work of some international Anglican efforts, including the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission, the Theological Education in the Anglican Communion project, and Lambeth Conference planning groups.

Summary

The Anglican Communion is a worldwide church of more than 77 million members. APJN believes it must increase its voice in advocacy on behalf of the powerless, for those most affected by conditions of suffering.

APJN continues to assert that in all situations of conflict and political violence, the church has the difficult and sometimes dangerous task of speaking out against injustice, especially where political interests are driven primarily by personal greed or ambition; where violence continues due to the unchecked spread of armaments, and where agreements between rebel or minority groups and governments are not being honored. It is therefore even more necessary that, globally, the Anglican Communion be encouraged to develop the skills and profile necessary for it to be an effective and boldly prophetic voice for God’s justice in all societies.

APJN supports the concept of healing through the processes of truth telling, repentance, and restorative justice. The network believes the worldwide Anglican Communion has an important role to play in these processes of reconciliation and in the ongoing pursuit of peace.

APJN calls on the Anglican Communion to preach the message of reconciliation by transformative prophetic action and to continue assisting in the facilitation of peace-making dialogue in situations of conflict. The Network will undertake, as one of its ongoing projects, to identify resources for conflict transformation that can be used in provinces and churches in the important work of reconciliation.

The Network encourages and celebrates the establishment of programs such as the Peace Centre in Burundi that seeks to support positive post-conflict reconciliation, rebuilding, and social development, including government initiatives to provide social security and services for primary education and medical care for pregnant women and for all children under five years of age.

While not for a moment overlooking the evidence of complicity by some church leaders in past conflicts and indeed in acts of genocide, the Network acknowledges that in each of the countries where conflict has destroyed communities, Anglican and Episcopal churches today are actively and authentically engaged in community rebuilding programs that address issues of human development through food security, education, the creation of sustainable livelihoods, health care, and women’s development.

APJN encourages the Anglican Communion to urge international Anglican development and aid agencies to increase their support where possible to local churches in order to hasten the implementation and flourishing of all social development programs.

On the devastating situation in Darfur, and specifically on the north–south conflict in Sudan, APJN requests that the African Union and United Nations be more assertive in seeking a commitment from the Khartoum government...
to the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement without further delay.

In all contexts where inter-religious tensions are a factor in ongoing conflict, APJN appeals to those Anglican leaders who are in dialogue with Muslim leaders around the world to share from their experience, insights, and wisdom on how best the inter-religious dimensions of the conflict in Sudan can be reduced. APJN applauds and affirms the efforts of local churches that are endeavoring to bring warring parties together and at the same time to provide training in conflict resolution skills. APJN calls on the Anglican Communion to support these courageous and visionary efforts.

APJN declares with firm conviction that the Anglican Communion must increase its presence in the regions and countries in conflict, and be in solidarity with the Anglican provinces and jurisdictions affected. APJN particularly calls for increased solidarity with the Anglican provinces in the Great Lakes region. While this solidarity should include a ministry of presence, the members of the Anglican Communion should strive to partner with all churches witnessing in the midst of civil strife and war AND support all efforts by those seeking to build peace and resolve conflict in their societies.

Members of APJN wish to directly challenge all provinces of the Communion to provide far more appropriately and adequately to those sister and brother members who are being needlessly and undeservedly caught up in seemingly endless cycles of political, economic, and sexual violence, and are thus experiencing resultant suffering, displacement, and unbearable poverty leading, in too many cases, to premature and entirely avoidable death.

APJN sees the critical work for justice and peace in all areas of conflict and violence mentioned in this report and in all earlier APJN reports as being utterly central to the effective and credible mission of the church and therefore to our ability as God’s peoples to reconcile all things to Christ.

At the conclusion of the business meeting, the Rev. Canon Brian Grieves, director of Peace and Justice Ministries for the Episcopal Church and long-serving APJN secretary, paid tribute to the hosts. “Archbishop Kolini could not have been more gracious and welcoming. He together with Bishop Pie guided us through what had been unspeakably horrific times in their respective countries with deep sensitivity and compassion. APJN participants were profoundly grateful to them and to their diocesan staff who had provided such exceptional administrative support in enabling the Network to see so much of what Rwanda and Burundi experienced during the genocides, and to appreciate the subsequent efforts of the Anglican Church to be a beacon of hope and of transformative promise in the aftermath of such unimaginable human suffering.”

Dr. Te Paa also expressed sincere gratitude on behalf of APJN to Archbishop Kolini and Bishop Pie and their diocesan staffs for their “abundant and exceptionally generous hospitality.” She noted the significance of two Communion networks, APJN and IAWN, working cooperatively on the critical issues of God’s mission in the world. She especially acknowledged the women who had so courageously recounted their harrowing personal experiences of often unspeakable suffering, and joined with them in expressing thanks to those church leaders “who are giving urgent and justified priority at this time in the life of the Communion to the needs of those who are suffering so disproportionately in God’s world.”
Our Hosts
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Abundant hospitality

Bishop Pie Ntukamazina joined the dancing and persuaded APJN members to try drumming during festive times accompanying the meeting in Bujumbura. Beautiful food, singing children, and heartfelt worship were other gifts.
“The confront line” or borderline of the Cold War

In the political negotiations (1943-45) to conclude World War II, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union had already decided to put the borderline of their impending ideological conflict on the Korean peninsula. At the end of World War II, the Korean people had sincerely wished to establish their own independent nation. However, in August 1945, according to secret agreements among the superpowers, American troops occupied the southern part of the Korean peninsula. Soviet troops occupied the northern part of the peninsula. The “Confront Line” of the impending Cold War was established on the heart of Korea without the consent of the Korean people.

Between 1945 and 1950, although Korea was under very tight control by the military governments established in both parts of the peninsula, civilian movement and communication still went on. In this difficult situation, the Korean people did their best to reunite their country. They sincerely believed that they would soon see a united country.

However, the Korean people’s expectations aside, the border between the north and the south became a “dead zone” that nobody could cross. The confrontation and conflict between the super-powers exploded into the conflict that came to be called the Korean War. The Korean War was not only an internal struggle on the Korean peninsula, but it also marked the beginning of the ideological conflict that came to be called the Cold War.

Sixteen countries including the United States allied with South Korea. Four countries including the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China allied with the North Korea. The tons of bombs and the other weapons that were used in the war added up to more than the total amount of destructive weaponry used in Europe during World War II. And all of this destructive force was concentrated in a relatively small land area in a relatively short period of time.

The whole country was devastated and much of the historical and cultural heritages of the land disappeared. The war has left deep scars in the hearts of the Korean...
people, with 6 million casualties and 10 million divided or separated families.

Military dictatorship in a divided Korea

The division between the North and the South, and the antagonism that grew between one side and the other, gave rise to oppression, torture, and killing on both sides of the border. It was a situation in which military dictatorships and the killing of its own citizens on both sides was legitimized. Under this system, anti-communism in South Korea and anti-capitalism or anti-imperialism in North Korea became the overriding principles to which all value judgments were pegged.

Religious and spiritual dimensions were also seriously contaminated by those ideologies of hatred. Christianity was regarded as the last fortress of anti-communism. Christian churches in South Korea incorporated anti-communism as part of their theology and hatred against their brothers and sisters in North Korea grew. We Koreans had exploited God’s words and truths for our own ideological purposes. But this essential betrayal provided opportunities for South Korean churches to draw many perhaps unthinking people into their own “fortress churches.” Under the division system, the church in South Korea has developed very rapidly, and the number of Christians doubled and tripled.

The new front line for the hegemony struggle among global superpowers

In 1980 several hundred civilians in Kwangjoo were killed by the South Korean military government. This event ignited resistance against the military dictatorship. In 1987, at last, the military dictatorship in South Korea ended with the victory of democratic civilian power. In the same period, the Cold War confrontation between East and West ended with the victory of the Western bloc.

In this changed situation, the South Korean democratization movement moved toward the peace and reunification movement on the Korean peninsula. Korean government and civilian organizations have done their best to strengthen the relationship between the North and the South. But we have seen that the hopeful signs brought by those efforts have been dissipated or marginalized by interventions by surrounding superpowers, including United States, Japan, China, and Russia.

Reaching out

Prior to attending the TOPIK conference in Seoul, a delegation of international and Korean members visited the Geumgangsan special tourism region in North Korea, 14-16 November 2007.
With the appearance of George W. Bush’s administration in the United States, the situation on the Korean peninsula became worse and worse. In the United States neo-conservative plans for the global hegemony of the United States began to take shape. The Bush Doctrine, which was concretized after the September 11 attack on New York City, shows very clearly his ideology of the holy war against terrorism and his global ruling strategy. One of the key elements of his doctrine and plan is the prerogative to choose the battlefields for his holy war. Like an ancient emperor, he decided to proclaim an Axis of Evil in the name of God. North Korea, along with Afghanistan and Iraq, was declared to be part of that Axis.

The Korean peninsula has once more become a front line for the global hegemony struggle among superpowers like the United States, China, Japan, and Russia. We believe that the so-called Six Party Talks—and all those confusing issues related to the North Korean nuclear plan—are controlled by the interests of those superpowers.

The Korean people and the Anglican Church of Korea understand that this situation presents great risks in which the future of the Korean people could be decided by the interests of those superpowers, ignoring the real desires of the Korean people, and increasing the threat of a new war on the Korean peninsula.

**APJN and ACC 13**

The Korean situation has been a continued concern of APJN since the network was founded. An APJN conference was held in Seoul in April 1999. APJN, on behalf of Anglican Communion, delivered its support for the Korean people and the ACK’s efforts for unification and reconciliation. Again, the crisis on the Korean peninsula was getting worse. The Anglican Church of Korea decided to introduce the situation to the Anglican Communion through the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in Nottingham in 2005.

ACC 13 decided as follows in its resolution 40:

**The Anglican Consultative Council:**

1. Expresses its profound concern about the deepening crisis on the Korean peninsula, consequent upon the announcements by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea [DPRK] that it is developing nuclear weapons and by the United States of America [USA] that it is contemplating the use of military force against the DPRK in order to prevent this.

2. Believes that, for the sake of peace in northeast Asia and the world, armed conflict on the Korean peninsula must be prevented, and to that end the DPRK and the USA should renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons and the use of military force respectively, and endeavor to resolve the present crisis through dialogue and negotiation.

3. Recognizes that the origin of the present crisis threatening peace on the Korean peninsula and northeast Asia lies in the division of the Korean peninsula into two states, and therefore supports and encourages the Anglican Church in Korea and other churches and organizations in Korea in their work for reunification of the two Koreas.

4. Asks Anglican Church leaders in nations with influence in the northeast Asian situation to consider visiting the DPRK and the Republic of Korea and contribute in whatever ways they can to the reunification of the two Koreas.

**Basic plans**

In accordance with ACC 13, plans were made for a peace trip to North Korea followed by a peace conference in South Korea in November 2007. This was organized by the Anglican Church of Korea through consultation with Lambeth Palace, APJN, and interested partner churches such as The Episcopal Church (USA), and the Nippon Sei Ko Kai (Japan).
Arising from the heart of the Korean people, and in response to a resolution of the 13th meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), a worldwide Anglican peace conference entitled “Towards Peace in Korea” (TOPIK), was held November 14-20 in Paju. Hosted by the Anglican Church of Korea, we came from all parts of the globe including: Korea, Japan, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Australia, Canada, the Philippines, Taiwan, Sri Lanka, Aotearoa New Zealand, the Solomon Islands, Palestine, Cyprus, Myanmar/Burma, Switzerland, and Hong Kong. We regret the absence of members from the China Christian Council, due to their Synod being held at the same time as this conference.

The Most Rev. Dr. Francis Kyong-Jo Park, Primate of the Anglican Church of Korea, reminded us that “as servant members of the Body of Christ, we are called to be apostles of peace in a world where discord and conflict are prevalent.” Through participation in this conference, we acknowledge that the “transformation of unjust structures of society” is one of the five marks of mission of the Anglican Communion.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. Dr. Rowan Williams, noted the appropriateness of Korea as a site for this conference. Reflecting on the fact that “the majority of Koreans have no memory of a time before the division of the peninsula,” Archbishop Williams observed that a deeper awareness of the difficult issues of Korean reunification can “empower and encourage those seeking to overcome the obstacles in the path to peace.”

Unable to attend the conference, the Archbishop named as his special envoy and president of the conference, the Most Rev. Dr. Robin Eames, former Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland. Archbishop Eames shared with us from the start that “only by coming together in a spirit of humility and with a willingness to learn from one another can we find the common ground that can allow us to move into the future in peace.”

Our conference began on Wednesday, November 14, as the 41 international members joined some 100 Korean members on a peace trip across the Korean Peninsula, over the Demilitarized Zone and into the Geumgang-san special tourism region of North Korea. It was significant for us, gathered from many nations, to make this crossing in a spirit of prayer. Surrounded by the beauty of these mountains, a representative group was able to make a presentation of goods both to aid reconstruction of buildings and farms damaged by the serious floods last summer, and to provide medical relief.

That same evening we, representing member churches of the Anglican Communion, gathered to celebrate the Eucharist. This was the first official Anglican worship in North Korea since the Korean War and division of the peninsula over 50 years ago.

Following our return to Paju, near Seoul in South Korea, we gathered for a four-day peace forum. We celebrated the Eucharist each day, led in turn by Korean, Japanese, and American members. We heard from many speakers about the background to the conflict on the Korean peninsula and the deep-seated pain resulting from that conflict and subsequent division. We also heard
the experiences and views of those living in other regions of conflict.

During this conference, we gathered in an atmosphere of prayerful fellowship, following a path taken by many pilgrims and disciples of peace before us in the way of Christ. We acknowledged and repented of our own role in creating and adding to conflict, and reflected theologically on the tasks of reconciliation, reunification and peace.

Now, at the conclusion of our conference, we wish to share several specific observations, followed by some possible follow-up recommendations.

First, in regards to the Anglican Communion and its member churches, we recognize the concern shown for the Korean situation in the 1998 Lambeth Conference Resolution v.26, which called for “peace, reunification, and cooperation” between the governments and people of the divided Korea. We believe that the work done here this week could serve as a model for other parts of the Communion where conflict persists. We appreciate the support given by the Archbishop of Canterbury for this conference, and hereby ask the organizers of the 2008 Lambeth Conference, as well as member churches’ national synods and conventions, to provide time in their agendas for presentations on peacemaking in general and the Korean situation in particular.

To our ecumenical and interfaith partners, we welcome further conversation with all who committed to peacemaking and affirm that what we can do together, we must not do alone. Therefore, we commend the World Council of Churches’ “Decade to Overcome Violence” and offer our support to that ongoing work, as well as to specific peacemaking projects sponsored by other denominations and faith groups.

To the governments of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, we acknowledge and appreciate their recent efforts towards peace and denuclearization, and we encourage further summit meetings in the future. Constructive dialogue is the first step in the process of reconciliation. We ask both governments to recognize that each has much to offer the other, far beyond economic resources. We offer our assistance to this ongoing process when needed and as possible. We commit to both governments the need for common space to support education programs for young people from both countries, following models such as the Middle East-based program, “Kids for Peace.”

To other governments, we remind them that Korea is part of the global family; and if one part of the family is suffering, the entire family suffers. Specifically, we encourage the various governments of northeast Asia as well as the United States to take active steps to reduce the military tension in that region, reminding them that long-term prosperity and stability is dependent on peaceful resolution of the Korean situation. We urge the countries that make up the Six-Party Talks to adopt specific practices to change the Cold War system into one of peace, leading to a normalization of relationships.

We recognize that this conference is but one step along the way of peace, and that there are a number of initiatives that can be taken in response to the Korean situation. We make the following specific recommendations:

**Member churches of the Anglican Communion**

- Utilize existing Anglican resources, particularly the Anglican Peace and Justice Network, for learning about and sharing information on peacemaking.
- Create a task force, authorized by the Archbishop of Canterbury and working with the Anglican Peace and Justice Network, to initiate future programs, including a similarly designed peace conference in another part of the world such as the Middle East.
- Authorize that task force to create peace-focused educational and liturgical materials for churches throughout the Communion.
• Build on the work of the World Council of Churches’ "Decade to Overcome Violence."
• Provide programs in conflict resolution for those in theological and ministry formation, specifically creating an Institute for Peace-Training within the Anglican Communion.
• Encourage the development of grassroots, parish-based peace training programs.

The Anglican Church of Korea
• Organize a further peace conference which would include a wider range of participation, particularly from North Koreans, young people, women, those of other faiths and those from regions under-represented at this conference.
• Sponsor the translation and publishing of the stories of Koreans’ experiences into at least English and Japanese.

The Anglican Consultative Council and the Lambeth Conference
• Initiate a specifically Anglican follow-up to the WCC Decade to Overcome Violence.
• Provide time in the agenda for Lambeth 2008 for discussion of the issues raised by this conference.

We again wish to share our deep appreciation to the Most Rev. Dr. Francis Kyong-Jo Park, Primate of the Anglican Church of Korea, for his vision in convening this conference and for his gracious hospitality towards all of us here present. We give thanks for the work of the Most Rev. Dr. Robin Eames as president of the conference. We also offer our appreciation to the Most Rev. Dr. Katharine Jefferts Schori, Presiding Bishop and Primate of The Episcopal Church; the Most Rev. Nathaniel Uematsu, Primate of Nippon Sei Ko Kai; the Most Rev. Roger Herft, Archbishop of Perth, attending at the request of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia; and all the other primates, bishops, clergy, laity, and religious who have participated in this conference. We extend our special thanks to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. Dr. Rowan Williams, for his support for this peace conference, and for tireless efforts on behalf of the Anglican Communion.

We affirm that peace is a gift from God. We, the participants of the Worldwide Anglican Peace Conference, TOPIK, commit ourselves to the recommendations of this communiqué, and offer it for your consideration and action.

The Most Rev. Dr. Robin Eames
President of the TOPIK Conference
The Most Rev. Dr. Francis Kyong-Jo Park
Host-Convener of the TOPIK Conference

Prayers for peace
Liturgical dancers added to the beauty of the worship service that inaugurated the worldwide Anglican conference “Towards Peace in Korea” in Seoul.
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In Johannesburg, more than 400 delegates from approximately 30 provinces of the Anglican Communion had an opportunity to hear from brothers and sisters who are actively engaged in ministry in regions that are experiencing or have recently emerged from conflict.

Among those who helped to give the Communion a sense of what is occurring, and how the body can support communities emerging from conflict or are still in the midst of it, was Bishop Nelson Onono-Onweng of Northern Uganda. Bishop Onono-Onweng shared a video, Rise Up and Walk, which depicted the many challenges facing Northern Uganda after two decades of war.

Since the war began, 300,000 civilians have died—primarily women, children, and the elderly. While camps have been established for displaced persons, overcrowding has led to unhealthy conditions. Currently, 1,200 people die in camps monthly, and the HIV and AIDS prevalence is 12 percent, double the national rate of infection. Outside of camps, an average of 46 people die violently each day.

In addition to inadequate health care and acts of violence, education remains a serious challenge in war-torn areas. In Northern Uganda, 700 schools are no longer functional, while a quarter of a million youth have never attended school. In this environment, children are particularly vulnerable to the lack of resources and violence. Latest estimates indicate that more than 20,000 children have been conscripted into rebel armies while at least 1,000 children have been born to girls, under the age of 14, who were abducted by rebels. Nightly, some 45,000 children sleep in the streets together, to avoid abduction.

Given the protracted nature of this conflict, society's ability to function has been seriously damaged; non-governmental organizations are now at the forefront of providing social services.

Considering the grave circumstances confronting members of the Communion in various parts of the world, it is essential that the entirety of the church be aware of and support work in conflict zones, not only in thought and word—but in deed as well. Despite the principle that if one member of the body is suffering, all are suffering, many delegates from areas experiencing conflict expressed how alone they feel; and that in many instances, sense that the Communion has forgotten them, and not suffered alongside them.

Tangibly, the church can play a significant role in post-conflict situations by helping communities to re-establish livelihoods. Often, in situations of armed struggle, land, livestock, equipment and other tools of production are destroyed—deliberately or inadvertently. This reality leaves individuals without the tools or resources to produce food or purchase goods. Given their presence in even the most remote places, churches are uniquely positioned to provide relief in these suffering communities.

Beyond providing immediate needs such as food, churches can assist by establishing seed banks, where farmers can obtain seeds to grow produce. This has been one of the more successful interventions in Northern Uganda. Bishop Onono-Onweng described how the church established a market where members of the community were given vouchers to purchase seeds from vendors. The vendors consisted of individuals from surrounding communities who had a surplus of seedlings. This model had a multiple effect; it allowed for a redistribution of resources while ensuring that proceeds from sales remained in local communities.

In light of the very real challenges facing the church in
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areas of unrest, delegates reaffirmed their commitment to ensure that none were forgotten, and to work in increased partnership to make sure that the concerns of all are actively addressed. To this end, the conference identified four areas where the Communion could make a contribution to the development of these societies, namely: caring for displaced people, rebuilding livelihoods, education, and reconciliation. Of the necessary interventions, the place in which the church has the potential to fill a particularly unique role is in supporting uprooted persons and facilitating processes of post-conflict reconciliation.

Refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons

In caring for those impacted by armed conflict, the church must pay special attention to the needs of internally displaced people, refugees and asylum seekers. Currently, the world is experiencing one of the greatest movements of peoples in human history; much of this migration is the result of conflict and the ensuing persecution and loss of livelihood. Despite the general acceptance of the free flow of money, goods, and services brought about by globalization, there remains a considerable amount of hostility toward the world’s 12 million refugees and 21 million internally displaced persons, the majority of whom are women and children.

The church must address issues of forced migration, not only because many Anglican dioceses have populations in various stages of migration, but because the church has a biblical imperative to respond to the needs of displaced people. Throughout the gospels, believers are reminded that the “Son of man has no place to lay his head.” The Book of Ruth, and in fact the entirety of scripture, speaks to the responsibility borne by those who know God to care for the stranger. The question then becomes how the Anglican Communion lives out this biblical imperative. Delegates acknowledged that in addition to mobilizing resources for the displaced in our communities, advocacy could serve as a powerful tool in assisting refugees and asylum seekers.

Post-conflict reconciliation

In exploring post-conflict reconciliation, delegates were privileged to hear from Fr. Michael Lapsley, director of the Institute for Healing Memories. Active in South Africa’s anti-apartheid struggle, Fr. Lapsley was sent into exile in the frontline states. In 1990, while in Harare, he was the victim of a letter bomb attack in which he lost both hands, an eye, and suffered hearing loss. As Fr. Lapsley’s own story is one of healing and reconciliation, he offered many helpful insights on the role of the church in this vital area. Pointing out that while the church’s main calling is to heal the brokenness of humanity and restore communities to right relationship with God, these are not areas that receive priority funding in churches and ministries. While the world may have neglected reconciliation in conceptualizing the MDGs, the body of Christ cannot.

Using South Africa as an example, Fr. Lapsley indicated that in post-conflict scenarios there are two types of healing that must occur. The first addresses issues of food,
electricity, water, and education; the other, less tangible but equally important, are issues of how to interact with the past. South Africa chose to facilitate a process of healing via the national Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). At the time the TRC was established, there were, and continue to be, those who asserted that the time had come to forgive and forget. Fr. Lapsley, however, reminded delegates that nowhere in scripture are believers called to forget. Rather, as “people of the book,” Christians belong to one of the great remembering religions. Throughout the Old Testament, the people of Israel are regularly admonished to build memorials; and when the nation went astray, their prophets reminded them of when they were slaves in Egypt, not to recall bitterness, but to spur them on to righteousness as a result of God’s grace. The New Testament also instructs believers to remember. The Eucharist, a central part of Anglican worship, recalls Jesus’ words: “Do this in remembrance of me.”

Fr. Lapsley cautions, however, that there are two types of memory: destructive and redemptive. Unfortunately, in both personal lives and national memory, destructive memory all too regularly passes the bitterness of one generation’s experience on to subsequent generations. Often people use the suffering they have experienced to justify inflicting pain and suffering upon others. Sharing a quote by South African Chief Albert Luthuli, Fr. Lapsley illustrated this principle: “Those who think of themselves as victims, eventually become the victimizers of others.” In order to move from destructive memory to redemptive memory, Fr. Lapsley spoke of the power of acknowledgement.

When individuals, governments or institutions acknowledge their role in causing pain and suffering, that moment has the power to begin a process of healing and restoration. Yet often, acknowledgment is not forthcoming. Even in these instances, once victims live through the circumstances inflicted upon them, they become survivors; if they choose to, they can move from being survivors to victors, as Jesus modeled through his death and resurrection.

As members of the Body, we are required to forgive. But as Fr. Lapsley points out, forgiveness is not necessarily the quickly made apology people so often give and so often receive. Rather, forgiveness is as much, if not more so, for the sake of the wounded as for the offender. Forgiveness is not something that happens instantaneously, rather it is a choice, it is a journey, and it is at times extremely challenging—but it must be undertaken if victims are to grow into victors.

In Fr. Lapsley’s work, the Institute for Healing Memories serves those seeking healing by providing a space for them to acknowledge their pain and to tell their stories. In a small way, every member of the Communion can contribute to the healing of others, by listening to their stories without judgment, and by acknowledging one another’s pain.
Some 90 members of the Church of Melanesia met April 28-May 1, 2008 in Honiara, Solomon Islands, for a provincial consultation entitled “Healing Past Hurts: A Way Forward for the Church of Melanesia in the Ministry of Reconciliation and Peace-Building.”

The consultation brought together participants from the areas of the Solomon Islands most seriously affected by the “ethnic tension” conflict of 1998-2003: rural Guadalcanal, Malaita Province, and Honiara. Participants included bishops, clergy, the church’s four religious communities, women, youth, chiefs, laymen, ex-militants and ex-police, as well as Provincial Office staff, the bishops of the other dioceses in the Solomon Islands and representatives of the Solomon Islands government.

The consultation began with a keynote address, “Biblical Reflection on Reconciliation and Peace,” by Bishop Philemon Riti, General Secretary of the Solomon Islands Christian Association and former Moderator of the United Church of the Solomon Islands. It was followed by a theological reflection on the same subject by the Very Rev. Sam Ata, Dean of St. Barnabas Cathedral, Honiara. Each day began with biblical reflection on the ministry of reconciliation.

A two-day listening process then began, with presentations by groups within the Consultation: the Dioceses of Central Solomons, Central Melanesia and Malaita; women; youth; men’s and women’s religious communities; ex-militants and their representatives; traditional chiefs, and the Solomon Islands Government. The presentations were all discussed in small mixed groups.

Ms. Joy Kere, Permanent Secretary of the Solomon Islands Government Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace, presented the government’s program of peace-building and reconciliation, including the proposed Truth and Reconciliation Commission bill to be brought before Parliament in July. This Commission has long been a request of the Solomon Islands churches.

On the third day, the Consultation agreed on seven key areas of reconciliation and peace-building ministry for the Church of Melanesia in the Solomon Islands: Healing ministry, mediating ministry, reconciling ministry, marriage and family ministry, rebuilding and strengthening Christian societies in post-conflict areas, seeking justice for the suffering people, and developing structures for coordinating, prioritizing and implementation, including ecumenical relations.

**Listening**

Women from Malaita and Guadalcanal were among those gathered for the Honiara consultation.
The “implementing groups” — the three dioceses, the religious communities, the provincial staff and representatives of the Solomon Islands government — then met in small groups to look at their work, develop new programs and prioritize.

On the fourth day, the Consultation accepted these priorities and discussed how the provincial program might coordinate and facilitate them. Priorities include a family-based training center for livelihood on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal, surveys to acquire more information on those affected by the violence, programs for Malaitan residents of Guadalcanal displaced back to Malaita, ministry to ex-militants, memorial services for those lost, and further training for members of religious communities and others, particularly in the area of trauma-counseling and conflict resolution.

On its final day, the Consultation recommended the formation of a Church of Melanesia Commission on Justice, Peace and Reconciliation under the Melanesian Board of Mission. The new Commission will be put to the November 2008 General Synod for approval.

The Consultation met in a spirit of friendship and good will, with church members who had been separated for many years seeing each other again and sharing each other’s stories of suffering and resurrection.

The “implementing groups” — the three dioceses, the religious communities, the provincial staff and representatives of the Solomon Islands government — then met in small groups to look at their work, develop new programs and prioritize.

On the fourth day, the Consultation accepted these priorities and discussed how the provincial program might coordinate and facilitate them. Priorities include a family-based training center for livelihood on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal, surveys to acquire more information on those affected by the violence, programs for Malaitan residents of Guadalcanal displaced back to Malaita, ministry to ex-militants, memorial services for those lost, and further training for members of religious communities and others, particularly in the area of trauma-counseling and conflict resolution.

On its final day, the Consultation recommended the formation of a Church of Melanesia Commission on Justice, Peace and Reconciliation under the Melanesian Board of Mission. The new Commission will be put to the November 2008 General Synod for approval.

The Consultation met in a spirit of friendship and good will, with church members who had been separated for many years seeing each other again and sharing each other’s stories of suffering and resurrection.

The Consultation concluded with an Ascension Day Eucharist with the theme of “Christ’s and our suffering and resurrected humanity lifted into the divine” at St. Alban’s Parish, Honiara. The Eucharist included a time of public confession and reconciliation and the commissioning of the Church of Melanesia’s new Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Coordinator, the Rev. Graham Mark. The Rt. Rev. Terry Brown, senior bishop of the Church of Melanesia, presided and preached. A closing dinner with speeches followed.

The Consultation was given financial support by the Community Sector Program of AusAID, for which the Church of Melanesia extends its thanks.

While many felt the Consultation was long overdue, because of ongoing difficulties and other concerns, it has been possible only now. However, with this Consultation, the Church of Melanesia’s formal program of reconciliation and peace-building is now firmly launched.

This article was written by the Rt. Rev. Terry Brown, bishop of the Diocese of Malaita, Solomon Islands, and chair of the consultation.
SUDAN:
Let Us Move from Violence to Peace

Church and community leaders came from throughout Sudan for a Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Conference at Juba Cathedral January 14-17, 2008, sponsored by the Episcopal Church of Sudan for its 24 dioceses. The theme was “Blessed are the Peacemakers for They Shall Be Called the Children of God.” The conference was funded by the Parish of Trinity Church, New York City, and organized by the ECS Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Commission. The chairman, the Rt. Rev. Daniel Deng Bul, then Bishop of Renk Diocese, has since been elected and enthroned as Archbishop of the ECS and Bishop of Juba. The vice chairman is the Rt. Rev. Micah Laila Dawidi, assistant bishop of Juba. He represented Sudan at the APJN meeting in Burundi.

In March 2008, during Holy Week, the Commission sponsored another peace conference in Bor, Southern Sudan, pulling together church and community leaders from Jonglei, Upper Nile, and Central Equatoria States. This conference was funded by the Diocese of Virginia.

Very complete summaries of both conferences, which include detailed reports from individual dioceses, have been published by the ECS.

The following communiqué, issued on January 17, summarizes the Juba conference recommendations.

We have spent four days in very valuable discussion, listening and in dialogue with one another, to assess the current situation in our places and plan how the Church can respond in cooperation with our communities and government. We affirm our Christian calling to work for peace, recognizing our Gospel mandate to take the lead to bring peace, and in thanksgiving to God who has reconciled us to himself through the death of his Son, Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. We seek to work according to the grace of God and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

In particular, we make the following recommendations:

Tribalism

We see an urgent need to address the issue of tribalism, within the Church and in all our communities. We see this as part of the wider question, How do we see ourselves as Sudanese people? This issue underlies many of the problems we face in Sudan. Can we recognize each other as created in the image of God, and as part of a single humanity blessed by God in order to fill the earth? We applaud the great progress made in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement but see that we still experience many divisions along ethnic lines, according to color, according to tribe, or through the absence of respect for our own languages. We consider it our urgent priority to proclaim the Gospel message of love, and of mutual respect for one another as created in God’s image and equal before God. We affirm our “unity in diversity.”

We recommend specific measures to address tribalism, including:

- Education to overcome prejudice and promote awareness of the dangers of tribalism;
- Develop a school curriculum which introduces our different cultures;
- Transfer church personnel between areas and regions;
- Establish boarding schools and ensure transfer of teachers between areas;
- Encourage reconciliation and forgiveness at all levels, from top to grass roots;
- Leading by example in avoiding rough words about other groups.

Comprehensive Peace Agreement

The CPA provides the basis for a just and sustainable peace in Sudan. We give thanks to God for the Agreement and express our support for all efforts to ensure its full and timely implementation. We nevertheless recognize that many people within our communities remain ignorant about the content of the CPA and see an urgent need for its
widespread dissemination. We therefore recommend:

- Use of preaching opportunities, public occasions and the mass media to disseminate information on the CPA;
- Organizing workshops, seminars and rallies, including the involvement of sister churches;
- Involvement of church leaders, Mothers' Union, youth and community leaders in propagating the CPA;
- Cooperation with UNMIS (United Nations Mission in Sudan) in organizing CPA awareness programs;
- Networking and partnership with NGOs, including use of their materials to promote the CPA, and translation of CPA into local languages;
- Appoint a CPA Sunday in churches, and a CPA Monday in secondary schools.

The Referendum

We recognize the Referendum to be held in 2011 as being of key significance in the implementation of the CPA. Aware of the various aspirations of our communities, we consider it important for church leaders to speak with a united voice on this issue. We affirm the right of every human being to decide his or her destiny, and accordingly we support the right of self-determination for the people of Southern Sudan to decide their future, whether for unity or separation. We commit ourselves to raise awareness of the Referendum to ensure that the process is carried out with proper transparency, and propose that the church and community leaders be involved in ensuring such transparency.

Safeguarding the church's position in Northern Sudan

While there may be uncertainty regarding the future political arrangements, we affirm that the church has no boundaries. We commit ourselves to the unity of the Church of Sudan whether across one or two countries. To consolidate the church’s position in Northern Sudan we propose the following strategies:

- Training of clergy and church leadership in economics and financial management;
- Capacity building of indigenous Christians to take positions in the church;
- Advocacy and mobilization of church and political forces together to repeal laws which restrict access to land for the building of churches, and restrict the church’s activities;
- Promoting constructive dialogue between Christians and Muslims at all levels and in all parts of Sudan;
- Working together with other churches to ensure equal representation of Christians and Muslims within the Ministry of Religious Affairs in the Government of National Unity;
- Establish missionary dioceses in the North to encourage the exchange of experiences between the South and North as well as with other parts of the world;
- Launch missionary programs involving the South to enable experienced clergy to serve for at least two years in the North.

Addressing trauma and threats of revenge

We recognize as a serious threat to security and well-being the war’s widespread legacy of trauma and the desire for revenge. To address this we propose:

- The training of counselors;
- The development of a Bible-based curriculum for counselors;
- Encourage a holistic approach to healing which includes emotional and spiritual healing as well as education, reparation, the rule of law and respect for humanity;
- Teaching and practice of forgiveness;
- A truth and reconciliation commission.

Disarmament

The proliferation of small arms represents a serious danger within our communities. We recommend close cooperation between the church, the government and community leaders in addressing this, in particular by:

- Supporting the work of the SDDR and SSDDR;
- Addressing the root causes of people's refusal to disarm;
- Ensuring that security is maintained for all people;
- Creating awareness of the danger of arms within the community;
- Encouraging compensation and providing development funds to whole communities;
- Controlling the sale of arms.
**Armed forces**

We have identified an important responsibility of the Church towards the dignity and well-being of our armed forces. We recognize the effect which many years of conflict have on those bearing arms. We therefore recommend renewed efforts by the Church:

- Provide army chaplains and assist in their training;
- Organize workshops for army officers and cooperate in providing civic education;
- Encourage the army and police in maintaining law and order;
- Enlighten the community to recognize and care for the army as our own children.

**Issues of cattle keeping and farming**

We have been concerned at reports of local conflicts between cattle keepers and farming communities. Memories of peaceful coexistence in earlier times assure us that such conflict can be avoided. We propose committed efforts to make it possible for both groups to pursue their livelihoods without damaging each other's interests. In particular we recommend:

- Location of cattle well away from agricultural lands;
- Enlightenment of cattle owners in the care of their cattle and the damage caused to crops;
- Formation of joint committees comprising cattle owners and farmers to solve their problems;
- Lobbying the local authority to introduce appropriate laws and regulations for cattle owners and agricultural schemes;
- Fines where owners allow their cattle to destroy crops;
- Encouraging cattle owners to return to their original places.

**Returnees**

Recognizing the difficulties faced by communities in the reintegration of returnees with different cultures, whether from Khartoum, East Africa or overseas, we propose that the Church cooperate closely with local governments in welcoming returnees and assisting in their reintegration. In particular we recommend:

- Organizing jointly a warm welcome for returnees;
- Encouraging the role of families in facilitating reintegration;
- Encouraging cooperation between Ministries for Youth & Sport, Gender and Education in organizing programs;
- Development of community facilities to provide social and spiritual space for reintegration to take place, such as a multi-purpose center.

**Plans for returning refugees**

The educational complex in the Diocese of Lainya was destroyed during two decades of civil war in Sudan. The remaining structures will be used as the foundation for a new rehabilitation center to train returning refugees.
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Displacement by oil exploration and other commercial interests

We are concerned at the absence of consideration for those displaced from their land by oil exploration and other commercial interests. We recommend:

- Proper regulation of the activities of commercial interests, including strict environmental controls;
- Advocacy by the Church on behalf of those displaced for compensation, proper resettlement, and training and employment opportunities.

Unity of the Church

We recognize a specific responsibility to work for the unity of the Church and see a special urgency for joint working where churches risk being identified locally along tribal lines. In particular we recommend:

- Holding a united day of thanksgiving and prayer for peace;
- Ecumenical prayers at grass-roots level;
- Respect for each other’s faith and processes;
- Avoiding naming churches on a tribal basis;
- Networking with other denominations in sharing workshops and conferences;
- Active support for the Sudan Council of Churches;
- Re-enforcing ECS Episcopal Order No.1 at every level of ECS.

Conclusion

Having heard at first hand of the situations in different parts of Sudan, and in particular of the continuing suffering in Darfur, we hold the concerns of all our people in our hearts and commit ourselves before God to prayer and action on their behalf. We plan to take forward these recommendations through the ECS Justice Peace and Reconciliation Commission, through visits to conflict areas by members of the Commission, and through the activities of our dioceses, in particular the diocesan Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Committees. We will work in close cooperation with community leaders, the Government, the UN Mission and other stakeholders to build peace, justice and reconciliation in our land. May Almighty God support us in this work.

(The communiqué was signed on behalf of the conference participants by Bishop Daniel Deng Bul, chair; Bishop Micah Laila Dawidi, vice chair, and the Rev. Nelson Fitch, coordinator, of the ECS Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Commission.)
RELIGION AND VIOLENCE

By the Most Rev. Dr. Alexander John Malik
Moderator of the United Church of Pakistan and Bishop of Lahore

Bishop Malik first presented this paper at the sixth annual meeting of the Anglican / Al-Azhar Dialogue Committee in London, 2-3 September 2007.

When one has to deal with a topic like “Religion and Violence,” one could start by defining the words “religion” and “violence.” We do not intend to do that. It would suffice to accept a general understanding of religion and violence. It is generally taken for granted that any philosophy or ideology having a set of beliefs in a supernatural Being or Body, and (or) a set of texts believed to be sacred or inspired and (or) requiring from its adherents conformity to certain rules, regulations, commandments, and ordinances, would fall within the scope of a definition of “religion.”

In the same way, it would not seem practical for our purposes here to get into a lengthy academic discussion defining “violence.” A more or less generalized understanding of violence would seem to be sufficient. Violence is generally taken to be any act or acts—physical, psychological, or otherwise—intended to cause injury or hurt to any individual or individuals, groups, organizations, nations, or states.

Religion, as we have defined it, is more or less universal. Violence, too, is universal. For some, violence is inherent in human nature. We may or may not agree with that statement but readily accept that humans have an animal nature, too. If both religion and violence are of universal character, is there an inherent relationship between them? Or has religion been merely employed as a tool to legitimize violence?

Does religion have the capacity to transform the animal nature inherent in humans into an instrument for peace and harmony in the world? In this paper we would like to look at all these questions with an emphasis on the last one.

Universality of violence

Violence is not restricted to one country or continent, one region or religion. It is universally used as a means and a strategy to achieve certain objectives; sometimes brutally as sheer naked aggression, or at other times subtly, covered in the garb of legislation and legitimacy as a tool to maintain law and order.

When one looks at nature, it seems that it works on the principle of “survival of the fittest.” In some ways, human history does not look very different from jungle law. For the past four to five thousand years of known human history, it seems that individuals, tribes, clans, communities, and nations have been committing violence against each other in one form or another.

No nation or people in the whole world could claim, in all honesty, that it has not committed violence at one time or other in its history. Even in the Old Testament, one can easily find accounts of everything from small skirmishes to large-scale wars. These accounts are recorded in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. Yahweh, the He-
brew name for God, has been referred to as the King of
the Jews and the Lord of the Armies of Israel (1 Samuel
17:45). Whenever the Israelites won, it was the victory of
Yahweh; and if they lost, it was considered to be a pun-
ishment from God for the sins of Israel as a people and
nation. Some of the accounts of the encounters of Israel
with other nations and the distribution of booty and spar-
ing (or not) the lives of the men, women, and children of
the enemies are so gruesome that one wonders whether
God did really want it that way! (1 Samuel 15; Numbers
25; 5:3; 7:88; Deuteronomy 13:15). We are not making
any moral judgment on this but only making a point that
violence is recorded even in the holy and sacred texts of
the Old Testament.

The religious history of the Old Testament aside, even
the secular histories of other nations are full of murders,
rapes, killings, massacres, and violence. These nations/
civilizations include the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the
Romans, the Persians, the Chinese, the Japanese, and
many others. All of them have used violence as strategy
and tactics to overpower their enemies and keep their
own people under control.

In short, whether it is the history of the conquests of
Islam or the Crusades or Counter-Crusades; coloniza-
tion by the Western nations (the French, English, Dutch,
Spanish, Portuguese and Americans are all guilty of colo-
nization), or in resistance to the colonization and occu-
pation; slave trade by the sultans of the Middle East or the
Western whites; World Wars I or II; Hitler’s Nazism and
the Jewish Holocaust; the Vietnam or the Korean Wars;
creation of the state of Israel and the dumping of the Pal-
estinians in refugee camps—all of these episodes in world
history were dominated by the strategic use of violence.

Even today, on almost every continent in the world,
there are situations and regions that are so violent that
hundreds and thousands of human lives have been lost.
Conflicts in Northern Ireland, Bosnia, Sudan, Kashmir,
Sri Lanka, Rwanda, Angola, the Middle East; the terrorist
attack on the World Trade Center in New York; war in
Iraq, Afghanistan, and Darfur. All are full of gruesome
accounts of torture, rape, kidnapping, mass murder, sui-
cide bombings, and hijackings. No matter where one
looks, violence is there. It pervades all countries and con-
tinents—and seems to reign supreme. All nations of the
world, irrespective of their creeds, or the caste or color of
their citizens, have participated in it, and their participa-
tion in violence continues.

**Violence generates violence**

Violence creates violence, begets and procreates vio-
ence. The violence of the colonialists created the violence
of the anti-colonialists, which in turn exceeded that of
the colonialists. Nor does victory in a conflict necessarily
bring any kind of freedom. Always, the victorious side
splits up into groups and parties—which often perpetuate
violence. One can quote an example from the recent his-
tory of Afghanistan. The Taliban were brought to power
by violently opposing and ousting the Russians from the
country. But the Taliban once they were in power wrought
worse kinds of violence against the people of Afghanistan
by usurping their freedom of speech and movement, by
imposing a code of dress and attire, by confining wom-
en to their homes and denying them the right to learn
and advance, by public hanging of criminals/enemies,
through summary trials by the shariah courts, inflicting
punishments such as lashing. In the United States, the
violence of black rioters in Newark, New Jersey, was in-
strumental in the creation of a special federal police force
for suppressing riots, often brutally.

The same dynamic could be attributed to the French
and the Italians. At the end of World War II, when these
nations were liberated from a brutal Nazi occupation, vi-
olence exploded, and they perpetrated crimes and torture
against their fellow countrymen in any way suspected of
collaboration with the enemy. Their tactics sometimes
mirrored the atrocities of the recently departed Germans.
There were concentration camps in post-World War II
France for suspected collaborators. A very recent exam-
ple of this brand of violence might be the detention camp
at Guantánamo Bay in Cuba, where Americans incarcer-
ate prisoners suspected of being involved in Islamic ter-
orist activities.

At times, people tend to make a distinction between
justified and unjustified violence; between violence that
liberates and violence that enslaves. From our point of
view, every act of violence is identical with every other
act of violence: the violence of the soldier who kills; the
policeman who bludgeons; the rebel who commits arson;
the revolutionary who assassinates.

This dynamic also exists in the world of economics. There is the violence of the privileged proprietor against his workers; the violence of the “haves” against the “have-nots;” the violence done in international economic relations between the developed and developing countries; the violence done through powerful corporations that exploit the resources of a country that is unable to defend itself.

Acts of psychological violence remain “violence,” whether they take the form of propaganda, biased reports, meetings of secret societies that inflate the egos of their members, brainwashing, or intellectual terrorism. In all these cases the victim is subjected to violence and is led to do what he or she does not want to do, so that any capacity for further personal development may well be destroyed.

Violence begets violence—nothing else: Once we consent to use violence ourselves, we have to consent to our adversary’s using it, too. We cannot demand to receive treatment different from that which we mete out. We must understand that our own violence necessarily justifies the enemy’s, and we cannot object to his violence. A government which maintains itself in power only through violence (economic, psychological, physical, or military), absolutely cannot protest when armed guerrillas, revolutionaries, rioters, or criminals attack it violently. It cannot plead that it represents justice legitimately by constraining “dangerous assassins.” And this holds true even when economic violence is met by physical violence. But the opposite also holds true: namely, that the revolutionary or the rioter cannot protest when the government uses violence against him. To condone revolutionary violence is to condone the state’s violence.

Revolutionaries have employed a lot of violence in the course of history. The revolutionary may be French or American or Iranian; he or she may be communist or socialist or of any other political group. All of them have used violence as a medium and means to achieve their objectives. Whether these objectives were fully met or not is debatable. Revolutionaries normally point to the tyrannical regimes and unjust socio-economic and political structures against which they incite violence. They feel the violence is justified in order to bring change in governments and socio-economic and political structures—for the good of the people. History bears witness to the fact that most often the objectives the revolutionaries wanted to achieve were mirages in the desert. The military takeovers in parts of Africa or the Pacific, or in Bangladesh or Myanmar or Pakistan, have often brought greater misery and pain for the people. Mao’s Cultural Revolution in China may have met with a limited success, but what about its usurpation of the fundamental rights of individuals and the denial of human liberty in China!

The Iranian revolution, too, which was initially against an authoritarian monarchy, did not bring greater freedom
for individuals. In Zimbabwe, under Robert Mugabe, the struggle for political freedom was successful but what about personal freedom and individual rights which were curbed to the full in his regime? More recently Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq and the Taliban’s rule in Afghanistan were toppled, purportedly, to usher in an era of freedom and liberty. In both cases, objectives are far from being fulfilled. Rather, in both countries, violence reigns—and it reigns supreme. Often revolutions bring greater enslavement and curbing of individual freedom. The point we are trying to make is that violence, whatever its initial motivation, can indeed set in motion another vicious cycle of violence.

Sometimes violence is employed through legal or legislative means. In history this has been done even by the so-called civilized nations: for example, the usurpation of the Native American lands in the United States and Canada by European settlers; the indigenous lands by the Spaniards and later by the independent Latin American governments in Central and South America; the Aboriginal lands by the Australians, and the Maoris’ land by the New Zealanders. The same tactic is being used by some of the Islamic countries in denying the rights of equality and freedom to the religious minorities in their countries by introducing discriminatory laws such as the Blasphemy Law in Pakistan. This kind of repressive law is tantamount to legal and legislative violence. Internationally laws and treaties like those of the W.T.O, trade embargos, import/export quotas, globalization etc., could very well be called economic violence. All that we are trying to show is that violence, in our present-day world, is being used as a strategy and tool by all, irrespective of creed, caste or color, and by all nations, whether religious or secular, for their vested interests.

**Violence stands in need of justification**

The late philosopher/historian Hannah Arendt, in her article “Power and Violence” (reprinted in the *Daily Times*, Lahore, 01 October 2006) says, “Violence is by nature instrumental: like all means, it always stands in need of guidance and justification through the ends it pursues. And what needs justification through something else cannot be the essence of anything.” Frequently, the justification needed by violence is provided by religious doctrine and dogma. Practically all the major religions believe that there is a perpetual fight between the good God and the bad “Satan.” Evil is personified in the person of Satan /Iblis and people who believe in God must fight Satan and wipe out all those who follow him and are his collaborators. Religious historian Elaine Pagels, in her book *The Origin of Satan*, says, “… the evolving image of Satan (in the Hebrew Bible) served to confirm for Christians their own identification with God and to demonize their opponents…first the Jews, then the Pagans and later dissenting Christians called heretics.” She goes on to say that “the use of Satan to represent one’s enemy lends to conflict a specific kind of moral and religious interpretation.” Such a notion gives rise to the idea that “we” are God’s people and “they” are God’s enemy—and since we belong to God, so God’s enemies are our enemies.

Interpretation like this has provided both justification for violence and added fuel and fury to the violent engine, to drive it to its seemingly inevitable conclusion: the complete annihilation of the opponent. In history, this has been done both by the Jews and the Christians. Recent examples among Jews would be the killing of 30 Palestinians by Dr. Baruch Goldstein, who was inspired by the teachings of rightwing Rabbi Meir Kahani; or the assassination of Israel’s moderate Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin by an Israeli extremist, who saw the murder as a sacred act in destroying someone, even his own leader, to fulfill what he saw as God’s true mission for Israel. In Christian history, the violence of the Crusades against Islam still casts a dark shadow over Christian-Islamic relations, even after hundreds of years.

In Islam, too, the concept of *jihad* has provided similar justification for violence, not only in past history, but in the present as well. One wonders why the terrorists of 9/11 targeted the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the White House. The only reason one could see is that these buildings stood as symbols of the economic and military might and political power of a country which has assumed the role of the only remaining superpower in the world. And that superpower is seen to be run by *kafirs* (infidels or non-Muslims) and, as such, the “enemies of God.” An infidel thus deserves to be either conquered by the people of God or destroyed. Hassan
Butt, a former member of the British Jihadi Network, writes in his article “The Fight against Terrorism” (The News, Lahore, 3 July 07), “In Islamic theology, there is no ‘Render unto Caesar’ because state and religion are considered to be one and the same. The justification of violence for Islamic extremists rests upon a dualistic model of the world: Dar-ul-Islam (The land of Islam) and Dar-ul-Kufr (The land of unbelief)."

The radicals and extremists, Butt says, take these premises two steps further. Their first step has been to reason that since there is no true Islamic state in existence presently, the whole world must be Dar-ul-Kufr. Step two: Since Islam must declare war on unbelief, Islamists have declared war upon the “whole world.” Coupled with these ideas, there is a prevalent perception among the Islamists that the superpower and its allies support and sustain what they consider illegal and illegitimate regimes in Islamic countries—Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Pakistan, Afghanistan and elsewhere. Thus, in the power struggle within the Islamic world between the “Islamists” and the "liberals,” between the “radicals” and the “moderates,” between the “theocrats” and the “democrats,” the Western countries are seen to be in the camp of the anti-Islamic forces. In this way, violence assumes a greater role as it is inspired, instilled, and motivated not only by purely religious ideas, but also by emerging religio-political concepts as well.

This kind of “justified violence” may be carried out by an individual (a suicide bomber), or by radical Islamic organizations (Hamas, Hisb-Allah, Al-Qaeda, the Taliban), or by states supplying arms and ammunitions to radical individuals and organizations. The recent events at Lal Masid, Islamabad, are clear proof of this—and are indicators of the ongoing struggle between the “Islamists” and the “Modernists” within the Muslim world.

The point is that in history, “religion” really has sanctified violence. Whether this has been done ignorantly or under pressure or strategically or otherwise, there is no denying that it has been done and is still being done.

Violence is not inherent to religion

While it is true that religion at times has provided the rationale for violence, it is equally true that violence is not inherent to religion. While we must face the fact that religion has provided justification for violence in history, to put all violence in the lap of religion would be neither fair nor true. The mono-political systems, such as communism or fascism, have been just as violent as any religiously backed systems. It is believed that Baathists, Stalinists, Maoists, Nazis, Khmer Rouge, and Sudanese government forces have killed millions of people. Each of these groups, and many others, has given humankind the stark choice of converting to their particular philosophy or political system or face enslavement and/or death. In the end, violence is the unfortunate result of misguided zeal and inevitable divisions in human society, not of religion in particular.

Most religions, in fact, theoretically condemn violence. All religions—including Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity—have a great deal to say about violence, both in their theologies and histories, which might promote peace and harmonious living. Judaism looked for such glorious bliss, for shalom, in messianic times, and Christianity sees this promise fulfilled in the person, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In Islam, too, such a blissful existence is projected in the concept of paradise (Al-Janit).

Some of the sayings of Jesus, the Prince of Peace, would certify that religion can indeed teach peace, love, reconciliation, and forgiveness. Jesus Christ says, “Make friends quickly with your accuser while you are going with him to court...” (Matthew 5:25) “Do not delay, make up your..."
Jesus underlines principles of love and forgiveness for resolution of conflicts. It is an accepted principle. Only love and the power of love truly promise resolution of conflict. St. Paul, also following the principles of Jesus, says, “Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God; for it is written, ‘Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord.’ No, ‘If your enemy is hungry feed him. If he is thirsty, give him drink; for by so doing you will heap burning coals upon his head.’ Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.” (Matthew 6:15)

Religion can transform violence
Violence, even though it is universal and present in all societies, is neither inherited nor genetic. It belongs to our “fallen” (animal) nature perverted by sin and self-assertion, by the desire to control and dominate; as such, humankind stands in need of recreation and rebirth. Jesus rightly pointed out this flaw in human nature to Nicodemus: “Unless one is born anew one cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.” (John 3:3) St. Paul offers a glimpse of how this new birth might be attained. He says, “…. offer your body as a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God…. Do not conform any longer to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind.” (Romans 12:1-2) The “animal” aspect of human nature is transformed by the renewal of one’s mind—that means that one’s thinking is changed, and once thinking is changed, then action will follow according to the changed thinking. Jesus, in His Sermon on the Mount, deliberately pitched His teaching over against the generally accepted legalized teachings of the Jews and perhaps of the world. All that He was pleading for was changed thinking. Instead of retaliation, He was pleading for forgiveness; instead of revenge, He was advocating for reconciliation.

This was a new teaching then and is, perhaps, new even now. People rejected His teaching then, and perhaps they reject it now. This rejection has landed humankind in chaos, crises, and confusion. The way to come out of the mess in which we have landed ourselves is to reject violence in all forms.

“Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good” (Romans 12:19-21) is not only a verse from scripture, but also a way of life leading to peace, reconciliation, and harmony.

The questions that arise are: Is there another way? Can we achieve our goals by non-violent means? And, if so, then how, and with what results?

Allow me to quote from a book by Sydney Cook and Garth Lean, the story of Irene Lauré of Marseilles. “In World War II, Irene Lauré was a Resistance leader in the south of France. After her son had been tortured by the Gestapo, her hatred for the German occupiers reached the point where she wanted every German dead and their country ‘wiped off the map of Europe.’ At war’s end she was elected as a deputy in the French Parliament and Secretary General of the Socialist Women of France. In 1947 she attended a conference in Switzerland aimed at restoring the unity of Europe. She was horrified to find Germans there and at once packed her bags. But before she could leave, someone asked her, ‘How do you hope to rebuild Europe without the Germans?’ She stayed on, for three nights of sleepless turmoil. A voice inside her told her to let go of her blinding hate. ‘I needed a miracle,’ she said. ‘I hardly believed in God, but He performed that miracle. I apologized to the Germans, not for my Resistance fight, but for having desired their total destruction.’ She went with her husband to Germany, addressed ten of its eleven provincial parliaments, and spoke to hundreds of thousands in meetings and on the radio. Because of
her, prominent Germans went to France and apologized publicly to the French people for what happened during the war. In the next years, several hundred leaders of the new Germany met with their French opposite numbers in Switzerland and a tide of reconciliation was set in motion. The German Chancellor and the French Prime Minister said that Irene Lauré did more than any other individual to reconcile their countries after hundreds of years of enmity.”

Another example of conflict resolution and healing that worked could be found in South Africa, after the fall of that country’s apartheid regime, where the Truth and Reconciliation Commission headed by Archbishop Desmond Tutu helped South African people come to terms with the violence they experienced during the years of apartheid and especially during the anti-apartheid movement.

If we want to start a revolution towards achieving peace, it is important to start at the right place. “Most of us feel that the world would be fine if somebody else were different — the workers, the bosses, the teachers, parents of children, the Arabs, the Americans, the Blacks or Whites,” say authors Cook and Lean. The revolution for peace starts at the other end. “We must accept for ourselves the changes we would like to see in others.”

The heart of the matter is that only principles of love and forgiveness can bring peace and harmony to the world, and a personal conviction to this path requires persistence and conviction from us all.

The American civil rights leader, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said in his Nobel Peace Laureate acceptance speech, “Violence as a way of achieving justice is both impractical and immoral…. It is impractical because it is a descending spiral ending in destruction for all. [The old law ‘eye for an eye’ leaves everybody blind.] It is immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather than win his understanding. It seeks to annihilate rather than to convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in monologue rather than dialogue. Violence ends up defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers.”

India’s great leader and peacemaker Mahatma Gandhi said, “Non-violence is the weapon of the strong.”

Let us be courageous and walk on the peace path even though we may go it alone. Let us ask God to give us the strength to conquer with the Power of Love. May God bless us all.

**Bibliography**

The context for liberation

In 1948, a grave injustice was committed against the Palestinian people. Many forces coalesced to carry out this project. Besides the Zionist Jewish forces that perpetrated the catastrophe, Britain and the United States as well as other countries provided the political and international legal support. Ilan Pappé, an Israeli Jewish historian, described the catastrophe in the preface to his book *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*:

“Once the decision was taken, it took six months to complete the mission. When it was over, more than half of Palestine's native population, close to 800,000 people, had been uprooted, 531 villages had been destroyed, and eleven urban neighborhoods emptied of their inhabitants. The plan decided upon on 10 March 1948, and above all its systematic implementation in the following months, was a clear-cut case of an ethnic cleansing operation, regarded under international law today as a crime against humanity.”

This led to the establishment of the state of Israel on May 15, 1948 on 78 percent of the area of Palestine. In a subsequent war in 1967, the Israeli army occupied the rest of Palestine, the remaining 22 percent. Since then the government of Israel has been confiscating Palestinian land, building settlements for exclusive Jewish use (illegal under international law), dissecting the Palestinian areas through hundreds of checkpoints that prevent freedom of movement for the Palestinian people within their own territories, subjecting the Palestinians to insult, humiliation, and even torture. Israel has been denying the Palestinians their human and political rights and refusing to implement the many resolutions of the United Nations to end its occupation and allow the Palestinians to establish their own state alongside the state of Israel. The violence and terrorism of the government of Israel has been met with the violence and terrorism of Palestinian resistance groups, and the cycle of violence has left the country, the economy, and the security situation in shambles. It is within this political context that a Palestinian Liberation Theology (PLT) has emerged to address this dire situation and its many injustices from the position of faith.

The theologies at play in Israel-Palestine

Generally speaking, most Palestinians—including Muslims and Christians—have never heard of liberation theology. Obviously, they know the word liberation and long to see it realized in their country. But a theology that liberates has not been part of their experience. On the contrary, the theologies and ideologies practiced against the Palestinians have always been oppressive.

There are four major observable “theologies” at play in the conflict over Palestine. In most cases the word “theology” is not used literally, but from my observation the word fits very well.

Separation wall

In the town of Abu Deis, slabs of concrete at least 18 feet high separate people from schools, jobs, hospitals, and each other.
1. Theology of domination and oppression. This state theology is expressed in Israel’s occupation of the Palestinian territories. Over three and a half million Palestinians— Muslims and Christians—are living under an oppressive Israeli occupation. It manifests itself through state violence and terrorism. It oppresses, humiliates, and crushes the Palestinians.

There are dangerous subsidiaries to this theology. These are expressed through religious Jewish Zionist settlers and their many religious friends. It is equally found in the theologies of Western Christian Zionists, who support the theology of domination on the basis of their literal interpretation of the Bible. There are also millions of Christians from mainline churches who are ignorant of Israeli injustices against the Palestinians and who support Israel because they believe that this is the proper Christian stance.

This is the dominant theology in the conflict. It is the theology that is based on military power. Essentially this constitutes the theology of empire. Many people today, including Palestinians, believe that we are living under an American Empire and that Israel is one of its strongest satellites.

The god of empire is the god of war and violence. For many Christian Biblicists in this camp, it is the same god that was active in many stories in the Old Testament. Those who espouse this theology believe that all the land belongs to the Jewish people and must not be shared with the Palestinians. And if God used violence and war to protect “his people” in the Old Testament, then what Israel is doing to the Palestinians today must also be acceptable to God.

Millions of Western Christian Zionists promote such a biblical theology and are blind supporters of Israel while they are adamantly against the Palestinians. These people consider the Palestinians to be the biblical Canaanites whose expulsion and/or extermination was mandated by God. They stand with Israel today because they believe this is what God wants them to do. In this sense, the Bible itself has been wrongly used as an instrument of oppression against the Palestinians. Their theology of liberation includes only the Jewish people, whom they believe are the legitimate inheritors of the land, while the Palestinians are totally excluded.

2. Theology of the armed struggle. In the history of humankind, most resistance movements against injustice and oppression used violence. In the face of violence, people instinctively turn to violence. Even when they know that the odds are against them and that they can never win against the enemy, they use the armed struggle to create a balance of terror and so that their adversary does not enjoy any security or peace. The history of the armed resistance against the Israeli occupation has never stopped since the beginning of the conflict. Though the gap between the military strength of Israel and the strength of the armed resistance groups has always been huge, it has persisted and never ceased.

For many years, both Palestinian Muslims and Christians were engaged in the armed struggle. Since the second intifada of 2000, one observes the “Islamization” of the armed struggle to a large extent. The Islamists believe that they are fighting for the cause of God. There is a basic theology that underpins their actions. Palestine for them is an integral part of the Muslim world. It is a Muslim Trust, placed in their hands by God, and it includes the holy city of Jerusalem, which is the third holiest city in Islam. They must liberate it and if they are killed in the process, they gain paradise because they die as martyrs.

Religious Muslims quote the Quran and other sacred writings to prove that their present sufferings, domination, and oppression are all predicted and due to their straying from the straight path of God. They need to accept this painful period of humiliation and turn to God in repentance. Eventually, they will be victorious and
God will vindicate them against the Jews. The number of Muslims who go to the mosques to say their prayers is noticeably growing.

Although armed resistance was once practiced by many of the Palestinian factions, one observes more recently that those who insist on it are becoming fewer. The two most rabid movements that are adamantly maintaining it are Hamas and Aljhad al-Islami. For these groups, the struggle is both religious and ideological.

3. Theology of resignation and withdrawal. This theology is practiced by different segments of the Palestinian community, both Muslim and Christian. It is, however, especially noticeable among some Christian religious leaders and laypeople. It is a passive theology of resignation. Some Palestinians have accepted the status quo and have benefited from it. Others wait on God passively to effect the change in God's own time.

4. Theology of nonviolence. There are Palestinian Christians who have always opted for nonviolent resistance and believed in its power and importance. For some, it is a matter of principle, which stems from their faith. They could not reconcile the armed struggle with their faith in Christ. Sabeel, the Ecumenical Liberation Theology movement, represents this position. It has advocated nonviolence since its inception. Other Palestinian Christians and Muslims have turned to nonviolence for pragmatic or strategic reasons and are quite active in promoting it. Jewish peace activists working alongside Palestinians in the struggle for justice and peace have also promoted nonviolence and have been very much involved in it. Moreover, international groups such as the Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT), the Ecumenical Accompaniment Program in Palestine and Israel of the World Council of Churches (EAPPI), and others have been living among the Palestinians, advocating for and witnessing the power of nonviolence.

The greatest theological obstacle to peace

Not all non-violent action is faith-based. Many of its proponents are secular. By and large, most of those who are committed religiously are either on the state theology of domination and oppression side or on the armed resistance side. In the Israel-Palestine conflict both Judaism and Islam have been used in the service of the armed struggle. Christians know that it is difficult to reconcile the gospel of Christ with violence. Others, whether people of faith or secular who did not turn to the armed struggle, have contributed much in their writings, speaking, and active political participation. The church hierarchy, with the exception of a handful of clergy who were politically involved, remained on the passive side and opted for the political periphery. Their theology did not prompt them into involvement. It was similar to the theology of the priest and the Levite in the story of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).

Generally speaking, this conflict has bankrupted the three religions. They had nothing of significance to contribute. Each of them has played a despicable role. One can even say that religion has been part of the problem and failed to be part of the solution. What then is the central theological obstacle that has stood in the way?

Without any hesitation, the greatest obstacle had to do with our theology of God. When our theology of God is wrong, inevitably, our theology of neighbor is automatically wrong, and vice versa. On the practical level, it is easier to examine one's theology of neighbor because it is quite noticeable. When that is deficient, we know that one's theology of God is equally deficient. As people of faith, it is our theology of God that determines our theology of neighbor; and if we want to help people change their theology of neighbor, we must address their theology of God. And if our theology of God is based on our
sacred texts which we interpret literally and must not be tampered with, then our theology of God is fixed and we are truly stuck.

In our Middle Eastern context, when we are relating to people of faith—whether Muslim, Jewish, or Christian and especially those who are religiously conservative, traditional, and quite fundamentalist—the underlying problem stems from their understanding of God. Depending on how small and narrow or big and open our concept of God is determines how we arrive at solutions to interfaith or political and socio-economic conflicts that face our communities.

What is quite clear is that the three Abrahamic faiths—or as some call them, the three monotheistic religions—have found themselves totally immersed in the Israel-Palestine conflict. It is important to remember that the conflict did not originate as a religious one. Over the years, however, religion has become an integral part of it and today, its clearest expression.

Since people believe that religion has an important role to play in peacemaking, it was expected that these three religions that claim Abraham as a common ancestor might make a valuable contribution in that regard. Indeed, the conflict over Palestine became a test case for religious authenticity. For example: Is religion able to find a resolution to the conflict on the basis of belief in the One God—the God of peace? One can even say that it was a unique opportunity for religious leaders and their people to apply themselves, speak prophetically, and produce the guidelines for peace based on their loyalty to the One God.

What transpired as a result of this conflict has been truly disappointing. This fierce political conflict led the adherents of the three religions to clash on the platform of Palestine; and when they clashed, their religions clashed. Judaism by and large, was hijacked by Zionism and became the servant of the state of Israel and its Jewish religious extremists. It presented its faith as centered in a national god who has returned to Palestine to claim “his” peoples’ rightful inheritance and to fight along their side in order to redeem the land from the hands of the modern-day Canaanites—the Palestinian Arabs. What we have observed from the Jewish side is actually a tribal god who bears no resemblance to the great God of the Bible.

Islam similarly invoked its own tribal god who also claimed exclusive rights to the whole region of the Middle East including that of Palestine. Muslims felt stabbed with the success of the Zionist project that requisitioned an important chunk of “their” land. And so with their god they were willing to go to war and to pick up the armed struggle. Like the Jewish people, instead of appealing to the higher tenets of their faith, they used the most primitive concepts of god and inevitably the tribal gods clashed.

The case of Palestinian Christianity was different. It was caught up in a theological schizophrenia. On the one hand, between an Old Testament theology (certain parts of it) that could throw us back into the bosom of a tribal god that could justify our violence and wars; and a New Testament theology of Jesus and the early church that was prominently nonviolent. On the other hand, there was the theology of “Constantinian Christianity” after the 4th century that regressed into an Old Testament theology of war and violence. In this theological confusion, the Palestinian church leadership, by and large, straddled the fence of passivity and marginalization. At the same time, it is important to remember that generally speaking, most Western Christians supported the Zionist project.

One can even say that Palestine stands at the crossroads of the world and in its arena the three major religions confronted each other in a quest for peace and the resolution of an obstinate conflict. Each of them approached the conflict with a faith in the One God and a strong tradition of justice and peace. Yet, instead of bringing their people closer to peace, they contributed to their further alienation. Their religions and their faiths did not prove strong enough to stop the conflict or achieve peace. Does this make the word “monotheism” a misnomer that must be challenged and even discarded? Does it make a sham of our monotheistic faith? Are we, in fact, looking at three religions where each believes in its own One God but not in the SAME One God? The assumption of many of our people is that the three religions believe in the same One God. That is why people refer to them as “the three monotheistic religions.”

On closer observation, however, and watching the behavior and interaction of people with one another, it is obvious that we do not share a faith in the same One
“Universal love is that which in solidarity with the oppressed seeks also to liberate the oppressors from their own power, from their ambition, and from their selfishness...”
—Gustavo Gutierrez

God. Otherwise, we would see greater respect among the followers of the three religions and greater progress in achieving peace. On the contrary, our religions are part of the problem and not of the solution. In other words, one would presume that our faith in the same One God who demands justice and peace for all, would bring us closer together and would be a strong catalyst and impetus to help us find a solution to our tragic conflict. Since this has not happened, it throws doubt on our professed monistic faiths. We have failed to transcend our selfishness and greed as well as our narrow nationalist concerns. Palestine-Israel is the only platform in the world where these three monotheistic religions meet in conflict and where the conflict has tested their theologies of justice and peace and found them wanting.

Here we need to distinguish between religion and its adherents. The crucial question is: What does religion say about the conflict and where does God stand on the issue of peace? If we believe in the same One God, our religions would presumably lift up, at least, a common vision for peace that pleases the One True God. Our religions would clearly name the injustice and the evil that have been perpetrated, and suggest ways for a just solution to be accomplished while, at the same time, exercising mercy and compassion.

If religion is not prophetic it can be co-opted by the worldly powers and become collaborative with them. Authentic religion must challenge its people with the word of God and encourage them to transform their ideas and actions according to it, rather than to drag God down to the level of their greed and selfishness that usually leads to violence and war. Whenever our theology of God deteriorates to an extent that supports and justifies our prejudices, something is wrong with our theology.

Furthermore, we must candidly say that if our various sacred texts cannot reconcile our theology of the One God as the God who abhors injustice and evil—regardless of who the perpetrator is—something is drastically wrong. If our theology of God does not condemn the oppression and exploitation of all of God's children, then something is basically wrong with our monotheistic theology. If our concept of God as loving, compassionate, and merciful cannot be tested today by showing mercy and compassion for the other, even the enemy, then our religion has failed. If the God we believe in has nothing to say regarding our enemies except to kill them, there is something wrong with our theology. If our religion has nothing to say about the poor and the oppressed except to ignore and demonize them, we need to examine the authenticity of our theology of God and neighbor. If our religion has nothing to say about peace and security except for ourselves, then our theology needs to be examined. The

“Destruction
A once functional industrial city just over the border in Gaza lies in ruins from repeated Israeli attacks.
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tragedy of so many people in power today is that what they wish for themselves when they are weak they are not willing to give to others when they become strong. And what we wish for ourselves when we are oppressed, we are not willing to give to others when we become oppressors. Liberation theology is concerned about both the oppressed and the oppressors. In the words of Gustavo Gutierrez,

“Universal love is that which in solidarity with the oppressed seeks also to liberate the oppressors from their own power, from their ambition, and from their selfishness…One loves the oppressors by liberating them from their inhuman condition as oppressors, by liberating them from themselves. But this cannot be achieved except by resolutely opting for the oppressed, that is, by combating the oppressive class…This is the challenge as new as the Gospel: to love our enemies.”

Speaking from the center of my faith as a Christian, I can say that unless the God I believe in is a God who embraces the other and cares for them as much as for me, this god cannot be the God of the universe who creates and loves us all. Unless each of our religions from its own theological basis can critique the violence and terrorism within it, and totally reject that God has anything to do with it, something is wrong with our understanding of God. As people of faith, we need to lift up a strong prophetic voice that reaches out to all people around us that the one God in whom we all believe is the God of justice, peace, love, mercy and compassion, and there is no God besides this God. Unless we succeed in doing this, we are doomed and our religions will continue to keep us imprisoned within a system of antiquated theology that has no relevance to God or to our neighbors around us; and our religions cannot make a valuable contribution towards the resolutions of the endemic problems of our world today.

The genuine and authentic God is the God of justice and peace for all. God cannot be pleased with injustice, domination, and oppression. Those who are oppressed must be set free and those who live under the yoke of domination must be liberated. This includes the oppressed Palestinians. Our three religions believe in a liberator God. Can this liberator God lead us to peace? It would be wonderful if our religions could produce a peace formula that gives justice, peace, and security for all the people of the land. I believe that it can be done. It demands of us both the will and the theology to do it.

Practically this means that the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories must end and the land must be shared. A Palestinian state must be established on all the occupied Palestinian territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip alongside the state of Israel. The city of Jerusalem must be shared as two capitals for the two states. A just solution for the Palestinian refugees must be found based on International Law. All violence and terrorism must be abandoned and the two governments and their peoples must work in cooperation together to develop the economic capacity of their countries for the well-being of all of their peoples.

I believe that the One God whom we all worship will be pleased with the doing of justice and the establishment of peace in the country that is dear to all of us, so that we can live as neighbors, not as enemies, and respect our God-given humanity. It is only then that our three monotheistic religions can share a common witness to the greatness, sovereignty, and love of the One God—the God of justice and peace.

Naim Ateek
Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center
Jerusalem (www.sabeel.org)
September 13, 2007

Notes:
5. As examples see Deuteronomy, chapters 7 and 20
Context

• The environment of hunger and poverty
• The problem of refugees and displaced people
• The phenomenon of violence in Burundi
• The religious confessions in the resolution of conflicts
• Recommendations

A small country in Africa, Burundi is known unfortunately for its endless ethnic crises, which have marked its social-economic existence as a nation/state. These crises came in 1965, 1969, 1972, 1991-1992, and 1993. Rebel movements emerged, which were the consequence of bad governance during the five decades of the post-colonial period.

In 1988, faced with impending crises, the Pierre Buyoya government initiated a policy of national unity. The process of democratization of Burundian institutions was crowned by the free, transparent, and democratic elections of 1993. Unfortunately, a crisis in October 1993 put the country in an unprecedented social-political situation that compromised the future of the country by acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and economical crimes.

Thanks to the combined efforts of Burundians, leaders of the countries of the sub-region, and the support of the international community, the elections of 2005 gave Burundi democratically elected institutions and hope for a better future for its seven million inhabitants.

But Burundi’s new government must face many challenges, among others the reconstruction of the country, of the economy, of the administration. In particular, it must maintain the climate of trust between the different components of the Burundian population.

An environment of hunger and poverty

Burundi is a land-locked country with natural resources (nickel, uranium, oxides, rare minerals, peat, cobalt, copper, platinum, vanadium, arable land, production of hydraulic energy, gold, kaolin, chalk, various climates, Lake Tanganyika, etc.). These assets have been less exploited than in some neighboring countries because of, almost perversely, Burundi’s instability and bad governance.

With its primary and secondary sectors not developed, the country counts on its rural sector to absorb around 90 percent of the working population. But the excessive subdivision of the agriculture exploitations, the insufficiency of work opportunities in the rural areas—as well as in the formal and informal urban sector—has generated a daunting structure of poverty.

In 1992, the country underwent a period of economic development characterized by a rate of growth of the PIB higher to the one of the population. This situation brutally deteriorated because of the 1993 crisis, which had, as a consequence, one more of the decade’s civil wars.

What plunged the country into its worst social-political and economic crisis?

Burundi suffered unprecedented economic sanctions: the freezing of essential external financial support and an economic embargo by the neighboring countries that put Burundi in a delicate situation. The gross national product also registered a fall of more than 30 percent, compared with its level before the crisis of 1992. This tendency was reflected in all sectors of the economy. Agricultural production, which came close to half of the PIB in 2000, and to 70 percent of the level of 1990, is at a deficit of 30 percent.

Poverty and ignorance increased as a result of the crisis, and average personal income was halved between 1990 and 2001, going from $210 to $110 a year. The percentage of the population touched by the endemic poverty went, in the same period, from 40 percent to 69 percent, and that was directly linked to the consequences of the long social-political crisis.

In 2006, natural disasters caused the loss of hundreds
of human lives, particularly among the country’s most vulnerable citizens. Inflation, the loss of the purchasing power of the people, and increasing unemployment added to the country’s problems.

Profile of the country in 2006

- Area: 27,834 sq. km.
- Population: 7 million people
- Density of the population: 250 per sq. km.
- Life expectancy: 43 years
- The demographic rising rate: 3.7 percent
- Primary and secondary schooling rate: 35 percent
- Literacy rate: 63% (male) and 51% (female)
- Rate of the HIV positive: 6 to 11 percent
- Annual income per person: $110
- Gross national product: 174th of 177 countries
- Monetary poverty: 68 percent, up from 33.5 percent
- Human poverty: 50 percent, up from 24 percent
- Infant mortality: 63.13 per 1,000

The problem of refugees and displaced people

The social-economic crisis of 1993 generated a massive displacement of the civilian population inside Burundi and toward the neighboring countries, estimated at about 1.2 million people or 20 percent of Burundi’s population. The harmful effects of the crisis impacted most strongly the poorest citizens of the country. Also in the sector of health, general sanitary conditions in the country deteriorated because of the widespread displacement and re-grouping of populations, and the destruction of sanitary infrastructure because medical personnel either were killed or fled to neighboring countries.

In this general environment of hunger and need, a new face of poverty emerged: outsiders, displaced people living on the margins. A significant number of these people were sheltered in the households of others—particularly in urban and semi-urban areas. Because of the war, people who were precariously balanced before entered a world of insecurity, malnutrition, idleness, illness, and lack of access to clean water, housing, health care services, and education. This has become the daily lot of many people in Burundi, despite the efforts of humanitarian aid organizations.

All of this has had dramatic consequences in both urban centers (where street kids have appeared), and in rural areas, where homeless youths wander through the hills. Moreover, during more than a decade of civil war, children were enrolled in the armed conflict as child soldiers where they were brutalized and deprived of education. It is absolutely necessary to rehabilitate these disoriented young people and help them turn this dark page of their life.

To these problems we must add the AIDS pandemic, which is, along with malaria and tuberculosis, among the first causes of hospitalization and mortality in the country. All of these scourges are exacerbated by the glaring misery which has engulfed so much of the population.

There also remains the great challenge of rehabilitating the people marginalized by the war, the people who have become outsiders in their own country. There is also the task of controlling the massive repatriation of refugees and of tackling, literally, the reconstruction of the country. All of this is conditional upon peace and the reconciliation of the Burundians themselves.

The phenomenon of violence

The politico-ethnic events of 1972 plunged Burundi into mourning on a grand scale and triggered the phenomenon of Burundian refugees. Following the events of 1972, a rebel movement was created by an agricultural engineer, Gahutu Remy, who was in exile in Tanzania. The armed movements, because of dissension and problems of leadership, splintered into many factions. The following were the important armed political groups:
• The FROLINA (National Liberation Front) of Karumbu
• The PALIPEHUTU (Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People) of Karatasi
• The FNL (National Liberation Forces) of Mugabarabona
• The CNDD (National Council for the Defense of Democracy) of Nyangoma
• The CNDD-FDD (National Council for the Defense of Democracy – Forces for the Defense of Democracy) of Ndayikengurukiye
• The CNDD-FDD of Nkurunziza
• The PALIPEHUTU FNL of Rwasa

In November 2001, a new transitional government was formed, led by the departing president Pierre Buyoya, in response to the peace agreement signed in August 2000, at Arusha in Tanzania. However, fighting intensified between government forces and those armed political groups who had not signed the Arusha agreement. There were many violations of human rights by both parties in the renewed conflict.

In October 2002, an agreement for the sharing of power (the Pretoria Agreement), was signed by the government and the CNDD-FDD. During the same year, a coalition government was established after the second agreement negotiated at Pretoria had given legal immunity to prosecution to the combatants of both sides.

A cease-fire agreement between the government and the National Council for the Defense of the Democracy (CNDD-FDD of Nkurunziza), the main armed political group active in the country, was signed in December 2002. This agreement anticipated the end of the recruitment of child soldiers.

In April 2003, transitional President Buyoya handed over governmental authority to Domitien Ndayizeye of the Front for Democracy in Burundi (the FRODEBU party). Only the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People – PALIPEHUTU-FNL (Rwasa), commonly called FNL Rwasa, was still officially “at war.” FNL Rwasa signed the agreement of Dar-es-Salaam in September 2006, and its application is being negotiated.

This civil war also engendered other forms of violence and crime (including rape, armed robbery, payback crimes, and the theft of public goods).

In 2007, the country found itself in a serious economic and political crisis:
• Following the internal divisions of the party in power, caused by the interference in government matters by the former leader of the party, Deputy Hussein Radjabu, an institutional blockage was created by the alliance of the parties cited against the government.
• The three parties in the National Assembly are divided and even the FNL has a split or dissension in the Assembly which compromised undertaking negotiation with the government.

In this environment of troubled institutions and economic stagnation, the risk of falling back into the violence is huge.

**The church in conflict resolution**

Burundians’ religious affiliations fall into four groups: Christians 67 percent (Roman Catholics constituting 62 percent and Protestants 5 percent); Ancestral believers 23 percent; and Muslims 10 percent.

Before independence, Burundi’s Christian elite played a big role in the formation of political parties and that influence lasted into the post-colonial period. During the country’s subsequent social-politic crises, the confes-
sional authorities were involved in the resolution of these conflicts, even at the cost of their lives. There are a number of well-known examples, including the Archbishop of Gitega, the late Bishop Joachim Ruhuna; and the Papal Nuncio, the late Bishop Michael Courtney, both assassinated as they worked to bring peace, truth, and reconciliation to Burundi.

Across the country, the church, confessional communities, and charitable organizations (local and international) brought support to victims of the war, especially children in trouble—street kids, orphans, and demobilized child soldiers. And they helped these children find safe places for their rehabilitation and re-entry into society.

The country’s religious groups support the government’s efforts to help the people, especially their efforts in the social sector. They support and help the government in the effort to care for the poor; to provide free and universal schooling; to provide free medical care for children from birth to 5 years of age; and to help with the maternity fees of mothers.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Environment of hunger and poverty**

As conflict ends, Burundi needs a true “period of grace,” a time for careful planning to prepare for a better future. There are three fundamental objectives: to intensify production, to modernize agriculture, and to prepare for major industrial development.

The reconstruction of the country will involve creating major public works projects to provide jobs for adult workers and professionals, and to make training available to young people without previous skills or training.

**Refugees and displaced people**

The rehabilitation of the population that was marginalized by the war; the control of the massive repatriation of refugees; and the creation of a new socio-economic life for these groups is essential to the overall reconstruction of the country.

Faced with this challenge, the government and the international community must act quickly to reduce unemployment, offer access to education and job training, and fight against a falling standard of living by the creation of new and more favorable conditions for the socio-economic development of the country.

**Phenomenon of violence**

Good governance and the respect of the democratic institution of the country are essential for a healthy future. But considering the recent past of the country, there are vital first steps that must be taken to protect the people and the country against violence. The civilian population must be disarmed. Light weapons must be collected and destroyed and land mines must be located and destroyed.

The country must lay the groundwork for an honest and democratic state that will instill in the people a respect for the law.

**Religious confessions in conflict resolution**

Faced with the aftermath of a long period of national crisis and the resultant frailty of the country and its war-weary people, a moral rearmament of some kind is indispensable. All the religious groups must get together to find new ways of healing their people after this long civil war—perhaps using the experiences of other countries emerging from similar situations as inspiration. We are looking for nothing less than the transformation of souls!

---

**Reconstruction of the country**

Creating major public works projects could help intensify production, provide jobs for adults, and make training available for young people.

_SAM KOSHIISHI / NIPPON SEI KO KAI_
The Province of the Anglican Church of Congo has eight dioceses in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). These dioceses are: Aru, Bukavu, Boga, Katanga, Kisangani, Kindu, Kinshasa, and North Kivu. Each diocese is autonomous and each has its own bishop. The dioceses of Kinshasa and North Kivu are exceptions, since Kinshasa has three bishops and North Kivu has two.

The PACC serves all of the Democratic Republic of Congo and a part of Congo Brazzaville. The Democratic Republic of Congo covers an area of 2,345,000 square kilometers, with an estimated population of 59 million people. The Archbishop is the Most Rev. Dr. Dirokpa Balufuga Fidèle.

**Socio-economic and political context**

**Healing the country**

The Anglican Church of Congo must deal with the aftermath of bitter conflict in the nation. There were wars and rebellions between 1997 and national elections in 2007. Conflicts still continue in some areas. In 1998, war actually divided the country into three factions. The Democratic Republic of Congo has had to cope with these repeated conflicts and the resulting political instability. The issues still being addressed are:

- 3.5 million deaths
- Many refugees and displaced persons
- Renewed rapes and violence against women
- Flagrant violations of human rights
- Devastation of animal and plant life
- Plundering of natural resources

On the socio-economic level, the consequences of the serial conflicts are also dramatic. Among the most alarming are:

- Continuing high rate of illiteracy and low rate of school attendance in the DRC.
- Weakening of the economy and overall drop in gross national product: More than 90 percent of Congolese are living under the poverty line.
- Increase in the spread of HIV/AIDS.
- Transportation system severely damaged, including the general condition of the roads.

Today in the DRC, the peace remains very fragile, although the country held elections in July 2006. Indeed, armed bands and militia remain very active, especially in the eastern part of the country. They regularly kill, rape, and plunder innocent civilian populations. Since many former rebel soldiers have resisted rejoining civil society; they remain a real threat and a source of insecurity among the population in general.

Taking all of these issues into account, the Anglican Church of Congo intends to continue to work for peace and political stability, not only in the DRC, but also in the Great Lakes region. The church remains convinced that the DRC, located in the heart of Africa, and sharing borders with more than nine countries, must at all costs be politically and economically stable. Instability in the DRC could easily spread to its neighbors.

**Building fellowship across borders**

Rwanda’s Provincial Secretary, the Rev. Emmanuel Gatera, right, chats with Congo Bishop Sylvestre Bahati Bali-Busane of Bukavu, during meeting in Burundi.
Some achievements within framework of the peace process

The church worked to educate and encourage the people to understand and participate in the electoral process. Specifically, it showed them how to vote and helped them to understand basic concepts such as democracy, the rule of law, good governance, the referendum, and the ballot box. The church also tried to explain the criteria for a good political candidate, and the importance of the presidential and legislative elections within the political life of the country.

The church helped organize and participated in mediations between tribes or ethnic groups in conflict. The church was strongly involved in the reconciliation between Lendu and Hema of Ituri in the Eastern Province, and between “Rwandophone” populations and the Bantu people of South and North Kivu.

The church spoke out for the return of peace and stability to the DRC. Our Archbishop addressed the British Parliament expressing the position of the church on the future of the country. While he made his plea, part of the DRC was still occupied by foreign armies.

The church denounced abuses and violations of human rights during the country’s periods of conflict, releasing statements making clear where the church stood and becoming involved in protest demonstrations against civil abuses.

The church helped organize and participated in seminars and workshops about attaining peace and reconciliation, and the management and prevention of conflicts in both the DRC and in the Great Lakes region.

The church made small grants to provide food and other necessities for victims of war.

The church worked to explain to the people the need to participate in voluntary testing for HIV/AIDS, and was involved in caring for people living with HIV/AIDS and for orphans of the pandemic.

We thank the Lord because these actions of the church contributed to organizing the inter-Congolese dialogue, to the withdrawal of foreign armies from the DRC, to the country’s reunification, and to the organization of free and democratic elections.

Plans for the future

The Anglican Church of Congo intends to carry out a number of activities toward building a lasting peace in the DRC:

- Continue to provide help in education and communication around issues of: democracy, good governance, the rule of law, and the rights and duties of citizenship.
- Continue to denounce violations of human rights and abuses of authority.
- Continue pleas and lobbying for national peace and development with political decision-makers and the international community.
- Continue to help people become familiar with the laws and codes that shape their life together (the constitution, human rights, the code of the family, and laws addressing rape and violence against women)
- Organize interfaith and intercommunity exchanges for leaders and for specific groups (women and young people) for the consolidation of peace.
- Initiate development projects integrating and supporting peace within the framework of healing wartime trauma, and socio-economic and psychological reintegration of the victims of war.
- Organize cultural events within the framework of prevention and management of conflicts.
- Continue to participate in seminars/workshops aimed at consolidation of peace, mediation, and reconciliation between tribal or ethnic groups in conflict.
- Support the displaced, the war refugees, and returnees who came back to the DRC at the end of the conflicts.

The Democratic Republic of Congo wants peace, and asks those nations and individuals in the world who manufacture weapons and those who arm dissident groups and armed militias to stop their activities, so that the war-weary people of the Democratic Republic of Congo may at last have real peace.
Japanese Christians, though in a minority position, take a strong stand for peace in their region and are committed to preserving the nation’s Peace Constitution. In 2006, then Prime Minister Abe intended to put the idea of revising the Constitution before the Diet for discussion. Opposition quickly mounted.

The member communions of the National Christian Council in Japan, including the Nippon Sei Ko Kai, and the Roman Catholic Church jointly set up a Promoting the Peace Constitution Project Committee which in turn organized an International Gathering of Religious People on Constitution 9 in December 2007.

The Rev. Toshi Yamamoto, a Methodist who was then the general secretary of the National Christian Council, wrote the following article. The Rev. Sam Koshiishi, long-time member of the APJN, is the moderator of the NCCJ and the acting general secretary.

Article 9 of the Japanese constitution says:
1) Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

2) In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

Article 9 in Asia and the world
Japan as a nation forever renounced war as the Introduction of the Japanese constitution clearly states: “We, the Japanese people resolve that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government.”

Article 9 is a firm pledge to the people in Okinawa and Asia not to wage war and military invasion ever again. It is a commitment based on repentance for the aggression committed during the Asia Pacific war. Article 9 is a law that binds the government of Japan not to wage war under any circumstances.

GPACC, the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, an initiative convened by the United Nations, refers to Article 9 in the context of the challenges of arms reduction and demilitarization in northeast Asia. “Japan should strictly abide by and preserve Article 9 of its Constitution. Any revision of this provision would form a threat to peace and stability in the region.” (GPACC 2005) Peace-loving people in the world expect Japan to keep Article 9.

U.S. military transformation and the militarization of Japan
Japan is accelerating a process of radical change in its involvement in war. From being a country that sometimes collaborated in and supported war, Japan is becom-
ing a country that can wage war. This transformation is intimately connected to the global realignment of American defense strategy. The ongoing transformation and realignment of the American military presence in the Asia Pacific region, with the objective of consolidating the defense structure of the "Arc of Invincibility" from Eastern Europe to the Middle East, from India to East Asia, is the greatest strategic change on the part of the United States since the Korean War, according to the Pentagon.

The bilateral agreement reached in Tokyo in May 2006 further spelled out Japan's role in this new situation. The transfer of the global headquarters of the U.S. First Army from Washington State to Camp Zama near Tokyo, where the SDF (Self Defense Forces of Japan) will also establish the headquarters of a Ground SDF Central Readiness Force Command, indicates the perspective for the unification of the American forces in Japan and the SDF. Japan is heading towards full collaboration with the American global war on terror, and is also strengthening its missile defense system.

**Legislation for “War Initiating Country”**

Japan's Abe administration took a step forward to change the Japanese constitution, aiming to remove Article 9, one of the biggest obstacles to accelerating the militarization of Japan. Japan's military budget is equivalent to that of the United States, Russia, and China. It is clear that Japan could become a threat to peace and security in Asia and the Pacific if Article 9 were eliminated.

In recent years, as a part of consolidating efforts by the Japanese government, all the laws such as those on the Hinomaru ("national flag"), Kimigayo ("national anthem") and wire tapping and emergency legislation were set in place. In addition to the Diet's passing of the amendment to the Fundamental Law on Education, which is centered on patriotic education, the Japanese government has been in the process of changing the constitution, particularly targeting Article 9. The Diet on May 14, 2007, passed into law a controversial national referendum bill for constitutional amendments. Furthermore, along with this move, Japan has been sending the SDF (Self Defense Force) to Iraq as an established reality in order to convince the Japanese people to support the change of the constitution and to become a country that could indeed initiate and wage war.

**Send us, God — for the realization of reconciliation and peace**

This year marked the 62nd anniversary of the end of World War II and the defeat of the Japanese Empire. For people in East Asia whose lands were invaded, occupied, or colonized by Japan, it was the 62nd anniversary of their liberation and independence. After Japan's defeat, many member churches and Christian organizations of NCC Japan confessed their sin before God of taking part in the war, repented, and asked the forgiveness of God and their neighbors. We inscribed their past "memories of assaults" and what history had taught us in our memories, determined that we would never commit the same sin again, and started to walk a new path.

In the light of the alarming governmental moves in Japan, we cannot remain passive spectators in this situation. The Bible says, “As God has sent me, so I send you.” (John 20:21) And God sends the Holy Spirit as the defender, and guides us to be reminded of what Jesus spoke to us. Jesus encourages us by saying, “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. I do not give to you as the world gives. Do not let your hearts be troubled, and do not let them be afraid.” (John 14:27) We would like to be the ones to respond to this call and sending by God, saying, “Send us, God—for the realization of reconciliation and peace.” We would like to follow the Gospel of reconciliation and peace that Jesus followed throughout his life, and participate in the work of God’s mission. “Rise, let us be on our way.” (John 14:31)
The Amazon region is a complex biome touching the borders of nine countries. Brazil owns 60 percent of the rain forest; the others are Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Guyana, Suriname and French Guiana. It is the world’s largest river basin and the source of one-fifth of all free-flowing fresh water in the planet. The whole map represents more than half of the planet’s remaining forests and comprises the largest and most species-rich tract of tropical rainforest in the world. It is also home to one-tenth of the known species on Earth. Only a fraction of its biological richness has been revealed. The scale of its biological diversity, the landscape and its challenge demand a competent and serious long-term commitment for conservation supported by honest scientific expertise.

A Brazilian view

The first invasion and foreign presence in the Amazon started two centuries ago, during a time the so-called developed countries devasted their own biomes without other nations’ interference. That devastation reduced their own forests to only 2 percent of the original. Since then, the environmental importance of the Amazon has been growing, because 83 percent of its resources are still untouched.

The environmental internationalization of Amazon had its starting point from the destructive efforts of those developed countries. Strangely, nowadays, the topic of preserving other countries’ eco-systems has become a matter of concern.

Of course, the Amazon biome is of vital environmental significance to the world, mainly because of recent climate changes. Climatologists say that the forest plays a distinctive role in capturing the atmospheric carbon, an essential resource to fight against the greenhouse effects which regulates the rain patterns.

If it were not for the God-given vocation of the Amazon, the world climate could be even more unbalanced considering the destruction of the developed countries’ eco-systems. Here we have to underline that these countries are exactly the ones responsible for the dramatic changes for the climate and human conditions everywhere. All the world’s biomes are in danger. The Amazon is, obviously, included.

There is an environmental debt of the industrialized countries to all the countries where the Amazon is still so alive. Even so, plenty of voices of the “developed world” are calling for a second internationalization of the Amazon. This time, it would be another step – some international “jurisdiction” over the region. Or, the Amazon would be transformed as an international “sanctuary” to compensate for the losses of the first invasion, those same losses generating the wealth and well-being for the industrialized countries. Should we remind you of the transplanted Euphorbiaceae/Hevea, robbed from the Amazon biome to provide latex? Or, perhaps, the well-known English-speaking “seed hunters” collecting samples and seeds all over the Province of Yunnan in China? Or the toilet seats made from Amazonian wood to serve the comfort of the rest rooms in Europe?

The rich countries are the ones who most enjoyed the benefits, by their development and industrial progress, of the environmental products. And they, themselves, caused the most destructive effects on the environment.

The thesis that a new internationalization is necessary is cause for concern; indeed, more than that, it is absurd. Such important politicians as Al Gore or powerful media as The New York Times often go back to that same nonsense. Even if one does not believe that nonsense becomes State politics, one cannot deny that this neo-colonial mind and its powerful mechanisms of pressure on the Amazonic countries are very destructive. If one wants to know what the Brazilian government is doing for the Amazon, have a look at http://www.sipam.gov.br. (SIPAM stands
Deforestation of Amazon region

On a flight to Ariquemes in 2007, one could see the extent of human intervention in this vast part of Brazil.

Now is the time – in fact, more than the right time – for Brazil and the other Amazonic partners linked by OTCA, an Agreement for Cooperation for the Amazon, the only multilateral and legal organization to decide for the future of the region. Brazil and its partners have to leave behind a defensive position in the discussion about that strategic biome in order to engage themselves in political and diplomatic action which can affirm a stronger position under proper guidelines defined by the countries’ sovereignty – getting, then, their own international community for the sustainable development of the Amazon.

Brazil cannot repeat the same failure and aggression made by the industrialized countries, letting the Amazon be devastated. It’s our responsibility to protect the life of 25 million people living there. The indigenous people have been living in the Amazon for eight thousand years. Their archeological crafts, mainly a very typical pottery (cerâmica majaroara), shows a social group doing a proper agriculture. Their social actions show even some specialization and labor division.

The first step is to acknowledge Brazil’s actual mistaken model of occupation, based on the expansion without rigid criterias of livestock farms and the poisonous soya plantation system. Our responsibility is to create a wise cartography to fix the boundaries promoting a rational occupation and a balanced development for every area. At the same time, we will need clear and safe measures to assure territorial sovereignty, such as the revision of those regulations which allow huge areas of our national land to be bought by foreigners. It is not xenophobia. The restrictive regulations are an urgent need. Territory is still the base for sovereignty. It is very strange that there is an obvious growth of foreigners buying land in Brazil right at the moment when the global food supply is getting even much more difficult. According to INCRA (the government’s National Institute for Colonization and Agricultural Reform), Brazil has more than 3.8 million hectares of land owned by foreigners. That is why the government has already been working for needed regulations to limit the purchase of land from foreigners. It is a needed strategy for the defense of the country’s sovereignty. The National Coordinator of CPT (The Pastoral Commission for the Land), Fr. Dirceu Fumagalli, has publicly stated, “It’s not coherent, it’s unfair and it’s immoral.” The first impact will be on the lives of the people living there.

On the issue of the Amazon region, there are some good ideas and initiatives but we do need stronger actions. The developed countries have to pay for their very high environmental price, without any interference in national sovereignty, on behalf of the Amazon countries. Feasible taxes can be demanded to fund programs of sustainable development. Right now, we have to stop some neo-colonial bad dreams. There are always very romantic approaches from good people to save the Amazon. They are sincere activist groups or NGO’s, sometimes very naive people, to say the least. The only internationalization Brazil can accept is the internationalization of the quality of life, with a fair and healthy environmental development.

Our own Brazilian troubles to face...

Mr. Mangabeira Unger, appointed by President Lula in 2007 as Minister for Brazilian Strategic Affairs and coordinator of the program to supervise the Amazon and the environmental challenges in Brazil, declared to the newspaper Folha de São Paulo, “...a small number of Brazilians think that the Amazon must be preserved as a park. An equally small number of Brazilians accepts to deliver the Amazon to the predatory forms of exploitation of the economic activities. The greatest majority reaffirms the need for sustainable development... but still don’t know how to achieve it.”

Well, if the great majority of our population do not
Indigenous, but landless

Simple houses are the only shelter for some of the landless communities in Brazil's Amazon region, one of the most resource-rich areas on the planet.

know how to face the problem (sustainable development), our situation is not that healthy. I would also add that we are not doing enough, neither for preservation nor development. Unhappily, if we just consider how the foreign media describe the “conservationists” and the “destructive” ones, evidence proves that the second group is much stronger. They “easily” say, “agribusiness – or livestock – are not possible without deforestation.” Actually, there are 74.59 million animals using 70 million hectares, or 13.5 percent of the whole basin. That's obscene considering the whole agricultural map available. Just compare China, whose population includes 60 percent of the peasants of the world, using only 9 percent of China’s agricultural map.

From 1990 to 2006 the soya plantation system increased 18 percent per year. The livestock activity grew similarly, but “only” 11 percent per year. One single “well-equipped” worker can cut down 50 tall and large trees a day. When those 50 trees are destroyed, 25 smaller ones are also killed by the violent impact. By 2030, if the actual rhythm of deforestation keeps going, 670,000 square kilometers of the Amazon will disappear. That’s an area equivalent to 22 Belgiums.

For “regular” people everywhere, Brazilians or others who are honestly concerned, a smaller action is to avoid whatever “products” originated from the Amazon ecocide. Our own citizenship here must also be strong and clear, saying NO to transnational or Brazilian agribusiness and the government’s easy “negotiations” for the coming elections.

It must be emphasized that 33.5 percent of what the Brazilian government calls “the Legal Amazon” includes specific areas reserved for the indigenous people, for conservation, and for military activities.

With the expansion of the so-called agribusiness, the economic activity inside of the “Legal Amazon” goes two times faster than the national average pace. In spite of the rapid economic growth, the richness produced by the region added less than 8 percent to our Brazilian GNP.

The government has been working hard to reinforce its control over more than five million square kilometers of the area. When we talk about sovereignty, we affirm that a country without total control of its map, properly under the national laws, is not free to manage its own interests. Any conscientious Brazilian citizen should not sacrifice even a bit of our territory in favor of whatever kind of internationalization. The rich countries will not give up their own protective measures. In the same way, Brazil should not accept foreign actions to preserve the Amazon.

An ecumenical perspective for the churches

The members of the National Council of Christian Churches in Brazil (CONIC), including the Anglicans and Roman Catholics who were co-founders, are very clear about how to engage church people to deeply commit themselves to the Amazon, considering the richness it represents to ourselves and to the world. We see what a wonderful system of life the Amazon is, the rich biome of possibilities, and so we want it to be still better known.

Years to grow, minutes to cut

Piles of logs stored in Ariquemes show evidence of multinational industry that continues unabated – and will, as long as there are customers.
and responsibly respected.

The Christian churches, considering the planet as the locus of life, are pointing to human life, the climax to the whole process so far. We also respectfully look to all the Amazon ethnic groups, the ancestors, the only ones having the “know-how,” the knowledge of a very long experience on how to live with that reality. Arousing awareness of Brazilian Christians regarding the Amazon, our churches themselves are called to a deeper commitment for their presence in that space.

In some ways, we thank God because it was the churches’ presence and work inside that map which marked the boundaries of the Amazon known nowadays. To respect and to protect that map is essential to our own national identity. Most of the international anxiety about the Amazon is respectable. But ours is the task to conserve it for the benefit of the whole planet. The Amazon is an invitation and calling for stronger responsibility by all the countries who inherited its territory.

The false dilemma: food production or transnational profit

There are those trying to justify the occupation of the Amazon as a matter of fighting against the famine. Famine is not a “natural” phenomena or other people’s responsibility. There are plenty of “explanations” to hide its true causes. The true reason, in the past, was the colonial exploitation imposed on most of the “newly discovered lands” of the world. Actually, today the neo-economic colonialism is imposed on us and on all the underdeveloped, dependent countries surviving by an agricultural economy. Josué de Castro, a very cherished name in Brazil’s medicine, sociology, geography and politics, was born in Recife on the 5th of September, 1908. He died in Paris on the 24th of September, 1973. He was exiled there during the military dictatorship in Brazil. Author of Geografia da Fome, he did the map of famine in Brazil. He wrote that starvation is the biological expression of our social diseases. Hunger is deeply linked to the economic distortions. That’s why we have to socialize the land to socialize the bread. Agribusiness based on monoculture is not agriculture, it is a system denying healthy life for cash crops. Everything is reduced to bagasse; like the sugar cane remains, even human beings are just dumped. Famine is not a by-product of overpopulation. The clever disciples of old Malthus keep saying that the economic growth of countries such as India and China create an unbearable increase of people needing to eat. That, according to Malthus’ disciples, would be the problem! Learning from Josué de Castro we know that famine is not a result of overpopulation. As someone wrote some years ago, “We are not poor because we are many but we are many because we are poor!” Famine was already there, even before the post-war demographic boom. The total and acute famine (according to its social and economic impact), is the result of chronic or partial famine, quietly devouring so many of the world’s population. In the past, famine was a taboo subject, wrapped in an ideological silence, but nowadays, the matter is clarified as we have to know. (See The Economist of 15 May 2008 and check why Malthus was called a false prophet.) The agribusiness system is unfair and perverted, concentrating land, public resources and technology. It is destructive to the environment and is still maintaining slave human labor.

Calling for international political solidarity

The good news for which we wait and pray is uniting ourselves to the strong will of the social movements and NGO’s in the Amazon region, asking for the venue of the coming World Social Forum to be an Amazon event in January 2009. The place hosting the forum is still to be...
chosen; Brazilians want the venue to be Belém. Brazilian citizens do not count it as a single national hope. Considering those countries involved, the Amazon already is a symbol for the world’s debates on global warming and the unsustainable use of the planet’s resources. The Amazon embraces not only the largest biodiversity and fresh water “reservoir” in the world but also a very impressive sociodiversity, represented by its traditional local populations and the indigenous people.

For us, we can openly say that the Brazilian Amazon is for all Brazilians. The Amazon Forest is owned by the country. To stop the deforestation and the wrong models of occupation is a matter of political will; it’s an action first for the Brazilian society. The urgent need for a common goal and work is much clearer to us on every new day.

The international community must seriously commit together to fight against injustice, famine and the diseases in the poorest countries. In June 2008 in Rome, 40 world leaders, including our own Brazilian president, concluded their meeting with a very disappointing document. Jacques Diouf, from the United Nations, anticipated the urgency for 832 million people facing starvation. Robert Zoellick, president of the World Bank, reminded these world leaders that now, because of the growing prices of food, two billion people are in “immediate danger.” After three days of speeches and lectures, 40 world leaders voted an emergency amount of US$3 billion. Mr. Diouf affirmed that at least US$30 billion would be needed to guarantee some nutrition security. Anyway, the closing title of the document, “A High-Level Conference on World Food Security – The Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy,” says much more than it really promises.

Here we can say, even the economic fruits of the forest can be also used to support the local groups living in the Amazon. That is sustainable development, a respectful use of the forest instead of the economic transnational exploitation. That is a proper way to attack the criminal deforestation which only looks for profit. The protection of the forest is a community model and all the citizens of the international community are responsible for that. The rest of the world must be prepared to pay and compensate the countries having tropical forests to protect. That can be another way to fight against poverty and build development, not only in Brazil and the whole basin of the Amazon but also in some African and Asian countries. Many people, Brazilians and plenty of foreigners, embrace this same ideal. The future of the planet itself is at risk. We are all responsible for preserving and improving the environment for the present and coming generations. A new Heaven and a new Earth are a central focus to our obedience and faith.

Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909), a venerable Brazilian writer and journalist, wrote the best expression to articulate our understanding of the Amazon as Christians: “The Amazon: the last page of Genesis, still to be written.”

The Rt. Rev. Luiz Prado, Dean
SETEK, the IEAB seminary in Porto Alegre
Dr. Wassara made this presentation to the Episcopal Church of Sudan’s Justice, Peace and Reconciliation Conference at Juba Cathedral 14-17 January 2008. It was published in the conference report, “Let Peace Prevail,” and is reprinted with permission of Archbishop Daniel Deng Bul.

OBJECTIVES
• To introduce participants to the basic understanding of relationships between conflict and peace.
• To enhance the understanding of the processes in addressing conflict and the search for peace.

INTRODUCTION
• Conflict and peace are different faces of society.
• Conflict and peace are ever present where there are people, depending on issues in their relationships.
• People’s lives are characterized by periods of disputes and periods of harmony.
• Escalation of conflict creates a host of complicated relationships between people, communities and nations.

CONFLICT
The most important thing one should know is to understand what conflict is all about, the nature of the conflict and seriousness of the conflict. What people know generally is that conflict involves differences and disagreements. It is always unwise to rely on definitions of conflict because different situations of conflict give rise to variations in definition. We can always describe conflict in a variety of complex entities.

Terminologies of conflict:
- Differences, perceptions, feelings of threat, fear of failure, distribution of power, state of personal or communal security, etc. Many differences do not become conflict unless:
  • One of the partners perceives the difference as an actual or potential obstacle to interest.
  • People’s means of achieving desired goals are weakened by differences they have with the other party.
  • Resources of one party are threatened by the other party’s values, goals, perceptions and behavior.

Results: Developing different degrees of hostile relationships, considering violence as a possible solution, engaging in violent action to change a situation.

There are always different types of conflict. In one way or the other there may be an interrelationship between such conflicts. This is when we talk about overlapping conflicts. It is important to know the types of conflict that are common in our communities and the country. Communities can be religious, ethnic, tribal, regional, or economic interest groups.

Interpersonal conflict:
Disagreements or acts of violence between members of a family, between one family member and an individual from another family, etc.

Community conflict:
Disagreements or acts of violence when a group of individuals within a community confront another group within the same community. This involves a pattern of alliance of parties to a conflict within conflict.
**Inter-communal conflict:** Disagreements, disharmony or acts of violence between different communities.

**State versus non-state entity:** Disagreement or violence between the state and sections of national society. This is represented by civil war, which is also a political conflict.

Conflict may cut across two or more of the types described above. An example is how armed conflicts can change the intensity or nature of communal or ethnic conflicts. In all, conflicts have impact on lives of people in society as summarized below:

- Breakdown of harmonious relationships in society.
- Social confusion and emergence of a culture of violence.
- Violations of human rights depending on the seriousness of the conflict (beating, killing, destruction of property and social service, displacement, abduction and others).
- Exposure of the most vulnerable groups of people to misery, poverty, disintegration of families and death.

**PEACE**

Peace cannot easily be defined because it is possible to find itself in relationships of conflict. Peace is a positive relationship in the family, community and the nation. There are many relationships that describe peace.

**Terminologies of peace:** Self-confidence, satisfaction, prevalence of security, enjoyment of rights, justice, respect of others, tolerance, flexibility in a situation of difference, perceiving problems as mutual concerns, sobriety and rationality in dealing with others, forgiveness, reconciliation, dialogue, etc. Peace can be assured when:

- Problems are perceived as shared concerns and expressed constructively.
- Social, political and economic disputes are addressed through dialogue.
- Alternative options are generated in situations of conflict relationships.

**Results:** Constructive expression of relationships leading to positive personal, socio-economic and political changes in society.

There is the tendency to classify peace into political peace and social peace. Political peace involves mediation and negotiation between political entities such as the government, international organizations, organized political institutions or movements which are in disharmony over power and power-related grievances. Social peace is the harmony after re-establishment of normal relationships between communities after dispute over services and other means of livelihoods. Political peace plays a major role in community stability and reduction of effects of social conflicts. For example, ending of civil war in some parts of Sudan may reduce cattle rustling and inter-community killing.

**CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

Conflict resolution is the process of all the attempts made by institutions and individuals to resolve a dispute or conflict between the parties involved. Conflict practitioners are at work on conflict in many arenas in the international scene, the domestic scene, and in communities. At the community level there are interpersonal and collective distorted relationships developed by a variety of events and interactions. Conflict itself has negative and positive aspects. The negative aspects of conflict involve the pain, injuries, destructions and deaths. However, the positive aspects focus on translating conflict into positive outcomes such as change, restoration of damaged relationships and sustainable peace.

Scholars in the field of conflict resolution differ on this topic. They argue that conflict cannot be resolved because it is an inseparable part of humanity. For this reason, new terms are emerging such as Conflict Management, Conflict Transformation. All in all, these terms go in the same direction as Conflict Resolution. Their focus is on mitigating and reducing dynamics of conflict. The terms imply that conflicts have to be addressed in order to restore harmony, and consolidate the harmony to develop into a durable peace.

There are two important tools of conflict resolution. They are mediation involving the technique of negotiation, and arbitration. The first falls into the category of political and social interactions, but the second is in the legal domain. Many people go for mediation and negotiation because they are based on mutual arrangements achieved through discussions and compromises. These tools are more relevant to Church functions. For this reason, our emphasis will be on techniques of mediation, negotiation and communication in conflict relationships.
RECONCILIATION PROCESSES

Objectives:
• To familiarize participants with critical steps of solving a problem.
• To make participants understand basic methods and principles of resolving disputes.
• To learn skills that will help reconciliation processes.

Critical Steps in Reconciliation

Peacemaking involves diplomacy at the appropriate level of intervention in a reconciliation process. It involves:
• Knowledge of the conflict one intends to address.
• Understanding culture, traditions, psychology and social environment of parties to the conflict.
• Identifying your targets for the re-establishment of working relationships and opening of communication channels.
• Engaging in mediation and negotiation.

What are the frequently used methods in reconciling parties to a conflict?

MEDIATION

Mediation is the intervention by an acceptable, impartial and neutral third party who has no authoritative decision-making power in a dispute or negotiation. This person assists contending parties to voluntarily reach their own mutually acceptable agreement. Mediation is an extension of the negotiating process. The basic components of mediation are intervention, acceptability, impartiality, assistance to the parties, and encouraging a voluntary process.

Pre-mediation preparation
• Information and data gathering
• Getting parties to the negotiating table
• Conflict analysis
• Selection of venue
• Physical set up of negotiations

Mediator’s role
• Explain the process and develop trust.
• Manage the process of negotiation and ensure confidentiality.
• Encourage parties to tell stories about their situation.
• Listen carefully and actively and ask open-ended questions.

Techniques and strategies of mediation
• Recognize the potential issues of conflict and agreement.
• Choose strategies and be flexible to harmonize conflict situations.
• Help everyone keep his or her self-respect.
• Encourage parties to turn win-lose negotiation into real problem-solving exercise.
• Identify issues separating the parties and convert them into creative alternatives for problem solving.
• Establish business and ground rules that must be respected by parties during negotiations.

Mediator checklist
• Pre-mediation preparation.
• Beginning the mediation session.
• Defining the issues and setting the agenda.
• Defining interests and needs.
• Generating and assessing options for settlement.
• Achieving formal settlement.

NEGOTIATION

• Problem-solving processes in which two or more people voluntarily discuss their differences and attempt to reach a mutually agreed solution.
• Requires participants to identify issues about which they differ; educate each other about their needs and interests, and generate possible settlement option and bargain over terms of final agreement.
• An opportunity that enables people to review old rela-
tionships, which are not working to their satisfaction.
• An opportunity to bargain and establish new relationships that did not exist before.
• As a common problem-solving process, is in everyone’s interest to become familiar with its dynamics and skills.

Patterns of Negotiating
Two recognized patterns of negotiations do occur in reconciliation processes: competitive and problem-solving. In the competitive pattern the negotiator:
• Tries to maximize gains within the limits of the current dispute problem.

Patterns of Negotiating
Two recognized patterns of negotiations do occur in reconciliation processes: competitive and problem-solving. In the competitive pattern the negotiator:
• Tries to maximize gains within the limits of the current dispute problem.

The DOV is:
• An invitation to learn about the issues of violence and non-violence
• A spiritual journey for individuals, churches and movements
• A study and reflection process
• An opportunity for creative projects in preventing and overcoming violence

The DOV calls us to:
• Work together for peace, justice, and reconciliation at all levels – local, regional, and global.
• Embrace creative approaches to peace building which are consonant with the spirit of the Gospel.
• Interact and collaborate with local communities, civil society actors, and people of other living faiths, so as to prevent violence and promote a culture of peace.
• Walk with people who are systematically oppressed by violence, and to act in solidarity with all struggling for justice, peace, and the integrity of creation.
• Repent for our complicity in violence, and to engage in theological reflection to overcome the spirit, logic, and practice of violence.

The DOV highlights and networks efforts by churches, ecumenical organizations, and civil society movements to prevent and overcome different types of violence. It seeks to establish points of contact with the relevant aims, programs, and initiatives within the United Nations Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2001-2010).

Goals of the DOV:
In order to move peace-building from the periphery to the center of the life and witness of the church and to build stronger alliances and understanding among churches, networks, and movements which are working toward a culture of peace, the goals of the Decade to Overcome Violence are:
• Addressing holistically the wide varieties of violence, both direct and structural, in homes, communities, and in international arenas and learning from the local and regional analyses of violence and ways to overcome violence.
• Challenging the churches to overcome the spirit, logic, and practice of violence; to relinquish any theological justification of violence; and to affirm anew the spirituality of reconciliation and active nonviolence.
• Creating a new understanding of security in terms of cooperation and community, instead of in terms of domination and competition.
• Learning from the spirituality and resources for peace-building of other faiths to work with communities of other faiths in the pursuit of peace and to challenge the churches to reflect on the misuse of religious and ethnic identities in pluralistic societies.
• Challenging the growing militarization of our world, especially the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

www.overcomingviolence.org
• Makes high opening demands and is slow to concede position.
• Uses threats, confrontation and extreme argumentation.
• Is not open to persuasion on substance.
• Is oriented to ambitious goals.

In the problem-solving patterns the negotiator:
• Tries to maximize benefits within the available alternatives.
• Focuses on common interest of parties.
• Tries to understand the merits of demands as objectively as possible.
• Is open to persuasion on substance.
• Is oriented to realistic goals.

Conditions of negotiations
The following conditions are necessary for negotiations to produce results:
• Identifiable parties who are willing to participate.
• Readiness of parties to engage in negotiations.
• Means and resources for negotiations.
• Sense of urgency and meeting deadlines.
• Elimination of psychological barriers in the process of reconciliation.
• Identifying the real issues to be negotiated.
• Delegates or representatives must have the authority to negotiate and decide on behalf of the party they represent.
• Demonstration of willingness to compromise.
• Issues of agreement must be reasonable and capable of being implemented.
• Controlling of emotions: anger, fear, bitterness, vengeance and misunderstanding.
• Focusing on interests not positions.
• Inventing alternative options for mutual gain.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Objectives:
• To promote the understanding of the role of communication in conflict situation.
• To prepare trainees to deal with communication problems in processes of conflict resolution.

Communication is an important tool of negotiation and mediation. It can contribute to increased or reduced tension in the process of negotiation and mediation. What is important in this topic is to overcome difficul-

ties of communication in conflict situations. This session examines the relevant aspects of communication.

Emphatic listening
This expression means listening actively with understanding. There are many benefits of emphatic listening:
• Enables the understanding of the other person's point of view and deal more actively with the problem.
• Allows each party to clarify their own thinking about the problem.
• Provides an opportunity for parties to air out anger leading to reduction in tension.
• Gives the impression to parties that someone is interested in them and their problem.
• Encourages cooperation of parties to a problem.
• Develops an active state of mind.

Paraphrasing
Paraphrasing means re-stating in your own words what the other person has said. It is useful in that it:
• Enables the other person to know you are listening and trying to understand what is being said.
• Facilitates good communication and helps to identify truth from statements.

Examples of paraphrasing are:
• “Let me make sure I am understanding you. You are saying...”
• “So the way you see it is...”
• “You felt I was being unfair to you when...”
• “You believe...”

Golden rules of paraphrasing are:
• Keep the focus of the person you are paraphrasing.
• Do not evaluate or judge.
• Be brief and condensed in restating.

Communication Openness
Communication openness is described as:
• Being keen to hearing the perception and needs of others even if you disagree with them.
• Efforts of the listener to avoid situations where parties are concerned with their own positions.
• Means of extracting as much information as possible from both sides in order to make way for expanding the options to resolve the problem.
The question is, How can we best use communication openness in negotiation and mediation? The following items are golden rules of how to do it:

• Ask as many questions as possible such as “What,” “Why” and “How.”
• Do not assume you know exactly what the other side means.
• Do not make others defensive by abruptly disapproving or contradicting their statements.
• Resist the temptation to gain the upper hand by chasing weakness in the other person's point of view and the reasons behind it.

Examples are:

• “I am not sure I understand your idea. Tell me more.”
• “How would that work...?”
• “Elaborate that point further...”
• “Tell me what you have in mind...”
• “Could you give me a specific example...?”

Dealing with Threats and Anger

Threats and anger are familiar scenes of reconciliation processes because emotions are always high, especially during the competitive pattern of negotiations. Threats and anger are dealt with at two levels.

Dealing with your own anger

• Recognize the underlying causes of your anger.
• Try to identify the other emotions you are experiencing such as fear or frustration.
• Acknowledge and accept your anger. Think about it. Do not deny its presence or refuse to deal with it. Otherwise it may come back and you may direct it at the wrong people.
• Express your anger when it is necessary, safe and appropriate to do it. Otherwise, anger makes problems worse.
• If you want to solve the problem that caused your anger, separate it from the people.
• Avoid making important decisions when your anger controls you.

Dealing with the anger of others

• Try to determine whether the anger is directed at you personally. Many angry people had those feelings inside them before you came along. You might simply have been in a wrong place at a wrong time.
• Adopt a calm style yourself and avoid getting into an angry response.
• Acknowledge and affirm the other person's anger.
• Encourage the other person to talk about his/her anger until it is no longer controlling the person.
The Episcopal Peace Fellowship mission is to: Do Justice, Dismantle Violence, Strive to be Peace Makers, in our parishes, our dioceses, our communities, our nation and our world. EPF has been working on these issues for 69 years. Our members make a commitment to pray, connect, and act for peace, and to renounce, as far as possible, participation in war, militarism, and all other forms of violence.

All of our work falls under an umbrella called Creative Peacemaking. We implement our commitment by living out our baptismal covenant to strive for peace and justice, respecting the dignity of everyone (Book of Common Prayer). We do this by forming local chapters in parishes and dioceses, by creating issue-focused action groups, by providing nonviolence tools and training, by providing liturgical resources and by publicly witnessing to Jesus’ gospel of peace and justice.

EPF Chapters (70+) bring together church members to discuss the issues about which they are the most passionate, how they might respond and what tools they need. Chapters present peace and justice resources to their parishes, write resolutions for their diocesan conventions, and organize ways that members can witness publicly.

EPF Action Groups organize and provide public witness to end war and bring peace (currently, we are especially concerned about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan); to bring justice to the Palestinians, and safety to Israel and Palestine; and to prevent a war in Iran. We also organize to end the death penalty in the U.S. and to end the nuclear proliferation. Our action groups provide information and ways to witness publicly to our members and the Church at large.

EPF Nonviolence Tools & Training. EPF is in the process of developing a nonviolent tool kit that is self-instructive and flexible, allowing for maximum interactive use. We also provide counsel and guidance to groups and individuals seeking to host nonviolence training, whether an introductory session, a day-long session or a three-day session.

Our major nonviolence training is called Creating a Culture of Peace: Nonviolence Training for Personal and Social Change. CCP is committed to the spirituality and practice of active nonviolence. It is intergenerational and community-based, with facilitators located across the U.S. and available to local groups. During the course of the three-day training, facilitators guide participants through an exploration of five themes: Violence, Active Nonviolence, Successful Nonviolent Social Movements, Community-Building, and Action-Planning. Every group plans nonviolent projects. The optimum training, a retreat with spiritual dimensions, allows for 20 contact hours, usually over a three-day weekend.

Contact Janet Chisholm: www.kirkridge.org.

EPF Liturgical Resources are woven into the very fabric of our life together as Episcopalians and Anglicans. EPF encourages our members to name, in the Prayers of the People, those oppressed by injustice and violence, to lift up in the liturgical context the themes of non-violence and forgiveness, and to organize vigils for both parishes and communities.

Website: www.epfnational.org
Contact: epfnational@ameritech.net
Cross of Nails Centers

On the 14th November 1940, much of the City of Coventry was reduced to rubble by German bombs. The Cathedral, at the heart of the city, burned with it. In the terrible aftermath that followed, Provost Howard wrote the words “Father forgive” on the smoke-blackened wall of the sanctuary. Two of the charred beams which had fallen in the shape of a cross were set on the altar and three of the medieval nails were bound into the shape of a cross.

The Cross of Nails is a very powerful and inspirational symbol worldwide of reconciliation and peace. After the Second World War, Crosses of Nails were presented to Kiel, Dresden and Berlin, cities shattered by Allied bombing: Out of the ashes grew a trust and partnership between Coventry and the German cities.

There are now 160 Cross of Nails Centers around the world, all emanating from this early, courageous vision, and all working for peace and reconciliation within their own communities and countries. This has no boundaries: it may focus on issues of politics, race, religion, economics, sexual orientation or personal; it can have broad and far-reaching national consequences, or it can make just a small – nonetheless significant – difference to people’s lives. Centers can be churches, reconciliation centers, prisons, NGOs and schools, any body of people who have a heart and a need to pursue reconciliation in their own lives and the lives of others. The Centers in Germany and the USA are administered by national boards; others range over all continents – from Africa to Australia, Europe to Asia: truly a global network, with Centers being encouraged to support each other – practically and prayerfully.

Associate Centers of Reconciliation

We also have partner organizations, from other faiths or working for interfaith relations around the world, and to them we present a miniature of the sculpture “Reconciliation,” which is found in the Cathedral ruins, in recognition of their work towards healing wounds.

A Unique Ministry

- In South Africa, the CCN centers have been focal points for sharing some of the painful memories and wounds of apartheid: they have been inspired entrepreneurial, health and land reclamation initiatives, and help to cross the boundaries of the social/religious/cultural divide.
- In Nigeria and Burundi, the CCN and associate centers play a vital part in the exit strategy from areas of intense interfaith tension and conflict.
- In the Middle East, our centers in Israel and Palestine are working towards a greater mutual understanding between Jews and Arabs.
- In the USA, where there are 43 centers, there are many active projects focusing on reconciliation within the community, teaching the ethics of mediation and coalition building. Some of the parishes are partnered with ones in South Africa, Sierra Leone and Cuba, offering practical and financial support.
- In Europe, Germany has the most active centers (40), many of whom are particularly committed to projects in Central and Eastern Europe (in Slovakia, Bosnia, Belarus and Romania). The UK is revitalizing its own collective ministry nationally and internationally, in churches, NGOs, prisons and schools. Our four centers in Northern Ireland – the Corrymeela and Cornerstone Communities, Lagan College and the Cross Fire Trust – are of world renown in their work with the Protestant and Catholic peoples, providing leadership, inspiration and a safe haven where trust and understanding can be fostered.

www.crossofnails.org
MORE RESOURCES AND MODELS
For Conflict Transformation

(The Anglican Peace and Justice Network is seeking examples of justice and peacemaking efforts to recommend to provinces throughout the Communion. These will be posted on the APJN section of the Anglican Communion website: www.anglicancommunion.org.)

CANADA

A Justice that Heals and Restores is a resource booklet about the principles of restorative justice with suggestions for worship, workshops and bible studies that parishes can use during Advent and Lent. The resource is a joint project of the Restorative Justice Working Group of the Diocese of Toronto, the Church Council on Justice and Corrections and the EcoJustice Committee. It arises out a resolution adopted by the Anglican Church of Canada’s General Synod to affirm the principles of restorative justice which focus on healing and restoration and take seriously the needs of victims, offenders, and communities. A Justice that Heals and Restores is a project of the Decade to Overcome Violence.

www.anglican.ca/partnerships/EcoJustice

Remembering the Children was a March 2008 multi-city tour by Aboriginal and church leaders to promote the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on residential schools, which was officially launched on June 1, 2008. The website provides important and detailed background on the issues, the tour, and the partners.

www.rememberingthechildren.ca

ENGLAND

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship

Established in 1937, APF now has some 1,400 members in over 40 countries, as well as a sister organization, the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, in the United States of America. APF founded the Week of Prayer for World Peace, is a member of the Network of Christian Peace Organisations and of the International Peace Bureau.

www.anglicanpeacemaker.org.uk

Conciliation Resources

Conciliation Resources (CR) is an international nongovernmental organization registered in the UK as a charity. CR works mainly in the Caucasus, Uganda and West Africa in partnership with local and international civil society organizations and governments. CR also publishes Accord: an international review of peace initiatives, and is involved in projects in Colombia, Fiji and the Philippines.

www.c-r.org

Coventry International Centre for Reconciliation

The International Center for Reconciliation (ICR) at Coventry Cathedral is one of the world’s oldest religious-based centers for reconciliation. It was established following the destruction of Coventry Cathedral in 1940, after which the provost made a commitment not to revenge, but to reconciliation with Britain’s enemies. Since then, ICR’s work for peace has expanded into some of the world’s worst areas of conflict. Much of the Center’s early work was in the former Communist bloc, broadening to focus on conflicts involving the three major monotheistic faiths. Today, ICR is committed to reconciliation in various situations of violent conflict, some related to religious dispute and others fueled by different factors. In addition to its short-term reconciliation work, ICR coordinates the Community of the Cross of Nails, an international network of over 150 organizations in 60 countries committed to reconciliation.

www.coventrycathedral.org.uk

St Ethelburga’s Centre for Reconciliation and Peace

In April 1993, the medieval church of St. Ethelburga’s was devastated by an IRA bomb. Now, St. Ethelburga’s Centre is a unique meeting space in the heart of the City of London devoted to promoting understanding
of the relationship between faith and conflict. It offers talks, workshops, and training about reconciliation and peace-making. It explores religious difference together in The Tent, and celebrates religious and cultural diversity through music and poetry.

www.stethelburgas.org

IRELAND

The Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation

This organization is devoted to peacebuilding and reconciliation in Ireland, North and South, Britain and beyond. It facilitates dialogues and creates peace education resources. The center was founded in 1974 as a response to violent conflict in Ireland, and in light of a conviction that non-violent solutions must be pursued to encourage reconciliation within and between communities.

www.glencree.ie

ISRAEL/PALESTINE

Kids4Peace

In response to concerns about the future of children in Israel and Palestine, especially in light of the escalation of tensions between the two communities in the Holy Land, the Diocese of Jerusalem has set in motion a “Kids4Peace” Special Program, with focus on “education for peace”. This program includes meetings between Israeli and Palestinian families from both sides of the cultural and political divide. Children aged 10-12, from Jewish, Christian and Muslim families, are introduced to each other, and engaged in fun and artistic activities. “Kids4 Peace” is non-denominational, non-political and non-partisan. All participants – staff, families and children – share a commitment to peace, and a belief that an educational experience of tolerance and respect for cultural and religious diversity should begin with the very young, and reach out to invite adults as well into mature ways of coexistence.

www.j-diocese.org/Interfaith_Ministries

NORTHERN IRELAND

Corrymeela Community

Founded in 1965, Corrymeela’s objective has always been, and continues to be, promoting reconciliation and peace-building through the healing of social, religious and political divisions in Northern Ireland. Corrymeela’s vision of Christian community and reconciliation has been expressed through a commitment to encounter, interaction and positive relationships throughout Northern Ireland and beyond. The Corrymeela Community currently has 150 members and more than 5,000 friends and supporters throughout the world. Many Corrymeela members are active in a wide variety of peace and reconciliation activity and some have created their own training agencies involved in conflict transformation work. Each year more than 6,000 people take part in programs at the Corrymeela Ballycastle Centre in Belfast.

www.corrymeela.org